BUSH'S MOTIVATIONS IN STARTING THE IRAQ WAR 2003: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Doaa Taher AL-dihaymawee
PhD student of linguistics, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad
duaataher1994@gmail.com

Shahla Sharifi
Associate Professor of Linguistics, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad
Sh-sharifi@um.ac.ir
Ali Alizadeh
Associate Professor of Linguistics, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad
alalizadeh@um.ac.ir

ABSTRACT

11 September attack was the starting point for long years of a bloody war. After this attack the American President George W. Bush declares 'war on terror', starting with accusing the Iraqi regime led by Saddam Hussein of Possessing WMDs and aiding AL-Qaeda. Because of the lack of the studies on this topic from Critical discourse analysis perspective, the researchers employ Wodak's (2001, 2009) *discourse-historical approach* and van Leeuwen's (2008) *sociological categories of actor representation approach*, trying to answer some questions related to Bush's uses of macro and micro strategies in his speech in addition to revealing his uncovered ideology. The findings of the analysis have revealed that Bush uses topoi of war, threat, and terrorism to support his view that the Iraqi regime is a source of danger on all the nations especially the America and its allies in the Middle East. Bush also exaggerates the level of threat that Saddam Hussein represents as there is neither Chemical nor biological weapons and there is no link

between Saddam Hussein and AL-Qaeda as he claimed. Thus, Bush mislead the world to a war that he minimizes its threat as "relatively short and hugely successful", however it continues for nine years in which hundreds of thousands lost their lives in both sides. Even though, Bush promises Iraqis with freedom and democracy yet Iraqis suffer sectarian war, ISIS and a corrupted government till now.

1. Introduction

The oldest civilization is known to humankind developed in Iraq (Mance, 2003:10). Iraq has an area of 447,964 square kilometres. It is considered as the shortcut route between Southeast Asia and Europe, thus, it has served as a bridge between Europe, Asia, and Africa and between the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean (Ghareeb, 2004:xl). Economically, Iraq has the second world major oil reserves (Mance, 2003:11), and it was the world's major exporter of dates, providing over 75 % of the world's supply. Nonetheless, the Gulf wars have destroyed numerous palm groves (Ghareeb, 2004: xlii). Baghdad is the country's largest city and it is also the capital. Moreover, Iraq became a republic in 1958 but has been an under a dictatorship controlled by a single party, the Ba'th Party, since 1968 and Saddam Hussein was the last ruler from this party (Mance, 2003:10-13).

After 11 September, Bush placed Iraq, North Korea, Iran, and 'their terrorist allies' in the category the 'axis of evil'. The US occupied Afghanistan and toppled its regime (Beeson, 2006:35; Ryan & Kiely, 2009:94). Over a year of invading Afghanistan and overthrow the Taliban regime, America set for a similar goal in Iraq that was to free the Iraqi people from a dictatorial regime which had frequently attacked its citizens, threatened its neighbours, and was supposed to possess WMDs (Weapons of Mass Destruction) (Hoehn et al, 2007: 4). In September 2002, Bush stated that "You can't distinguish between al Qaeda and Saddam when you talk about the war on terror". In their public presentations, Bush and his counsellors allowed no room for doubt that Saddam did not only possess WMD but also it possessed the willingness and the capability to use these weapons against American citizens on American soil (Alterman & Green, 2004: 6, 252-254).

Primarily, Bush emphasized that Iraq possess weapons of mass destruction, and the regime linked with al-Qaeda as well as Saddam effort to import nuclear material from Niger. Nevertheless, Bush applied the greatest emphasis on the humanitarian aspects, to get the UN support, such as Bush's speech to the UN in late 2002:

> Tens of thousands of political opponents and ordinary citizens have been subjected to arbitrary arrest and imprisonment, summary execution and torture by beating and burning, electric shock, starvation, mutilation and rape. Wives are tortured in front of their husbands, children in the presence of their parents – and all of these horrors concealed from the world by the apparatus of a totalitarian state (Hehir, 2008:60).

The case of war against Iraq was international. The level of the opposition to the war was exceptional. On 7–9 February 2003, a poll done by *The Times* found that three-fifths of the British population assumed that their country should only launch a war against Iraq if the United Nation authorized it. International legal scholars stated that the war against Iraq violated international law. In the period prior the war, the Foreign Office's top legal advisers, Elizabeth Wilmshurst, and Michael Wood made clear to the Foreign Secretary that with the absence of obvious UNSC (United Nations Security Council) authorization, Britain would be joining an illegal "war of aggression" (Davidson, 2011:141-144).

On 17 March 2003, George Bush gave Hussein and his sons forty-eight hours to leave Iraq or be bombed. Bush described the war against Iraq as "relatively short and hugely successful". He also stated that "our mission is clear, to disarm Iraq of weapons of mass destruction, to end Saddam Hussein's support for terrorism, and to free the Iraqi people" (Hehir, 2008:60-62). On March 20, 2003, the US launched the war against Iraq. Blair's government in Britain was Bush's closest ally during the war, providing the US campaign with absolute political support and 46,000 troops for the invasion. Silvio Berlusconi's government in Italy supported the Bush decision of war but provided no military contribution (Davidson, 2011:133). In addition to Spain, Japan, and Australia provided diplomatic support for the operation, furthermore, the US-allied in the region including Saudi Arabia, and Jordan represented their behind-the-scenes support. But other U.S. allies, such as Germany, France, and Turkey, opposed the invasion. After a long process of negotiating, Turkey lastly allowed U.S. overflights, as did Germany and France. But Turkey did not allow U.S. ground troops to use its land to invade Iraq. (Dobbins et al, 2003:167). The combat was known as *'Operation Iraqi Freedom'* (OIF) (Davidson, 2011:133).

However, Rudyk (2007), Sabry (2015), Kalsi (2017), and Beshara (2018) dealt with a different aspect from Bush's speeches regarding 'war on terror'. Rudyk (2007) studies President George Bush's State of the Union Speech using Fairclough's (2001) model. To represent the exercise of power related to America position in Iraq. The study shows that the signs of

manipulation at the levels of semantics, syntax and pragmatics. A multidisciplinary approach to manipulation elicits discursive, cognitive and social mechanisms of manipulation in the text of the speech. Sabry (2015), on the other hand, studies Bush's speech related to Islam and Muslims from a CDA perspective. He adopts presuppositions and entailments, with shadowing more lights on the ideology which is considered as the umbrella for both models. The article uses both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Sabry reveals that George Bush tries to use diverse categories of presupposition to achieve ideological and political purposes. The main aim is to convince the world that the USA is not in a war with Islam, but the opposite, it calls for democracy and freedom in the Middle East. Kalsi (2017) uses Carvalho's (2008) CDA framework to study ending the war in Iraq by George Bush 2003 and Barack Obama 2011. His newspaper discourse depends on major American newspapers such as *The New York Times, The Wall Street Journal, USA Today,* and *The Washington Post*. This study found that there is a strong presence of nationalistic ideology in all four newspapers in both 2003 and 2011 news reports. In 2018, Beshara studies President George W. Bush's speech on 'War on Terror' (WOT) in 2001, depending on Norman Fairclough (2001) 'analytical framework', and the register theory of Jacques Lacan (2011). The paper concludes that terrorism is a real social problem, as it results in an Islamophobia that is raising violence in the world. Furthermore, the WOT creates a negative-patriotism or a national identity against Muslims. Therefore, there is a huge gap in the study as there is no single study has been done about Bush's speech in declaring war on Iraq particularly via employing Wodak's (2001;2009) *discourse-historical approach* and van Leeuwen's (2008) *sociological categories of actor representation approach*. The study addresses the following research questions:

1. What are the macro-topics that President Bush uses in the representation of terrorism in Iraq?

2. What are the micro-strategies and categories that President Bush used to represent terrorism in Iraq?

3. How do the macro-topics and micro-strategies uncover Bush's ideology?

2. Methodology

The selected speech is delivered by Bush on 18 March 2003, to give Saddam Hussein and his two sons the last chance to leave Iraq within 48 hours before using force. In this speech, Bush highlights the great threat that Hussein causes on America and its allies if he stays in power. The script of this speech is taken from the New York Times official page:

https://www.nytimes.com/2003/03/18/politics/text-bushs-speech-on-iraq.html. This speech contains 1746 words.

3. Critical Discourse Analysis

Since the 1970s, Discourse Analysis has developed into a new area known as Critical Discourse Analysis which looks for discourse as a form of social practice, and studies how language represents the world from various standpoints. CDA studies the connection between language, power, ideas, as well as the ordering of relationship within society (Rashidi & Souzandehfar, 2010:56). Van Dijk (1998:353) stresses that CDA is not "a unitary theoretical framework or a specific direction". CDA has four typical approaches. The first approach is Critical Linguistics which established by Fowler, Kress, Hodge & Trew (1979), Kress (1985), Fowler (1991, 1996), and Kress & Hodge (1979). The second approach represents by Fairclough (1989, 1992, and 1995), which is known as Sociocultural approach. Wodak (1996, 2001) represents the Discourse-Historical approach. Finally, Van Dijk's (1998, 2001) proposed the sociocognitive approach (Rashidi & Souzandehfar, 2010:57).

Kress (1990:94) states that CDA was "emerging as a distinct theory of language, a radically different kind of linguistics", while, Fairclough (1995:20) defines critical theory as "any theory concerned with critique of ideology and the effects of domination".

Another critical discourse analyst is Wodak. Wodak (2oo1; 2006) points out that term Critical Linguistic and critical discourse analysis is frequently used interchangeably. CDA is an interdisciplinary approach, thus, it is the mix of Rhetoric, Text linguistics, Philosophy, Anthropology, Socio-Psychology, Cognitive Science, Sociolinguistics, and Literary Studies, as well as Applied Linguistics and Pragmatics(Wodak, 2006:1-2) (Wodak, & Ruth, 2001: 1-2). She also (2001:70) adds that" CDA sees language as 'social-political power", thus, critical discourse analysis (CDA) investigates socio-political values and norms.

Van Dijk (2001:104), one the other hand, describes CDA as the study of "implicit or indirect meanings in text". Van Dijk studies media discourse. Recently, he starts focusing on issues of racism and ideology (Wodak, & Ruth, 2001:5), as well as on representing a theory of context. Van Dijk's most outstanding approach is known as 'sociocognitive model', which is based on the link between 'society 'and' discourse'. The socio-cognitive approach is basic on short-term and long term memories which form the perception and comprehension of the world (Wodak, & Busch, 2004:110).

The last critical discourse analyst is Van Leeuwen. Van Leeuwen (1996) provides a practical structure for considering the communicative prospect of visual devices in the media. Van Leeuwen studied film production and Hallidayan linguistics as well (Wodak, & Busch, 2004:111). His main publications are concerned with the intonation of newsreaders and disc jockeys, as well as the language of newspaper reporting, television interviews and more recently the semiotics of music and visual communication (Wodak & Meyer,2001:8-9)

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a basic discipline used to offer answers to questions about the links between society, language, identity, power, politics, ideology, and culture (Rahimi, & Riasati, 2011:107). Thus, it studies cases of racism, injustice, prejudice, inequality, and danger (Rahimi, & Riasati, 2011:107). CDA normally analyses political speeches, news texts, school books, advertisements, etc., exposing strategies that appear normal on the surface, but in fact, be ideological and seek to shape the representation of events and persons for specific ends (Machin, & Mayr, 2012:5).

4. Theoretical Framework

The researchers have chosen two approaches relevant to the objectives and scope of this research; they are Wodak's (2001; 2009) Discourse-Historical approach (DHA) and van Leeuwen's (1996; 2008) Sociological Categories of Actor Representation. The discourse-historical approach (DHA) is interpretative and hermeneutic in studying discourse (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001; Wodak et al., 2009), due to the reality that this approach combines history, cognition, and linguistics. While, Van Leeuwen's (2008) approach functions on the micro (local) linguistic level and it is mixed within Wodak's DHA referential, predictional and intensification/mitigation strategies. Therefore, the representation of the social actors in this study is to be accounted for by these socio-semantic categories with their linguistic realisations. Accordingly, the researchers apply two levels of analysis in this study: linguistic and ideological. The linguistic level focuses on macro and micro levels of analysis. While, the macro-level centres on the analysis of discourse topics, the micro-level deals with three different strategies; referential, Predictional and intensification/mitigation strategies; each strategy has several linguistic patterns. On the other hand, ideological analysis exists to investigate the ideologies of the speaker. In the next section, we will analyze Bush's speech in the mentioned linguistic and ideological levels.

5. Data Analysis

At the macro-level analysis, discourse topics are identified and analysed as shown below.

-Discourse Topics

An overview of the discourse topics or contents of the selected news reports is provided along with the arguments, which are constructed around certain topics. This is in line with Wodak's (2006:74) view that *"topoi* or *loci* can be described as parts of argumentation which belong to the obligatory, either explicit or inferable premises". Thus, the researchers highlight the main topoi that refer to the representation of social actors as they are discussed below with examples.

Example (1): Topoi of war, terrorism and danger

- A. The United States and other nations did nothing to deserve or invite this threat, but we will do everything to defeat it.
- B. Before the day of horror can come, before it is too late to act, this danger will be removed.
- C. Yet some permanent members of the Security Council have publicly announced that they will veto any resolution that compels the disarmament of Iraq.
- D. And a broad coalition is now gathering to enforce the just demands of the world.
- E. Their refusal to do so will result in military conflict, commenced at a time of our choosing. For their safety, all foreign nationals, including journalists and inspectors should leave Iraq immediately.
- F. If we must begin a military campaign, it will be directed against the lawless men who rule your country and not against you.
- G. Should Saddam Hussein choose confrontation, the American people can know that every measure has been taken to avoid war. And every measure will be taken to win it.
- H. War has no certainty except the certainty of sacrifice. Yet the only way to reduce the harm and duration of war is to apply the full force and might of our military. And we are prepared to do so.
- I. If our enemies dare to strike us, they and all who have aided them will face fearful consequences
- J. the Iraq regime continues to possess and conceal some of the most lethal weapons ever devised
- K. This regime has already used weapons of mass destruction against Iraq's neighbours and Iraq's people. The regime has a history of reckless aggression in the Middle East
- L. The danger is clear. Using chemical, biological or, one day, nuclear weapons, obtained with the help of Iraq,
- M. Today, no nation can claim that Iraq has disarmed, and it will not disarm so long as Saddam Hussein holds the power

Despite, the majority of Bush administration officials know that Saddam Hussein has nothing to do with 9/11. Yet Bush saw new reason to be concerned about Saddam WMD programs (Collins, 2008:5). After over a year from 11 September attacks, all Bush's speeches are about the Iraqi regime great threat on the USA and the necessity of declaring war on Iraq. In this speech, Bush declared his motives and strategies for this war. Thus, the main topos is *topoi of war* as this speech is a clear declaration for the war on terror represented by Saddam Hussein. In (I), Bush clarifies that the reason beyond declaring war on Iraq is due to Saddam's

aid for Al-Qaeda *"it has aided, trained and harbored terrorists",* which strikes the US on 11 September. In (A, B and C), he states that the USA did nothing to deserve such danger *"did nothing to deserve or invite this threat"* neither from Saddam nor from Al-Qaeda, however, he is willing to do anything to prevent that threat before it is too late, even if the UN did not support this war. Despite the UN disproval, Bush gets the support from many great nations for his case and he is going to lead a "*broad coalition"* that will fulfil the *"demands of the world".* Even this war faced the greatest international opposition in human history (Hehir, 2008:73). Still Bush represents it as a war that is going to *"enforce the just demands of the world".* In extract (E, F, G, and H), Bush started to talk about war directly, staring from the timing that the USA is going to select to determine the goal of the war which is Hussein *"the lawless men who rule your country"* and by that he asks other foreign nationalities from weapon inspectors or journalists to leave Iraq as the moments of war comes closer. Bush emphasizes that the choice of war is not the best but still it is the only choice left to defeat Hussein's threat. Bush refers to the start of the war indirectly by emphasizing on the positive results that the war may bring *"deceit and cruelty have now reached an end", "tear down the apparatus of terror",* and *"we will help you to build a new Iraq".* Since Iraq was under sanction for over thirteen years during which Iraqis hugely suffer poverty, the absence of adequate infrastructure, medicines, or equipment. Avoidable diseases started killing huge numbers of people, especially the elderly and the children (Ghareeb, 2004: lxx) (Tucker, 2010:592), therefore, Bush states that the coalitions are going to deliver "the food and medicine you need", indicating that he already knows about this humanitarian disaster which was happening for years and now he is showing his support to emphasize on the humanitarian side for this war.

Bush used *topoi of terrorism* as the main umbrella to justify his war; meanwhile, he uses other topoi such as *topoi of danger and threat* to support his point. Bush shows that Saddam not only possesses these deadly weapons but also willing to use anytime as he has already used them against his neighbour country Iran during their eight years of war (1980-1988). Additionally, Saddam used chemical weapons against his citizens "already used weapons of mass destruction against Iraq's neighbours and Iraq's people". Among Bush's claims this one is true (Collins, 2008:9-10) (Oygarden, 2014:7) (Hube, 2019). By this, he supports his view that Saddam is a dictator who is a source of threat for all nations including his peaceful inhabitants as in extracts (J, K and L). In (L and M), Bush suggests that the only way to stop this threat is by disarming Iraq and to do that war on Saddam should be declared before it is too late: *"We choose to meet that threat", "this danger will be removed", "military conflict" "urging the dictator to leave Iraq",* and *"Hussein choose confrontation".*

Micro-Level Analysis

   At the macro-level analysis, discourse topics are identified and analysed as shown below.

1. Referential Strategy

Example (2): Genericisation

   A. <u>My fellow citizens</u>, events in Iraq have now reached the final days of the decision.

   B. <u>The Iraqi regime</u> has used diplomacy as a ploy to gain time and advantage.

   C. <u>U.N. weapon inspectors</u> have been threatened by <u>Iraqi officials</u>, electronically bugged.

   D. <u>The regime</u> has a history of reckless aggression in the Middle East…And it has aided, trained and harbored <u>terrorists</u>, including operatives of Al Qaeda.

   E. <u>the Security Council</u> did act in the early 1990's.

   F. I went to <u>the U.N. General</u> Assembly and urged the nations of the world to unite and bring an end to this danger. On Nov. 8, <u>the Security Council</u> unanimously passed Resolution 1441…

   G. They have delivered public and private messages urging <u>the dictator</u> to leave Iraq

   H. I urge every member of <u>the Iraqi military and intelligence services</u>, if war comes,

   I. <u>Americans</u> understand the cost of conflict…

   J. In desperation he and <u>terrorist groups</u> might try to conduct terrorist operations against the American people

   K. <u>Terrorists and terrorist states</u> do not reveal these threats with fair notice in formal declarations.

Bush uses several terminologies within genericisation to describe the Iraqi government, such as "*The regime"*, "*the Iraqi regime*" and "*the Iraqi military*" in (D, B, and H) which are genericisation via using singular noun with a definite article. Another terminology can be seen in (C and H) "*Iraqi officials*", and "*intelligence services*" which is also genericisation but this time by using plural noun without any article. Referring to the Iraqi president at that time, Bush uses the term "*the dictator*" in (G) as he tries to emphasize that this person comments many war crimes against his citizens and he even does not deserve to call 'president' or even by his regular name 'Saddam Hussein'. It is genericisation via using a single noun with a definite article. Starting his speech by "*My fellow citizens*", Bush addresses his citizens and to show his closeness to them and that any decision he is going to make it out of his fear on them. While in (I), he refers to them as "*Americans*", emphasizing more on their nationality as people who already now the coast of war and willing to pay it for great causes. Additionally, it indicates that "Americans" have been targeted by terrorist attacks only because of their nationality. Both cases are genericisation via using plurality without article. However, to highlight all the

peaceful offers that have been done to disarm Iraq, Bush refers to the UN as *"the Security Council"*, and *"the U.N. General"* in (E, and F). To emphasize that even though the UN does not support invading Iraq, but the UN has already considered Iraq as a threat since 1991 when Iraq invaded Kuwait and has made great offers over twelve years to disarm Iraq peacefully. Yet the UN has not succeeded thus the only choice left is using force to end this threat. According to Van Leeuwen (1996; 2008), all these terminologies are generisication by using single noun with a definite article. While (C) is generisication by using plural noun without article "*U.N. weapon inspectors*", here Bush shows the great offers and threats that the UN inspectors face in Iraq. Finally, Geneicisation by using plurality can also be found in *"terrorist groups*", and *"terrorists"* in (D, J and K) stands for Al-Qaeda which Bush accuses Hussein of aiding them. While, "*terrorist states*" stands for Iraq, North Kora and Iran which Bush already called them the *"Axis of evil"*.

Example (3): Assimilation

A. That regime pledged to reveal and destroy all its weapons of mass destruction as a condition for ending the Persian Gulf war in 1991

B. the terrorists could fulfil their stated ambitions and kills thousands or hundreds of thousands of innocent people in our country or any other.

C. This regime has already used weapons of mass destruction against Iraq's neighbours and Iraq's people.

D. War crimes will be prosecuted. War criminals will be punished.

E. the American people can know that every measure has been taken to avoid war.

F. War has no certainty except the certainty of sacrifice.

G. In desperation he and terrorist groups might try to conduct terrorist operations against the American people and our friends. These attacks are not inevitable

H. In recent days American authorities have expelled from the country certain individuals with ties to Iraqi intelligence services.

I. We are a peaceful people, yet we're not a fragile people, and we will not be intimidated by thugs and killers

J. Do not destroy oil wells, a source of wealth that belongs to the Iraqi people. Do not obey any command to use weapons of mass destruction against anyone, including the Iraqi people.

K. some chose to appease murderous dictators whose threats were allowed to grow into genocide and global war.

L. we believe the Iraqi people are deserving and capable of human liberty.

Bush started his speech by mentioning America's agreement to end the *"Persian Gulf war in 1991"* under one condition that is the disarming of Iraq. According to Bush, Iraq did not keep his side from this agreement and for over Twelve years after the end of that war, Iraq still possesses WMDs. Therefore, Bush decided to declare war against Iraq to prevent "*global war"* that Iraq may lead by using its chemical and biological weapons. He also warns the Iraqi military from committing any "*war crimes*" against the coalitions force during their entrance to Iraq. Accordingly, (A, D, F and K) is *assimilation* by using the mass noun *'war'*. Bush emphasizes that he is leading this war for the safety of "*innocent people in our country or any other*", and if the American people are "*peaceful people*" that do not mean they are "*a fragile people*". Therefore, in time of danger, they are going to defend their country. Bush adds that he wages this war because the "*the Iraqi people*" deserve to have freedom and democracy away from their brutal government and here he tries also to highlight the humanitarian side of the war (Hehir, 2008:60). Accordingly, (B, C, G, J, and L) is *assimilation* by the use of the mass noun *'people'* that stands for all the people that Bush tries to protect in this war. In (B, and G), *"the terrorists", "our friends"* and *"These attacks"* are assimilation by plurality, while "*Iraqi intelligence services"* in (H) is assimilation by the use of the mass noun "*intelligence*".

Example (4): Individuality and Nomination

    A.   <u>Saddam Hussein</u> and his sons must leave Iraq within 48 hours.

    B.   The terrorist threat to America and the world will be diminished the moment that <u>Saddam Hussein</u> is disarmed.

    C.   <u>Saddam Hussein</u> and his terrorist allies could choose the moment of deadly conflict when they are strongest.

    D.   The security of the world requires disarming <u>Saddam Hussein</u> now

In the entire speech, there is a reference for a single individual only *"Saddam Hussein"*. Even Bush has many enemies in different nations such as the 'axis of evil' which includes north Kora, Iran, and Iraq. Bush also hates the Libyan and Syrian leadership and above all AL-Qaeda organization and its leader Bin Laden, which he considers the top terrorist organization in the world. In this speech, Bush addresses exclusively one individual whom he considers the most dangers among all his enemies "*Saddam Hussein*". One can notice that "*Saddam Hussein*" has been mention nine times and always linked to terror and danger *"evil men plot chemical, biological and nuclear terror"* and *"Saddam Hussein and his terrorist allies"*. According to ideology theory, this is a "negative other representation" for Saddam Hussein. Bush considers

Saddam as a bad guy, therefore he represents himself as the good guy who is going to save the world from Saddam's threat. Here, it is "positive self-representation" for Bush (Moore, 2004, p.xvi). Nevertheless, the purpose of Bush's speech is to give Saddam Hussein the last chance to surround by leaving Iraq with his two sons within 48 hours. Actually, "*his sons*", there is no direct mention to their names, the only mention is through their kinship relation to Saddam Hussein. Because they are not of great importance to Bush, neither of threat. The only name that Bush utters repeatedly is "*Saddam Hussein*" as seen in the above extracts. This is a *semi-formal nomination* as Bush only uses the first name and the surname without any titles such as the 'leader' or 'president' of Iraq, which indicates that Bush does not respect Saddam Hussein or even, considers him worthy that leadership. Sometimes, Bush even does not utter Hussein's name but instead uses other negative terms such as 'the dictator' which indicates Bush hater for Saddam Hussein.

Example (5): Aggregation

  A. For <u>more than a decade,</u> the United States and other nations have pursued patient and honorable efforts to disarm the Iraqi regime without war.

  B. as a condition for ending the Persian Gulf war in <u>1991</u>. Since then the world has engaged in <u>12 years</u> of diplomacy. We have passed more than <u>a dozen resolutions</u> in the United Nations Security Council. We have sent <u>hundreds of weapons inspectors</u> to oversee the disarmament of Iraq.

  C. <u>Over the years,</u> U.N. weapon inspectors have been threatened by Iraqi officials,

  D. that the Iraq regime continues to possess and conceal <u>some of the most lethal weapons</u> ever devised.

  E. <u>one day</u>, nuclear weapons, obtained with the help of Iraq, the terrorists could fulfill their stated ambitions and kills <u>thousands or hundreds of thousands of innocent people</u> in our country or any other.

  F. the United States Congress voted overwhelmingly <u>last year</u> to support the use of force against Iraq.

  G. the U.N. was founded after <u>the Second World War</u>

  H. in the <u>early 1990's</u>. Under <u>Resolutions 678 and 687,</u> both still in effect, the United States and our allies are authorized to use force in ridding Iraq of weapons of mass destruction.

  I. <u>Last September,</u> I went to the U.N. General Assembly and urged the nations of the world to unite and bring an end to this danger. On <u>Nov. 8</u>, the Security Council unanimously passed <u>Resolution 1441</u> ...

  J. For the <u>last four and a half months,</u> the United States and our allies have worked within the Security Council to enforce that council's longstanding demands.

  K. <u>Many nations</u>, however, do have the resolve and fortitude to act against this threat to peace

    L. *In recent days*, some governments in the Middle East have been doing their part.

    M. *All the decades* of deceit and cruelty have now reached an end. Saddam Hussein and his sons must leave Iraq within <u>48 hours</u>.

    N. In <u>one year or five years</u> the power of Iraq to inflict harm on all free nations would be multiplied <u>many times</u> over.

Psychologically, when someone tries to prove a point, it is better to depend on numbers to support his opinions and make them much clearer. Bush uses this strategy a lot in his speech. Starting from talking about the long history of the UN as an organization that has been established after the Second World War to prevent any other brutal war and to call for peace. To show the long offers in solving WMDs matter peaceful, Bush highlights the UN long history in this case which least for "*more than a decade*", and "*12 years*". The story started *"in 1991"* when the USA make a coalition of 32 nations to force Saddam Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait. The war ended by declaring "*Resolutions 678 and 687*", which force Iraq to destroy "*all its weapons of mass destruction*". Meanwhile, the USA has declared "*more than a dozen resolutions*" and send "*hundreds of weapons inspectors*" to check to disarm of Iraq. Here, Bush uses the quantifiers "*more*" as he did not have the exact number of these resolutions but his hidden intention is to exaggerate the numbers of offers the USA did to disarm Iraq. Furthermore, he uses "*hundreds*" of weapon inspectors in which he also misleads the listeners by giving unlimited numbers. Another quantifier is *"over years"* in (C), as this inspectors and for *"over years"* have been threatened by "by Iraqi officials, electronically". Bush uses the quantifier "*some*" to express his fear that if some of Iraq "*most lethal weapons"* given to terrorists can result in killing "*thousands or hundreds of thousands*" of innocent people around the world as in (D and E). Accordingly, the USA congress votes for war against Iraq "*last year*", here Bush tries to highlight that even his congress support him on war a year ago but still he is patience in taking such step. Meanwhile, Bush went to the UN General "*last September*" asking him to urge all the nation to unite against Saddam Hussein to stop this danger by declaring the last Resolution "*Resolution 1441" on "Nov.8"* 2002, asking Iraq of immediate and full disarm. Here Bush gives the most details sentence is all his speech by using one quantifier *'last'* and two statistical aggregations "*Resolution 1441"* and *"Nov.8"* which make an extract (I) is the strongest as far as aggregation is concerned. In (J), the case does not go smoothly inside the UN, *"last four and a half months"* the US and its allies worked to get the UN approval to Resolution 1441 but *"some permanent members"* refuse "*any resolution*" force Iraq to disarm. Bush here uses four quantifiers *'last'*, *'half'*, *'some'*, and *'any'* to express

aggregation. In (L), Bush uses the quantifiers *'some'* to hints to some neighbouring countries to Iraq who tries to help peacefully by asking Saddam to disarm. Other countries enter in coalition with America to solve the matter by force as in (K). In both cases (L) and (K), Bush uses aggregation by using the quantifiers *'many'*, and *'some'* rather than giving the exact numbers or names of these countries. In (M, N, and O), Bush gives Saddam Hussein and his sons "*48 hours*" to leave Iraq otherwise the US force is going to end *"all the decades"* of their governing. Bush closes his speech by using two statistical aggregations "*one years or five*" to highlight that if Saddam stays in power for another year "*all free nations*" is going to be harmed "*many times*" than the danger and the harm that is present now.

2. **Predictional Strategy**

Example (6): Metaphor

    A. Instead of <u>drifting along toward tragedy</u>, <u>we will set a course toward safety</u>. Before <u>the day of horror </u>can come,

    B. The United Nations Security Council has <u>not lived up to its responsibilities</u>, so <u>we will rise</u> to ours.

In his speech, Bush shows the great threat that Saddam Hussein causes if he stays in power. Bush uses metaphor to assimilate that danger like driving on a road and Saddam's danger is the power that is going to drive all the world toward tragedy. While he as a president of the United States is going to drive the world toward safety in this war by putting an end to Saddam's threat. Because if Saddam stays in power the world in general and the United States and its allies, in particular, is going to be in great danger as Hussein may use his WMDs against them in any unexpected day. In (A), Bush describes that day as *"the day of horror"* to emphasizes the great fear, horror, chaos and dreadfulness that may happen when Saddam uses his WMDs against them. According to Bush, the United Nations Security Council does not do their job by disarming Iraq from WMDs or even by agreeing on Bush decision of launching a war on Iraq. Bush assimilates them of not "*lived up to its responsibilities"* of saving the world from the source of danger that threat. Therefore, he is going to take this responsibility by saving the world from the threat of chemical and biological war that Saddam may start.

3 Intensification/Mitigation Strategy

Example (7): Speech Acts

A. Recognizing the threat to our country, the United States Congress <u>voted</u> overwhelmingly last year to support the use of force against Iraq.
B. For their own safety, all foreign nationals, including journalists and inspectors <u>should leave</u> Iraq immediately.
C. Our forces will <u>give Iraqi military units clear instructions</u> on actions they can take to avoid being attacked and destroyed.
D. And we will help you to <u>build a new Iraq that is prosperous and free</u>.
E. <u>do not fight</u> for a dying regime that is not worth your own life. And all Iraqi military and civilian personnel <u>should listen carefully</u> to this warning… <u>Do not destroy</u> oil wells… <u>Do not obey</u> any command to use weapons of mass destruction against anyone, including the Iraqi people.
F. War crimes will be <u>prosecuted</u>. War criminals will be <u>punished</u>.
G. Should enemies strike our country they would be attempting to shift our attention with <u>panic</u> and <u>weaken</u> our morale with <u>fear</u>.
H. And when the dictator has departed, they can <u>set an example to all the Middle East of a vital and peaceful and self-governing nation</u>. The United States with other countries will work to advance <u>liberty and peace</u> in that region.
I. And the <u>greatest power of freedom</u> is to overcome <u>hatred</u> and <u>violence</u>, and turn the creative gifts of men and women to the pursuits of peace.

As declaring the war is getting close, Bush gives some orders as in (B, C and E). He orders all foreign journalists and inspectors to leave Iraq. He also orders the Iraqi military not to fight or use WMDs against the Coalition forces or even the Iraqis. The strategy of asking someone to do something is a *directive speech act*. After the world suffers from the feeling of fear, panic, and weaken, the world is going to enjoy peace after defeating Saddam. This is a representation of feelings in (G and I) is a *representative speech act*. *Declarative speech act* has its part in this speech, in (A) Bush declares that the *"United States Congress has already voted"* for declaring war on Iraq. This vote is going to change the state of Iraq forever that why it is a *declarative speech act*. Extract (F), Bush warns that if the Iraqi troops disobey him by fighting and using WMDs he is going to punish them for war crimes, and this is a *commissives speech act*. Additionally, Bush promises the Iraqis that after toppling Saddam Hussein, they are going to have a free country *"build a new Iraq that is prosperous and free",* and *"they can set an example to all the Middle East of a vital and peaceful and self-governing nation"* as in (D and H). This is also *a commissive speech act* for the act of promising something in the future. The question is that 'has Bush fulfilled his promises after eliminating Saddam Hussein?' According to Miller (2003:60)

> [T]he reality of the war's aftermath was death and destruction, a power vacuum, and chaos in the streets. Thousands of Iraqis were killed or injured by American bombs, and the cutoff of essential services such as water, food, and electricity created humanitarian disasters in the making. Without a police force to maintain order, looting and crime became widespread…America, however, appeared much less prepared for postwar challenges than it was for war.

Example (8): Hyperbole

A. the Iraq regime continues to possess and conceal some of <u>the most lethal weapons ever devised</u>.
B. Using <u>chemical, biological</u> or, one day, <u>nuclear weapons</u>, obtained with the help of Iraq, the <u>terrorists</u> could fulfill their stated ambitions and kills thousands or hundreds of thousands of innocent people in our country or any other.
C. we cannot live under <u>the threat of blackmail</u>.
D. In this century when <u>evil men</u> plot <u>chemical, biological and nuclear terror</u>, a policy of appeasement could bring <u>destruction</u> of a kind <u>never before seen on this earth</u>.
E. As we enforce the just <u>demands of the world</u>,
F. And it has <u>aided, trained and harbored terrorists</u>, including operatives of Al Qaeda.

Proving his point that Saddam is a source of the threat, Bush uses a lot of hyperbole to exaggerate Saddam's threat. Bush accuses Iraq of having WMDs *"the most lethal weapons ever devised"*, *"chemical, biological or, one day, nuclear weapons"*, *"the threat of blackmail"*, and *"destruction of a kind never before seen on this earth"*. Even after invading Iraq, Bush continues to tell the media that there are WMDs and they found them. In June 2003, Bush delivers a speech in Krakow, Poland "*For those who say we haven't found the banned manufacturing devices or banned weapons, they're wrong. We found them,"* the president claimed. He was referring to two mobile chemical labs which had been instantaneously tested and "*showed no positive hits at all*" for chemical weapons. The official report of a British scientist who tested them for his government, states that "They are not mobile germ warfare laboratories. You could not use them for making biological weapons. They do not even look like them. They are exactly what the Iraqis said they were—facilities for the production of hydrogen gas to fill balloons." Alterman and Green (2004: 254) state that to George Bush, Iraq was not just a *"first-order"* priority but at some times his only priority to persuade the Americans to go along with his invasion plan. He depends on deceiving his nation by exaggerating the level of threat Iraq represented to the United States and its ally. Meanwhile, he minimized the cost and difficulty of the military occupation. In October 2003, the Bush administration's main investigator, David Kay, told the Congress that after searching for almost six months, as well as spending over $300 million, CIA experts and U.S. forces had found no biological or chemical weapons in Iraq. Lieutenant General, James Conway stated that the failure to find any chemical weapons was definitely "*not for lack of trying. We've been to virtually every ammunition supply point between the Kuwaiti border and Baghdad, but they're simply not there"* (Alterman & Green, 2004:254-257).

Excusing Hussein's regime of hosting, training, and aiding Al-Qaeda in extract (F) is also an exaggeration as there is no clear evidence about the link between Saddam Hussein and AL-Qaeda (*Hehir*, 2008: 62). Bush claims that this war is not for political purposes, yet it is the *"demands of the world", as* in (E), which is completely misleading and exaggeration. On 15 February 2003, over one million people marched in each of Rome, Madrid, and London in what David Cortright, the American scholar and peace activist, described as *"the largest-scale single day of anti-war protest in human history"* (Hehir, 2008, p.73). Therefore, this war faces huge disapproval before it started and more afterwards; among them Barack Obama, who was against this war 'from the start'. In a speech delivered in October 2002, he describes this war as 'dumb' and 'rash' and based *"not on principle but on politics",* (Pedersen, 2009:8-9)that why when he becomes a president (2009-2017) he withdraws all the American troops from Iraq by the end of 2011. After all claims of the war proved to be largely false, great emphasis was placed on the moral aspect of the war as Blair stated:

> I can't, sincerely at least, apologize for removing Saddam. The world is a better place with Saddam in prison not in power…success for us in Iraq is not success for America or Britain or even Iraq itself but for the values and way of life that democracy represents (Hehir, 2008: 62)

America wants the war simply "*a good guy versus bad guy battle"*. But the anger of the terrorists, America's need for oil, the commitment of U.S. soldiers, and the failures of the media, has created a lethal mix. As Saddam Hussein had no WMDs, families start to wonder why their children die in a war for *"regime change"* (Moore, 2004:xvi). In his book *The New Imperialism,* Harvey (2003) states that there is a huge difference between legitimate self-defense and "new imperialism". He accuses America of invading Iraq only to steal its oil. Therefore, such accusation sparks the slogan *"No blood for oil"* (Essay, 2015:3). Miller (2003: 9-10) argues that there was a huge doubt

> that the United States sought to occupy Iraq for its own purposes, perhaps to control Iraqi oil, to profit from doing business with Iraq after the war, or to install a government in Iraq that would be partial to U.S. control. Even before the military operation had ended some European nations began calling for United Nations (UN) control over the rebuilding of Iraq. The United States also was criticized, even in Britain, when initial rebuilding contracts were swiftly awarded to big American firms that had close connections with President Bush's administration (Miller, 2003, p.10).

Conclusion

The researchers find out that Bush's speech which is delivered on 18 March 2003; just two days before waging war on Iraq; emphasize mainly on *topoi of war, danger, threat,* and *terrorism.* Since the aim of this speech is giving Hussein the last chance to leave Iraq before using force, therefore it is a clear representation for *topoi of warning and war.* To justify his reasons for war, Bush claims that Saddam regime threatening America and the entire world by its chemical and biological weapons and this is topoi of danger and threat. Bush offers his help by removing Saddam to end that threat and also to liberate the Iraqis from 36 years of Saddam dictatorial rule by this he offering the Iraqis as well as the world a chance of peace and freedom and this is a *topos of peace.*

As far as referential strategy is concerned, Bush uses genericisation a lot referring to the Iraqi government as *the Iraqi regime*" and "*the Iraqi military*", with both emphasize on their nationality as 'Iraqi'. Additionally, Bush refers to Saddam Hussein as "*the dictator*" twice, to emphasize the humanitarian aspect of war. Bush also refers to Iraq as one of the "*terrorist states*", by accusing the Iraqi regime of training and aiding Al-Qaeda and this a negative representation for Iraq as a supporter of terror. Bush also uses assimilation via using the mass nouns *'people', 'war',* and *'intelligence'.* As far as individuality is concerned Bush mentions only one individual *'Saddam Hussein'* whom he considers the source of threat to the entire world. This is reflected Bush's ideology of his deep hate for Saddam Hussein. Mentioning Hussein's name, Bush tends to use semi-formal nomination by mentioning the given name and the surname only without any titles or honorifications. Sometimes, he calls his 'the evil man' or 'the dictator'. Ideologically, it reflects Bush negative representation for 'others'. Aggregation is used a lot especially in emphasizing the long period the UN spend trying to disarm Iraq. In Predictical Strategy, he uses three metaphors. Within the Intensification and Mitigation Strategy, Bush uses a lot of hyperbole to exaggerate Saddam's threat to the world and his relation with AL-Qaeda. He claims that this war is *"demands of the world",* which is also an exaggeration. Finally, Bush uses directive, commissives, representative, and declarative speech act.

References

Alterman, E. & Green, M. (2004). *The Book on Bush: How George W. (mis)leads America*. USA: Penguin Group.

Beeson, M. (2006). *Bush and Asia: America's evolving relations with East Asia*. New York: Routledge.

Beshara R. K. (2018). *A critical discourse analysis of George W. Bush's 'War on Terror' speech : the rhetoric of (counter) terrorism and the logic of Islamophobia*. Journal of Language and Discrimination, 2 (1) pp. 85–112.

Davidson, W. J. (2011). *America's sllies and war Kosovo, Afghanistan, and Iraq.* USA: Palgrave and Macmillan.

Dobbins, J., McGinn J. G., Crane, K., Jones, S. G., Lal, R., Andrew, R., Swanger, R., & Timilsina, A. (2003). *America's role in nation-building: from Germany to Iraq.* Santa Monica: RAND.

Essay, A. (2015). *The Iraq war: Discourse analysis of Christopher Hitchens and Noam Chomsky*. Unpublished Thesis University of Iceland.

Fairclough, N. (1995*). Critical discourse analysis*. Boston: Addison Wesley.

Ghareeb, A. E. (2004). *Historical Dictionary of Iraq*. USA: The Scarecrow Press.

Collins J. (2008). *Choosing war: The Decision to invade Iraq and Its aftermath*. Washington: National Defense University Press.

Harvey, D. (2003). *The New imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hehir, A. (2008). *Humanitarian intervention after Kosovo: Iraq, 791arfur and the record of global civil society*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hoehn, A. R., Grissom A., Ochmanek D. A., Shlapak, D. A., & Vick A. J. (2007). *A New division of labor: Meeting America's security challenges beyond Iraq*. USA: Rand Corporation.

Huber, C. (2019). "*A war of frustration: Saddam Hussein's use of nerve gas on civilians at Halabja (1988) and the American response" (2019).* Senior Honors Projects, 2010-current. 683. https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/honors201019/683

Kalsi, A. (2017). *No End in Sight: A Critical Discourse Analysis of U.S. National Newspaper Coverage of the Iraq War.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/4437

Kress, G. (1990). Critical discourse analysis, *Annual Review of Applied Linguistic* .pp.84-97.

Machin, D. & Mayr, A. (2012). *How to do critical discourse analysis: A Multimodal introduction.* Los Angeles: SAG

Mance, A. L. (2003). *Iraq. USA*: Chelsea House Publishers.

Miller, D. (2003).*The war against Iraq*. USA: the Lucent Terrorism library.

Moore, J. (2004).*Bush's war for reelection: Iraq, the White house, and the people*. USA: John Wiley & Sons.

Oygarden, R. (2014). *Chemical weapons and the Iran-Iraq war*. Unpublished M.A thesis.

Pedersen, C. (2009).*Obama's America*. UK: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

Rahimi, F. & Riasati M. J. (2011). *Critical discourse analysis: scrutinizing ideologically-driven discourses*. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science. Iran: Centre for Promoting Ideas.

Rashidi, N. & Souzandehfar, M. (2010). *A Critical discourse analysis of the debates between Republicans and Democrats over the continuation of war in Iraq*. JoLIE*, 3*, pp.55-82.

Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and discrimination: Rhetoric of racism and antisemitism.* London: Routledge.

Rudyk, I. (2007). *Power Relations in President Bush's State of the Union Speech*. The International Journal of Language Society and Culture. ISSN 1327-774X pp.68-76. URL: www.educ.utas.edu.au/users/tle/JOURNAL/

Ryan, D. & Kiely P. eds. (2009) .*America and Iraq: Policy-making, intervention and regional politics*. London: Routledge.

Tucker, Spencer C., ed. (2010). *The encyclopedia of Middle East wars: The United States in the Persian Gulf, Afghanistan, and Iraq conflicts.* Santa Barbara: ABC- CLIo.

Sabry, M. (2015). *A critical discourse analysis of George W. Bush's speech An Appeal to Muslims: Address to the United Nations.* Research Gate. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327270369_A_Critical_Discourse_Analysis_of_George_W_Bush%27s_Speech_An_Appeal_to_Muslims_Address_to_the_United_Nations?enrichId=rgreq-dcefaa5baaef3d8f64fc18b4387fba1e-XXX&enrichSource=Y292ZXJQYWdlOzMyNzI3MDM2OTtBUzo2NjQ2MzE1MjE1OTk0ODlAMTUzNTQ3MTkxMTM1Nw%3D%3D&el=1_x_2&_esc=publicationCoverPdf.

Van Dijk, T. (1998*). Critical discourse analysis.* In Schiffrin, D. Tannen, D. & Ham H. E. (Eds.) *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 352-371).   Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.

Van Dijk, T (2001). *Multidisciplinary CDA: A pleas for diversity*. In Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis.* London: Sage publications, pp.95-120.

Van Leeuwen, T. (1996). *The representation of social actors. In C. R. Caldas-Coulthard   andM. Coulthard (Eds.)*. Texts and practices: Reading in critical discourse analysis (pp.32-70). London: Routledge.

Van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and practice: News Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis.*New York: Oxford University Press.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2001) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.

Wodak, R. & Busch, B. (2004*). Approaches to media texts*. In J. Downing (Ed.), The
 Sage handbook of media studies (pp.105-122). London: Sage Publications, Inc.

Wodak, R. (2006) *Critical linguistics and critical discourse analysis.* Amsterdam: John
Benjamins Publ. Co

Wodak, R., de Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., & Liebhart, K. (2009). *The Discursive Construction of
National Identity* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd editions). London:
Sage Publication.