



IRAQI  
Academic Scientific Journals



العراقية  
المجلات الأكاديمية العلمية

ISSN: 2663-9033 (Online) | ISSN: 2616-6224 (Print)

**Journal of Language Studies**

Contents available at: <https://jls.tu.edu.iq/index.php/JLS>



## A Socio-Cognitive Analysis of the Self/other Representation in Bush's Speech

**Huda Abdul-Latif Mahmoud\***

English department/ college of Education for Humanities/ University of Tikrit  
[ha231436ped@st.tu.edu.iq](mailto:ha231436ped@st.tu.edu.iq)

&

**Pro.Dr. Hasan Shaban Ali Al-Thalab**

English department/ college of Education for Humanities/ University of Tikrit  
[hassanshaban@tu.edu.iq](mailto:hassanshaban@tu.edu.iq)

Received: 11\5\2024, Accepted: 12\6\2024, Online Published: 31/ 8 / 2024

### ABSTRACT

It is known that political speeches are important as a communicative tool for politicians to maintain the power, which is essential to express political opinions and views as well as ideologies, though not always explicitly. Ideology is regarded as one of the primary objectives of text analysis in linguistic studies, particularly critical discourse analysis (henceforth CDA), which consists of shared values, beliefs and attitudes within a group. In this way, discourse reflects the values of these ideological held by those

\* **Corresponding Author:** Huda Abdul-Latif Mahmoud, **Email:** [ha231436ped@st.tu.edu.iq](mailto:ha231436ped@st.tu.edu.iq)

**Affiliation:** Tikrit University - Iraq

© This is an open access article under the CC by licenses <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>



groups who create it. The present study focuses on investigating the discursive ideological strategies of the self/other in Bush's speech after September 11 attacks based on Van Dijk's (2006) model of ideological square. The data are collected qualitatively and a mixed method is used to analyze the results of this study. The major findings show that Bush used more ideological strategies to represent the image of "US" (selves) positively, than the image of "THEM" (others) negatively. In particular, the lexicalization is the most common strategy used by Bush's speech, which showed that Bush emphasized on reflecting that Americans are (good, innocent, peaceful, victims, targeted, respectful, strong, great, powerful and sympathetic), while Arabs, particularly Muslims are (bad, terrorists, evil, violent, peace-haters, spiteful, murderers, vengeful, dangerous, destructive, violence and enemy). It is hoped that this study can improve the understanding of EFL learners about the importance of clarifying the hidden ideologies in politician's speech and all kinds of discourse.

**Keywords:** Discourse ,Critical ,Terrorism and political speech.

## التحليل الاجتماعي المعرفي لتمثيل الذات/الآخر في خطاب بوش

هدى عبد اللطيف محمود

قسم اللغة الانجليزية/ كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية/ جامعة تكريت

و

اد. حسن شعبان علي الثلاب

قسم اللغة الانجليزية/ كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية/ جامعة تكريت

خلاصة

من المعروف أن الخطابات السياسية مهمة كأداة تواصل للسياسيين للحفاظ على السلطة، وهو أمر ضروري للتعبير عن الآراء ووجهات النظر السياسية وكذلك الأيديولوجيات، ولكن ليس دائماً بشكل صريح. تعتبر الأيديولوجيا أحد الأهداف الأساسية لتحليل النص في الدراسات اللغوية، ولاسيما تحليل الخطاب النقدي ، والذي يتكون من القيم والمعتقدات والمواقف المشتركة داخل المجموعة (فان ديك، 2006). وبهذه الطريقة، يعكس الخطاب قيم هذه الأيديولوجيات التي تحملها تلك المجموعات التي تخلقه. تركز الدراسة الحالية على دراسة الاستراتيجيات الخطابية الأيديولوجية للذات/الآخر في خطاب بوش بعد هجمات 11 سبتمبر استناداً إلى نموذج فان دايك (2006) للمربع الأيديولوجي. يتم جمع البيانات نوعياً ويتم استخدام طريقة مختلطة لتحليل نتائج هذه الدراسة. وتشير النتائج الرئيسية إلى أن بوش استخدم قدرًا أكبر من الاستراتيجيات الإيديولوجية لتمثيل صورة "الولايات

المتحدة" (الذات) بشكل إيجابي، مقارنة بصورة "هم" (الآخرين) بشكل سلبي. وعلى وجه الخصوص، فإن التعبيرات المعجمية هي الإستراتيجية الأكثر شيوعاً في خطاب بوش، والتي أظهرت أن بوش أكد على التفكير في أن الأمريكيين (صالحون، أبرياء، مسالمون، ضحايا، مستهدفون، محترمون، أقوياء، عظماء، أقوياء، متعاطفون)، بينما العرب، والمسلمون على وجه الخصوص هم (أشرار، إرهابيون، عنيفون، كارهون للسلام، حاقدون، قتلة، منتقمون، خطرون، مدمرون، عنيفون، أعداء). من المؤمل أن تتمكن هذه الدراسة من تحسين فهم متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية حول أهمية توضيح الأيديولوجيات الخفية في الخطاب السياسي وجميع أنواع الخطابات. الكلمات الدالة: الخطاب والنقد والإرهاب والخطاب السياسي.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Van Dijk's (1998) definition of discourse states that it includes "language use, text, talk, verbal interaction, and communication." Thus, discourse can be perceived as the result of a complex communicative situation in which a message is produced, conveyed to recipients via a variety of media, discussed, modified, or distorted, thereby influencing the thoughts and knowledge of the discourse's active and passive participants. By "active participants," means those who directly participate in the creation of the discourse and significantly alter it; by "passive participants," means passive perceivers of it. Discourse studies are primarily concerned with the analysis of written or spoken texts from a broad perspective, rather than just on the level of text language. Discourse studies typically employ a broad textual analysis rather than a particular linguistic approach. It is important to mention that the current study focuses on investigating the discursive strategies of self/other in Bush's speech after September 11 attacks based on Van Dijk's (2006) model of ideological square.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Political speeches are defined as a "coherent stream of spoken language that is usually prepared for delivery by a speaker to an audience for a purpose on a political occasion" (Reisigl, 2008). They exist because of their political activity; they are aimed at a broad audience; and their topics are political. Aside from that, political speeches are associated with either the struggle for or the maintenance of power (Sharndama, 2015). They are an important communicative tool for politicians, allowing them to express political opinions and views as well as ideologies, though not always explicitly. Their textual conditions have been characterized as "directing oneself to an audience while respecting a topical (semantic) organization that is compatible with the issue on the (political) agenda at hand" (Charteris-Black, 2018). One of the reasons why political language is so important is that it concentrates on how power is used to manipulate and shape the minds of the people. In general, power is seen as a tool that can be used to control and convince the people (Abdul Kreem, et.al. ,2022). Any political speech can exist before it is delivered, and it is typically co-authored. Nonetheless, each politician's

adaptation of a Written speech is affected by the audience's level of knowledge, which influences grammatical and word choices, as well as other language features.

Moreover, many studies applied the ideological square of Van Dijk (2006) in political discourse. In this regard, Qaiwer (2020) investigates Trump's representation of social groups which may involve positive presentation in one context and negative representation in another, thus, providing a detailed account of the way such representation is legitimised. This study has shown that power abuse, as a global contextual property, can be reflected in an intricate unite of several forms of talk-in-interaction seen as local textual roots. The study suggests a simple approach for the scrutiny of power abuse as a social phenomenon.

In 2016, Tennant uses Critical Discourse Analysis to analyze the presentation of Muslims in rightwing political discourse, specifically speeches made by UK politician, Nigel Farage, and American Republican candidate, Donald Trump. This study is based on both Van Dijk's "Ideological Square" (1998) and Wodak's positive presentation strategies (2010). The results show that British rhetoric is more polite than the American rhetoric, where both speakers rely on the use of implicit language and connotations to present Muslims as the "other", presenting them as both terrorists and immigrants, and using the terms interchangeably.

In 2020, Afsar and Mohamood investigates linguistically the ways in which systems of meaning are constructed in British newspaper editorials to represent 'self' and 'other' through currently circulating discourse of 'war on terror' in ideology formation. The study explores the newspaper editorials' role in shaping stereotypical images and ideologies as a result of the events of September 11, 2001, which are still on their way in the form of 'war on terror' discourse based on Van Dijk's concept of ideological square (1993, 1995, 1998 and 2008) framework. The empirical findings show that in both The Times and The Guardian corpora the negative 'other' presentation is unanimously and consistently revolves around the terrorists, militants, extremists, militias, fundamentalists and rebels; and interestingly all these words are the strong collocates of Islam, Islamic and Islamists in the corpus. In addition, a study is done by Merskin (2014) examine six speeches, remarks, and a memorial address given by President George W. Bush shortly after September 11, 2001. Textual analysis reveals that Bush's speeches, from his public statements on September 11, 2001, to the January 29, 2002, State of the Union address, reflected an identifiable model of enemy image construction that had, and continues to have, important human rights implications for Arab American citizens and noncitizens. It is important to mention that this study focuses specifically on the ways these ideologies were constructed by politicians through the discourse they produced in speech as a result of the events of September 11, 2001, which are still on their way in the form of 'war on terror' discourse. Besides, it explores the most common discursive strategies of the positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation used in Bush's speech after September 11 attacks.

### **3.Socio-Cognitive approach of Van Dijk's (2006) Ideological Square**

Van Dijk's Ideological Square theory is ideology based and used to sketch mental representations that are "articulated along Us versus Them dimensions, in which speakers

of one group will generally tend to present themselves or their own group in positive terms, and other groups in negative terms.” Van Dijk (1995) notes that the idea of ‘ideological square’ draws upon a positive ‘self-presentation’ and a negative ‘other-presentation.’ These representations are observable through linguistic dimensions of a text. Language is, therefore, regarded as a social construction formed by meanings associated with objects falling into binary relationships e.g. female vs. male, good vs. evil ,etc. Table 1 below shows Van Dijk’s Critical Discourse Analysis (Sobur ,2001):

Table 2.1 Van Dijk’s Critical Discourse Analysis (Sobur ,2001)

Structure	Item for Observed	Element
Macrostructure	THEMATIC (What it was said?)	Topic
Superstructure	SCHEMATIC (How to compile and assembled)	Schema
Microstructure	SEMANTIC (Meaning that wants to emphasize the news text)	Background, detail, intentions, presuppositions, nominalizations
	SYNTACTIC (How to deliver?)	Tenses, coherence, pronouns
	STYLISTIC (Word Choice)	Lexicons
	RHETORICAL (How and in what way the emphasis is done?)	Graphic, metaphor expression

Van Dijk (2000a) introduces four criteria for analyzing ideology, which he refers to as the "ideological square" which are as follows:

- 1-Emphasize positive things about Us.
- 2- Emphasize negative things about Them.
- 3- De-emphasize negative things about Us.
- 4- De-emphasize positive things about Them.

This model can be used at all levels of discourse and for their analysis. In terms of the dichotomy 'Emphasize and De-emphasize,' various methods are provided, such as talking briefly, explicitly or hideously, consciously, or writing with a specific format about the good or bad thing. In a nutshell, ideology can be studied at various levels. In addition, Van Dijk's (2000a) ideological square helps Polarization of in-groups versus out-groups to favor Us but not Them. Van Dijk (2000a, 2004) has provided ideological analysis categories that are conducive to the portrayal of Us versus Them, some of which are as follows:

- 1- Actor description: the ways we characterize actors are influenced by our ideologies, such as describing the in-group as positive and the out-group as bad.

- 2-Authority: citing authority to back up one's point of view.
- 3- Categorization is the process of categorizing people and assigning them good or negative attributes.
- 4- Lexicalization: the expressing of lexical items in order to create an overall ideological approach for the presentation of negative others.
- 5- Polarization: dividing people into in-groups and out-groups and assigning positive traits to Us while assigning negative attributes to Them.
- 6-Vagueness: the use of ambiguous terms with no precise referents.
- 7- Victimization: highlighting the "bad" aspect of the out group by recounting horrible stories about them.
- 8- Burden concluded things are displayed.
- 9- Comparison: Comparison occurs in talk to positively and negatively compare two different groups.
- 10- Consensus: It is a cross-party or national in situation where the country is threatened.
- 11- Counterfactual: A claim or hypothesis, or other belief that is contrary to the facts is to show what something or somebody would be like in situation.
- 12-Disclaimers: Combinations of those positively and negatively represented. They are connected by (but).
- 13- Euphemism: The discourse producer uses certain expressions to lessen their impact on the audience. It is an avoidance of negative impression formation.
- 14-Evidentiality: Proofs may be used to make discourse more objective and credible.
- 15-Example: Example mentions in a speech to illustrate and make cases clearer.
- 16-Generalization: It is accomplished when speakers may make generalization or attitude to formulate positive or negative feelings.
- 17-Hyperbole: It is an overstatement (figurative language) that exaggerates a particular condition for emphasis.
- 18-Implication: It is the understanding of what is not explicitly expressed.
- 19-Irony: What the speaker says differs from what he means through language use.
- 20-Metaphor: It is a figure of speech that has rhetorical effect in referring to one thing by mentioning another.
- 21-National self-glorification: It is positive reference to the speaker's nation. It is combined with nationalist ideologies.

22-Norm expression: To convey the norm of what somebody or something should/not be done.

23-Number game: Discourse producers apply numbers or statistics to enhance credibility.

24-Populism: It is the political ideas intended to represent or promote the interests and opinions of ordinary people's needs or wishes.

25-Presupposition: The speaker presupposes something or somebody.

#### **4. DATA ANALYSIS**

Ten excerpts are selected from George Bush's speech, which was delivered on September 11, 2001 after hijackers commandeered four commercial airplanes crashed into the World Trade Center Towers in New York, the Pentagon outside Washington, D.C., and a Pennsylvania field, killing thousands. The data are collected qualitatively and a mixed method is used to analyze the results of this study in terms of Van Dijk's (2006) model of ideological square. The following is a brief discussion of the discursive strategies used by Bush's speech:

- 1) **Consensus:** consensus strategy is noted in Bush's speech as he said "*Our fellow citizens, our way of life, .....*". This strategy reflected his unity with the community, particularly using the pronoun (our), which showed the unification and cohesion among the members of one community who shared the same goals and duties for the sake of their own country. The repetition of the pronoun (our) in Bush's speech indicated also the representation of himself as one of the normal people who live together in one country. His speech shows the sense of difference and opposition between America as good and terrorists as evil.
- 2) **Categorization:** Bush categorized the American people positively as victims in showing a difference and opposition with Arab people, particularly Muslims as criminals. In his speech "*The victims were in airplanes, or in their offices; secretaries.....*", Bush deliberately used these strong expressions to attract the attention of the listeners in order to convince them about the dangerous of Muslims on the lives of Americans. This excerpt shows that Bush emphasized on the first ideology of 'us' in Van Dijk's ideological square, which refers to Americans positively as innocents people.
- 3) **Number game & hyperbole:** Bush used the number game flavored with hyperbolic taste as he said "*Thousands of lives were suddenly ended by evil, despicable acts of terror. The pictures of airplanes flying into buildings, .....*", in which it is used to plant fear in the hearts of the Americans regarding the risk of the terrorists. Here, Bush employs hyperbolic expressions to express and emphasize the negative actions of the enemies on the Americans' perception in order to increase the pressure upon his audience about the activities of Muslim terrorists against non-Muslims, particularly Americans.
- 4) **Disclaimers & lexicalization:** disclaimers is noted when Bush used the coordinator conjunction (but), when he said "*These acts of mass murder were intended to frighten our nation into chaos and retreat. But they have failed*". Here, he started

with a contradiction of information between what the terrorists intend to achieve by mentioning their actions in the first phrase and their failure to achieve their actions in the second. Bush compares between two pronouns, which are “they” to refer to the terrorists’ failure and “our” to refer the Americans as victims. Here, Bush portrayed the positive self-representation using lexical impressive expressions like ‘strong, great’ to affect psychology on his audience (Americans) , which in turn this can emphasize the positive characteristics of the force of goodness (Americans). This can highlight the good actions of Americans in contrast to the bad actions of the terrorists. Such expressions (strong, great) are important to enhance the listeners’ confidence by saying that ‘our nation is strong’ and he is responsible to defend his country against any terrorists threats, who failed to achieve their goals. This in turn will help manage their minds towards the positive goals he intends to achieve through discourse.

- 5) **Burden & national-glorification:** Bush’s speech “*our country is strong. A great people has been moved to defend a great nation*” reflected the strategy of burden when Bush tried to touch the feelings of his audience by reflecting the chain of difference, which then seeks to build confidence in the listener ‘Americans’ “our country –the foundation of America’ is strong. After Bush has shown how terrorists committed their attacks on the American people, he specifies the conclusion that Americans accept their responsibilities and benefits in defending their country against such terrorist threats. Here he changes "a great people" into "a great nation". Americans are not only a stitched group of people anymore; they are a nation, based on the “steel of American resolve” that is under attack. Bush’s suggestion that “they have failed” certainly forms a chain of difference to make a division among ‘us’ –the attacked. When he said “A great people has been moved to defend a great nation”, in an effort to control and manage their thoughts in order to achieve specific political goals, the speaker here glorifies and praises the people in his own community as well as the nation they live in. This is meant to send a message to other communities that it is acceptable to respond in defense of their country.
- 6) **Euphemism & presupposition & metaphor:** Bush used more than one strategy to convince Americans about his intended goals. In his speech “*Terrorist attacks can shake the foundations of our biggest buildings, but they cannot touch the foundation of America. These acts shattered steel, but they cannot dent the steel of American resolve*”, Bush employed euphemism strategy as a communicative tactic when he tried to use less harsh words like ‘shake’ instead of harsh words like ‘destroy’ to lessen the negative impression formation of the unfavorable impression that the terrorist acts may have left on the Americans’ minds. Then, in the last sentences he employed three important strategies ,in which he used the word “shattered” to negatively presupposed that the attacks were destroyable .He also uses the metaphorical expression ‘steel’, which is known as a solid metal to express the frigidity and cohesion of the American people .He also employed hyperbolic language to highlight the admirable traits and deeds of the American people in order to strengthen their positions in the war to protect them from such adversaries and to improve their ideologically grounded views toward their own nation. . Actually, the first and the second concepts of emphasizing the positive



- nature of us and emphasizing negative nature of others in Van Dijk's ideological square are established in this excerpt when he tries to emphasize that no positive saying should be directed to "them" and always positive deeds should be directed to "us".
- 7) **victimization & evidentially**: the victimization with evidentially strategies are clarified when Bush said "*America was targeted for attack because we're the brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world. And no one will keep that light from shining*". Here, he attempted to portray his own nation as the victim of the enemies' evil acts in order to show to the other communities that they have been attacked also in their own country and to persuade them to join America's anti-terror campaign, so that they will not suffer the same fate. He wants to reflect the threat that his country encountered although no apparent reason for that. Here, Bush's inflexibly simplified politico-rhetorical explanation of the events gave an additional allusion to what will be taken as necessary governmental reaction in conformity with that determinant articulation, in order to preserve 'the shining of the beacon'. It is important to mention that Bush must first establish himself as the group's genuine representative.
- 8) **Vagueness & actor description**: Bush used vagueness positively when he said "*And no one will keep that light from shining. Today, our nation saw evil ,the very worst of human nature. And we responded with the best of America with the daring of our rescue workers...*", and he used the implied expression ( one), which has no specific referent in his speech in order to make it more constrained and avoid apparent bias to his country. This will give the community members assurance of being safe with positive feelings. Then, he attempts to negatively describe those who have committed the terrorist attacks, as the worst thing people can see in their lives .Here, he emphasizes the evil intentions of the enemies against the population of America .He also concentrate on certain words like 'evil' to reflect the negative characteristics of the others or terrorists.
- 9) **Polarization & presupposition**: these two strategies are noted in Bush's speech "*Immediately following the first attack, I implemented our government's emergency response plans .Our military is powerful and it's prepared. Our emergency*", when he tried to polarize the positive characteristics of the term "our military". Here, Bush used the polarization strategy to highlight the difference between America and the enemy in order to urge Americans' ideologically based attitudes toward their home country. In addition, he employed the pronoun 'our' to create a positive distance between himself as president and ordinary Americans .He also positively presupposes that America has powerful military to guarantee safety of the Americans.
- 10) **Norm expression**: the president conveys the norms that community members should help one another. This is noted in his speech "*Our first priority is to get help to those who have been injured and to take every precaution to protect our citizens at home and around the world from further attacks*", when he demonstrated them by taking steps to ensure that their country is safe from

terrorist attacks. He demonstrates his national intentions by defending the interests of all community members. This excerpt shows that Bush emphasized on the first ideology of 'us' in Van Dijk's ideological square, which refers to Americans positively as united, strong, powerful and always ready to protect their country.

- 11) **Implication:** The implication strategy is noted when Bush said "*We will make no distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbor them, ...*", as he does not explicitly state the type of punishment, but leaves it to the audience to infer that not only will terrorists be punished, but also the countries that support them. The speaker categorizes negative expressions like "the terrorists" to differentiate them from positive ones and create a negative impression on the audience (Americans). This distinction is important in separating the good Americans from the bad others. The same word also has an effective influence on the audience, which is used to highlight the enemies' evil intentions against the people mentioned by the president. This is intended to convey a clear image of the force of evil while also creating a negative impression and interpretation of them. It is negatively portrayed the victimization when the speaker depicts those who are as the source of harming the innocent in order to highlight their evil actions and show that they were the first to initiate the attacks in order to avoid being blamed when reacting against them. He also seeks to instill ideological attitudes and opinions against them. In regard to authority, the speaker refers to members of Congress as the "representatives" for the important resolution to send the message that he is the "authority speaker" in deciding against the enemy.
- 12) **Authority & generalization:** *Bush's speech "I appreciate so very much the members of Congress who have joined me in strongly condemning these attacks, and on behalf of the American people .....", I thank the many world leaders who have called to offer their condolences and assistance*", reflected his authority as he refers to members of Congress as the "representatives" for the important resolution to send the message that he is the "authority speaker" in deciding against the enemy. Besides, the Discourse producer refers to an important American intelligence institution as "the many". The term "many" is a generalization that he creates in discourse in order to make it more powerful and useful as a form of nationalist language. This excerpt shows that Bush emphasized on the first and the second ideologies of 'us' and 'them' in Van Dijk's ideological square, which is emphasizing the positive 'us' (Americans) and emphasize the negative 'others'.
- 13) **Metaphor and Comparison:** Bush used the image of 'God' when he said, "*Even though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I fear no evil, for You are with me.*" Here, he resembled and himself to 'God' after he quoted Psalm 23 and he promised to remain firm in the face of global terrorism and urged all Americans to "go forward to defend freedom and all that is good and just in our world." This metaphor is an important to this speech because it is used to make the audiences feel safe. He also uses these metaphors to show that these

attacks cannot damage America as a whole. Here, Bush's speech linked between his foreign freedom, justice, and faith (in American strength and God) as an indication to his political agenda throughout his two years in office. Bush used this powerful quote from the Bible in a good way to make people feel safe by using 'God' as the example to help comfort the people of the United States. is the comparison when Bush quoted hymns from the Bible, which represented the Christian religion in indication to the 'Qur'an', which represented the Islamic religion. Here, Bush consistently used language of good and evil and he wants to show that Christian religion represents the good, peace, justice, and freedom, while Islamic religion shows the evil, unpeace, terrorisms, and murder. He insisted on reflecting that 'we' are good and 'them' are evil and those who aren't with us are with the terrorists.

After the aforementioned discussion, Table 2 below shows the frequency and percentages of ideological strategies types of us/them used in Bush's speech:

**Table 2 The frequency and percentages of ideological strategies types of us/them used in Bush's speech**

No.	Ideological strategies	frequency of the positive (us) %	frequency of negative (them) %	Percentage of the total frequency %
1.	consensus	4.34	2.17	6.52
2.	categorization	4.34	4.34	8.69
3.	Number game	0	2.17	2.17
4.	hyperbole	2.17	4.34	6.56
5.	euphemism	0	4.34	4.34
6.	lexicalization	4.34	6.52	10.86
7.	presupposition	2.17	4.34	6.56
8.	victimization	4.34	4.34	8.69
9.	polarization	4.34	2.17	6.52
10.	disclaimers	0	2.17	2.17
11.	burden	2.17	0	2.17
12.	Nationalself-glorification	4.34	0	4.34
13.	metaphor	6.52	2.17	8.69
14.	evidentiality	2.17	2.17	4.34
15.	vagueness	2.17	0	2.17
16.	actor description	2.17	2.17	4.34
17.	norm expression	2.17	0	2.17
18.	implication	2.17	0	2.17
19.	authority	2.17	0	2.17
20.	generalization	4.34	0	4.34

21.	comparison	4.34	0	4.34
total		57.44	42.55	

Generally, the findings indicate that there are 21 ideological strategies used by Bush’s speech. It is clear that Bush used more ideological strategies to represent the image of “US” (selves) positively, than the image of “THEM” (others) negatively since the percentage of the former is (57.44%), while in the latter it is (42.55%). This shows that Bush emphasizes on reflecting that Americans are (good, innocent, peaceful, victims, targeted, respectful, strong, great, powerful and sympathetic), while Muslims are (bad, terrorists, evil, violent, peace- haters, spiteful, murderers, vengeful, dangerous, destructive, violence and enemy). In most of his speech, Bush shows sympathy, compassion, and feeling of support for the majority group of Americans in particular in order to add new information and attract and motivate them to take negative impression towards Islam people. The findings show that the lexicalization strategy is higher than the other strategies (consensus, categorization, number game, hyperbole, euphemism, presupposition, victimization, polarization, disclaimers, burden, nationalself-glorification, metaphor, evidentiality, vagueness, actor description, norm expression, implication, authority, generalization, and comparison) since the percentage of the former is (10.86%), while in the latter is (6.52,8.69,2.17, 6.52, 4.34, 6.52, 8.69, 6.52, 2.17, 2.17, 4.34, 8.69, 4.34, 2.17, 4.34, 2.17,2.17,2.17, 4.34, 4.34)% respectively. This means that Bush used commonly impressive lexical expressions like ‘strong, great’ to portray positively the self-representation, particularly the good characteristics of Americans in order to affect psychology on his listeners in contrast to the bad actions of the terrorists since such terms give the Americans the feeling of strength and encouragement towards community and intense hostility towards Muslims.

In particular, it is noted that Bush used the strategies of consensus, polarization, burden, Nationalself-glorification, metaphor, vagueness, norm expression, implication, authority, generalization, and comparison to reflect the image of (selves) positively more than the image of (others) negatively since their percentages in the former are ( 4.34, 4.34, 2.17, 4.34, 6.52, 2.17, 2.17, 2.17,2.17, 4.34,4.34)% , while in the latter are (2.17, 2.17, 0,0, 2.17, 0, 0, 0,0,0,0)% respectively. This means that Bush used more positive expressions to show his solidarity and unity between the American people and himself. The pronouns (we & our) are used deliberately by Bush to create a feeling of belonging and togetherness among the citizens and at the same time emphasize the message of how serious the attacks are. In this way, this can give the unification and cohesion among the members of one community who shared the same goals and duties for the sake of their own country. Therefore, commitment makes all Americans feel like a single, historically connected family while also fostering an awareness of the high cost of freedom—a sacrifice that comes with belonging.

As for the polarization strategy, it is used when Bush highlighted the difference between positive attributes of America and the negative attributes of enemy in order to urge Americans' ideologically based attitudes toward their home country. This results in reinforcing the ideological polarization of ‘US’ versus ‘THEM’ in the selected data. Bush tried to touch the feeling of the public by reflecting the chain of difference, which then

seeks to build confidence in the listener ‘Americans’ “our country –the foundation of America” is strong, and that Americans accept their responsibilities and benefits in defending their country against such terrorist threats. In his speech, Bush glorified and praised the people in his own community as well as the nation they live in. This is meant to send a message to other communities that it is acceptable to respond in defense of their country in order to accomplish certain political objectives, and to demonstrate to other communities that there is justice in responding to the defense of their nation. It is worth to mention that Bush has commonly used metaphorical images like (brightest beacon and steel) to represent positively America to refer to this strength and frugidity, while expression like (evil) is used to represent negatively the terrorists, particularly Muslims in order to trigger the audience's (Americans') ideological biases against such an enemy. Further, Bush used the word (a great people) to refer to Americans in order to encourage and tell the people they have been strong in the past and that strength is still part of them, which is important to comfort them and give the confidence in the country and its government and encourage people the face the enemy. The image of God is also used to comfort his people while also urging the American public to support the war on terrorism. Besides, he used implied expression positively in order to avoid apparent bias to the same group. However, the president conveys the norms that community members should help one another. He also demonstrates them by taking steps to ensure that their country is safe from terrorist attacks. In addition, the implication is noted when Bush did not explicitly state the type of punishment, but leaves it to the audience to infer that not only will terrorists be punished, but also the countries that support them.

In terms of comparison, Bush compared between the defeated enemies of the past and the ones of the present. He shows the powerful of America in the past and present in which he referred to those enemies who are defeated in the past as well as those who have already been vanquished. He makes an effort to harden the American people's feelings against this new enemy and to defend their distinctive values, which he sees as being under attack. Besides, Bush consistently used language of good and evil and he wants to show that Christian religion represents the good, peace, justice, and freedom, while Islamic religion shows the evil, unpeace, terrorisms, and murder. He insisted on reflecting that ‘we’ are good and ‘them’ are evil and those who aren’t with us are with the terrorists. As for the strategy of authority, Bush refers to members of Congress as the “representatives” for the important resolution to send the message that he is the “authority speaker” in deciding against the enemy. Finally, Bush’s use of the negative terms like (evil, enemy), particularly when he said “the very worst of human nature” presupposed that all Muslims are terrorists without even drawing a little distinction between those peaceful Muslim people and some terrorists, who have nothing to do with Islam.

On the other hand, it is noted that Bush used the strategies of number game, hyperbole, euphemism, presupposition, and disclaimers to reflect the image of (others) negatively more than the image of (selves) positively since their percentages in the former are ( 2.17, 4.34, 4.34,4.34,2.17)%, while in the latter are (0, 2.17, 0, 2.17, 0)% respectively. In this regard, Bush used the number game strategy flavoured with hyperbolic taste in the word (thousands), which is used to plant fear in the hearts of the Americans regarding the risk of the terrorists. The hyperbolic expressions like the expressions (ended by evil) are used

to express and emphasize the negative deeds of the enemies in the audience's perception, and to make them clear as negatively represented to the population in general to enhance their emotions against the terrorists. Accordingly, Euphemism strategy is shown when Bush employed this strategy as a communicative tactic when he tried to use less harsh words like 'shake' instead of harsh words like 'destroy' to lessen the negative impression formation of the unfavorable impression that the terrorist acts may have left on the Americans' minds. In addition, Bush presupposed negatively that many of the people have been died by the terrorists. Here, he wants to emphasize not only the committers of the attacks on the innocent to emphasize their evil deeds and to demonstrate that they were the first to initiate the attacks in order to avoid being accused of being the first to react against them.

Moreover, other strategies are used by Bush's speech equally in representing the (self) positively and (other) negatively, which are categorization, victimization, evidentially, and actor description since their values in the former and latter are (4.34%) for each respectively. In his speech, Bush categorized the American people positively as victims in showing a difference and opposition negatively with Arab people, particularly Muslims as criminals and enemies. It is also negatively portrayed the victimization when Bush depicts those who are as the source of harming the innocent in order to highlight their evil actions and show that they were the first to initiate the attacks in order to avoid being blamed when reacting against them. Bush supplied his speech with facts to convey objectivity when he said that America was always targeted for attacks of terrorists because it's regarded as one of the world's highest state in income, wealth, economic competitiveness, productivity, innovation, human rights, higher education, and its cultures. In addition, all the descriptions given about Americans and allies reflected them positively as (in-groups) and terrorists, particularly Muslims as (out-groups).

## **5. CONCLUSION**

This study concludes how the ideological strategies in Van Dijk's (2006) shapes clearly the discourse of "US" (selves) and "THEM" (others) in Bush's speech. The findings show that Bush used more ideological strategies to represent the image of "US" (selves) positively, than the image of "THEM" (others) negatively, i.e., the positive self-representation is explicitly used more than negative other representation. It is important to mention that most of discursive strategies are collaborated to achieve multiple functions in representing the ideological square of us/them in Bush's speech. In particular, the lexicalization is the most common strategy used by Bush's speech, which showed that Bush emphasized on reflecting that Americans are (good, innocent, peaceful, victims, targeted, respectful, strong, great, powerful and sympathetic), while Arabs, particularly Muslims are (bad, terrorists, evil, violent, peace-haters, spiteful, murderers, vengeful, dangerous, destructive, violence and enemy).

## **REFERENCES**

- Abdul Kreem, M.S., Ali, Z.A., & Al-Bahrani, R.H. (2022). Intonational patterns of persuasive strategies in Blair's speech: A socio-cognitive phonological analysis. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 18(1), 683-696. Doi: 10.52462/jlls.212

- Charteris-Black, J. (2018). *Analysing political speeches: Macmillan International Higher Education. Language and Peace*. Alder shot: Dartmouth Publishing
- Reisigl, M. (2008). 11. *Rhetoric of political speeches. Handbook of communication in the public sphere*,4,243.doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110198980.3.243>.
- Sharndama, E. C. (2015). Political discourse: A critical discourse analysis of President Muhammadu Buhari's inaugural speech. *European Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, 3(3), 12-24.
- Sobur, A. (2001). *Analisis teks media: Suatu pengantar untuk analisis wacana, analisis semiotik dan analisis framing*. Bandung, Indonesia: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). *Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis.*, pp. 17-33.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology, A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Sage Publication, Great Britain.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2000). *Ideology and discourse: A multidisciplinary introduction*. Pompeu Fabra University, Barcelona, 1025-1034. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00722-7>.
- Van Dijk, T.A.(2004). *Politics, ideology, and discourse*. Retrieved from <http://www.discourse-in-society.org/teun.html>.