Analysis of Bush's Speeches on Iraq War and Terrorism, Based on Chilton's Emotion Theory

Mohammed Hameed Rasheed
Al-Qalam University College, College of Education
Mohamed.rasheed@alqalam.edu.iq

ABSTRACT: As a subfield of linguistics, Political Linguistics deals with the relationship between language and politics with critical discourse analysis approach. Being aware of the power of language, politicians appeal to the power of linguistic strategies in political discourse to reach their political goals. The present study analyzed five speeches of President Bush, based on Chilton's (2004) theoretical framework to investigate to what extent and for what purposes Bush applied those theories to his speeches. Investigating the frequency of the other applied theories was the other purpose of the study. The corpus consisted of full transcript of five speeches of Bush delivered on Iraq war and terrorism, from 2001 to 2003, the critical period of Iraq war. Regarding the limitation of space and time, the emotion theory, out of twelve proposed Chilton's strategies were selected for analyzing the data. The main reason of the application of the applied theory, was legitimizing the Iraq war decision and persuading people to go to war. Analyzing the data revealed that Bush applied emotion theory, to arouse war-related feelings in people and consequently control their decision making.

1- Introduction

Language has long been considered as a means of communication. As a social tool, it communicates messages and serves to convey people's ideas. Via language, people express their views and thoughts. Usually people use language with specific and clear purposes in their mind. According to Van Dijk (2006), if they use language to show their thought and purposes, it can be employed skillfully to exert power over others. Power exists in language and the exercise of power, in fact, is achieved through ideology embedded in the language lexically and syntactically. Undoubtedly, language and power relations have a close connection.

Since politician's speeches outline their strategy for victory against their rivals, political discourse of politicians is a very good area to find their ideologies and rhetorical strategies and proves the relationship between language and power. In his linguistic study of interface between language and politics, Geis (1987) drew out some characteristics of political language. He stated that political language may have an indirect but stronger impact on people's political thought than expressions of strong opinion.

Wodak (2001) said that political language has been used to denote the use of language in the context of politics, i.e. a specific language use with the purpose of achieving a specific politically motivated function, or it has been used to denote the specific political vocabulary, i.e. words and phrases that refer to extra-linguistic phenomenon in the domain of politics (p. 223). Klein (1998) stated that

linguistic study of political communication is a sub-discipline of linguistic that has developed mainly in the German-speaking area since the 1950s.

Political linguistic studies draw on some related domains, including linguistic pragmatics, text linguistics, CDA (Critical Discourse Analysis), corpus linguistics, translation and literary studies, social psychology, sociology, anthropology and philosophy. CDA is a domain of critical applied linguistics. This approach emerged from 1970s with the salient works of Kress and Hodge (1979), Foucault (1972), etc. Famous linguists such as Kress and Hodge (1979), Van Dijk (1985), Fairclough (2001) and Wodak (2001), in their works set out the main principles of CDA and Critical Linguistics (CL).

According to Wodak (2006), four concepts figure indispensably in all CDA work: the concept of critique, power, history and ideology. Based on CDA approach, language is not powerful on its own; rather it gains power by the use powerful people make of it. Wodak (2001) stated that CDA studies language in relation with power, ideology, and other sociological variables such as racism, gender, etc. CDA aims at addressing social problems from linguistic point of view. It seeks to describe language, and at the same time provides critical linguistic resources to unravel hidden power, ideologies, etc. Van Dijk (1993) defined CDA as a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. Most of the analyses in CDA focus on revealing how a speaker uses certain strategies to communicate his messages and which linguistic means are used to achieve these strategies. (Wodak, 2006; Van Leeuven, 2006; Wodak & De Cillia, 2007).

Recently Political discourse in general and presidential speech in particular are mainly analyzed under the light of CDA. As a matter of fact, analyzing political discourse in linguistic domain is mainly done with CDA approach. Since politicians in all parts of the globe are conservative in their speeches, misunderstanding and incomprehensibility will appear as a result. The occurrence of misunderstanding can have serious consequences. In fact, politicians use special rhetorical trends in their speeches to influence people's mind, impose their ideas on people and consequently reach their goals. Finding the exact conceptual representation of politician's speeches and discovering the hidden ideologies are challenging issues that analysts confront within the domain of political discourse analysis. Actually, political analysts have faced with the lack of academic research that can be used as a guideline for analyzing political speech. As a subfield of linguistics, political linguistics has developed to cope with the problem by investigating the issue with CDA approach. The present study is done to test the applicability of the emotion theory out of twelve Chilton's (2004) proposed strategies to political discourse in general and presidential speech in particular.

While there is a great volume of researches contributed to the analysis of politicians' speech in general and President Bush's speeches in particular in political sciences, unfortunately the research in analyzing political speeches in the domain of political linguistics with CDA approach has been highly neglected.

Regarding the fact that war is such a serious enterprise that it requires extraordinary communicative efforts, hence; discovering strategies that Bush applied to his speeches to justify the war decision against Iraq is highly important. Being cognizant of the great importance of the issue of Iraq war, the researcher made its best to reveal such strategies by analyzing Bush's speeches on Iraq war and terrorism. One important point about the significance of this study is that findings of the paper will be used to reinforce the idea that politicians apply special strategies to keep their political ideas hidden and influence people's ideas. Therefore, the study tries to answer the following questions: To what extent did Bush apply Chilton's (2004) strategies to his speeches on Iraq war and terrorism?

2- Literature Review

Analyses of discourse have been carried out within a variety of social science disciplines such as linguistics, anthropology, sociology, international relations, communication studies and political science. While the concept of political discourse has been used for centuries to describe political debate in political theory and philosophy, only within the last 40 or so years, some theoretical and methodological studies have been done on the relationship between language and political action. This started in the 1960s in Europe as the renewal of the humanities and social sciences and later it was known as structuralism and post-structuralism, or in more general terms as the Linguistic Turn. In the 1970s it spread into the CDA with studies of how political concepts and political news play a role in the construction of social problems (Wodak, 2001, p. 67).

Critical discourse analysis can be traced at least as far back as the Aristotelian study of rhetoric. In contemporary philosophy, the Marxist-influenced critical theory of the Frankfurt school which later was followed by Habermas (1986) and Foucault (1982), should also be considered as CDA (Fairclough 1989, 1995; Wodak 1996, 2001).

Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) elaborated how CDA was useful in disclosing the discursive nature of much contemporary social and cultural changes. CDA refers to a particular branch of applied linguistics associated with scholars such as Fowler (1991), Fairclough (1995), Van Dijk (1993) and Wodak (1996). According to Weiss and Wodak (2003, p. 12), studies in CDA are multifarious, derived from quite different theoretical backgrounds and orientated toward very different data and methodologies.

The terms CL (critical linguistic) and CDA are often used interchangeably. At first, CL drew upon Chomsky's transformational grammar (Fowler et al. 1979; Kress & Hodge 1979) but eventually replaced this with Halliday's systemic functional linguistics (Fowler, 1991). On the other hand, Halliday's systemic functional linguistics related structure to communicative function. Similarly, Fairclough (1989) found functionalist' approaches more helpful than formalist's approaches.

Wodak (2001, p. 8) affirmed that an understanding of the basic claims of Halliday's grammar and his approach to linguistic understanding is essential for a proper understanding of CDA. Contrary to Wodak's view, Chilton (2004) did not draw on Hallidayan linguistics in his analyses and theories. Chilton regarded Hallidayan linguistics inadequate because of its inability to deal with a range of pragmatic and semantic phenomena, such as presupposition, implicature, metaphor and blending. Due to the influence of CDA (including CL), Hallidayan systemic functional grammar became synonymous with linguistic approaches to critical discourse analysis. It is only much more recently that Cognitive Linguistics has provided a theory of language for CDA.

Chilton (2004), as a cognitive linguist has always worked within a cognitive framework, principally on the discourse of politics and the international relations framework. More particularly, Chilton (2004) has drawn on cognitive evolutionary psychology to ask whether there might exist an innate 'critical instinct'. Also as a philosopher in Critical Linguists, Chilton (2004) has done great researches and has provided a theory of language regarding political discourse which is the base of the present study.

As a reaction to the harsh experience of world wars and Iraq war, some researches have been done on political news related to war rhetoric which are listed below. Through content analysis of news release on Iraq war, the real reasons for the upcoming war with Iraq were investigated by Clark (2003). He discussed that the answer to the Iraq enigma was simple yet shocking and it was an oil currency war. He stated that the real reason for this upcoming war was this administration's goal of preventing further Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) momentum towards the euro as an oil transaction currency standard.

Since in response to the September the 11th attacks U.S. government and military leaders constructed a national identity discourse to unite the American public and mobilize support for the war on terrorism, Hutcheson et.al. (2004) to test their claim, conducted a content analysis of Time and Newsweek for the five weeks following September the 11th attack. Their findings suggested that government and military officials consistently emphasized American core values and themes of U.S. strength and power, and that journalists closely paralleled these nationalist themes in their language. Wenden (2005) Conducted a critical analysis of Aljazeera special reports. The paper focused on the role of language in social life, specifically on discourse as the focus of political struggle, i.e. the struggle for the power of representation. It reports on the results of a discourse analysis of 12 articles posted on Aljazeera's English website to mark the third anniversary of the al-Aqsa Intifada. The conclusion pointed to the utility of including a linguistic perspective in planning interventions for achieving a culture of social and ecological peace in Aljazeera's report.

Suslova (2008) argued that in modern political discourse a lot of American politicians with the help of their speechwriters and political image makers use various linguistic technologies to reach their political goals through the process of persuasion or bargaining. She also argued that politicians by using technologies such as the simplicity of speech (direct appeal to ordinary people), and effective image-making strategies by visual and verbal language means, introduce socially important and culturally oriented concepts to keep their power and reinforcing their influence on public opinion regarding war issues. Fracer (2010) investigated the application of hedging in Bush's response to challenging questions posed to him by reporters. He found numerous examples of neutral hedging and found that hedging was not used in the Press Conferences for mitigation purposes leading to polite effects. It was reported that Bush applied hedging through utilizing several of the techniques suggested by Partington, including outright lying.

3- Methodology

This study was a functional and qualitative research and its aim was restricted to emotion strategy of Chilton (2004) to analyses particular strategies applied by President Bush to his speeches on Iraq war and terrorism. To accomplish the purpose of this study, five speeches of Bush on Iraq war and terrorism were extracted from the Whitehouse website in the period of March-May 2012. Although the number of speeches chosen for this study was not immense, the date of speeches stretched between three years and approximately contained 812 sentences which should give the study some validity.

The corpus selected for the present study consisted of five speeches of Bush on Iraq war and terrorism including 812 sentences which were downloaded from White House website. This website provides full transcript of Presidential speech. The speeches chosen randomly were delivered by Bush after September the 11th phenomenon on Iraq war and terrorism from 2001 to 2003, the period of Iraq war. The speeches were delivered on September, 20, 2001; October, 7, 2007; November, 8, 2002; March, 18, 2003; February, 23, 2003. The aim of the present study was to analyses those speeches based on Chilton's theoretical framework. Regarding the limitation of space and time, the study intended to investigate to what extent and for what purposes Bush applied those strategies to his speeches.

After gathering the corpus, to accomplish the purpose of the study, step by step procedures were followed. First, regarding the limitation of space and time, among Chilton's twelve proposed strategies on political discourse, emotion strategy was selected randomly. Second, regarding the strategy, the linguistic cues that showed the application of the above strategy were selected and highlighted for each speech separately. Third, the sentences consisted of those linguistic cues were analyzed based on the strategy to investigate to what extent, Bush applied the strategy and to decide about the reasons behind the application of the strategy. Forth, the analyses were compared to decide about the frequency of

applied strategy in Bush's speeches. It should be mentioned that the oral and non-verbal aspect of the speeches were not considered in this thesis.

4- Results

Based on Chilton's (2004) theoretical framework, there are eight politically relevant feelings that are stimulated automatically and in the political use of language. The list of Chilton's eight proposed arguments for evoking emotions along with one example from Bush's speeches is provided below. For some emotions no example was found.

1) Fear of invasion: "Alliances with terrorists could allow the Iraqi regime to attack America without leaving any fingerprints".
2) Fear of domination: "He would dominate the Middle East".
3) Fear of intruders: "Al Qaeda is still active in Iraq".
4) Love of family: "We are removing a source of violence and instability and laying the foundation of peace for our children and our grandchildren"
5) Security: "The United States of America has the sovereign authority to use force in assuring its own national security".
6) Protectiveness: "Just as we are preparing to ensure victory in Iraq, we are taking further actions to protect our homeland".
7) Territorial belonging and identity: No example was found.
8) Loyalty: No example was found.

Analyzing the data revealed that 498 out of the total number of 812 sentences were used to evoke emotions. While, in 287 sentences, Bush used Chilton's proposed arguments to evoke emotions, in 211 sentences He used other types of arguments to evoke emotions. Below table 1 represents the frequency of the application of Chilton's (2004) eight proposed arguments for evoking emotions in five speeches of Bush on Iraq war and terrorism.

Table 1: *The frequency of Bush's applied arguments for evoking emotions based on Chilton's propositions*

Chilton's proposed arguments for evoking emotion	Number of sentences	percentage
Fear of invasion	107	21.48%
Fear of domination	71	14.25%
Fear of intruders	4	0.80%
Security	59	11.84%
Protectiveness	43	8.63%
Love of family	3	0.60%
Loyalty	-	-
Territorial belonging	-	-
Total	287	59%

As the above table shows, "fear of invasion" was the most frequent argument that Bush applied to his speeches to instill fear emotion. Regarding the frequency of other applied arguments, "fear of domination" became the second, then "security", "protectiveness", "fear of intruders" and "love of family" came respectively. As the frequency table asserts, Bush did not apply two arguments of "territorial belonging" and "loyalty" to his speeches at all. The table shows that 59% of applied arguments for instilling emotions were those proposed by Chilton (2004), meanwhile Bush applied

other types of arguments which will be discussed at follow. Three examples that were indicative of applying the above arguments for instilling emotions are analyzed below.

- ✓ **Fear of invasion:** "To complete the mission, we will prevent Al Qaida and other foreign terrorists from turning Iraq into what Afghanistan was under the Taliban: a safe haven from which they could launch attacks on America and our friends".

According to Chilton (2004), fear of invasion includes the memories of the Second World War that is presumed by the speaker as a presupposed knowledge of the hearer. The data analysis showed that just in some few cases, Bush referred to the memories of the Second World War. In most of the cases, Bush tried to evoke the fear of invasion in people by reminding Saddam's possession of dangerous weapons and horrible gasses.

To emphasize the danger of invasion, Bush defined those who were the target of invasion as U.S., Saudi Arabia, Turkey, American people and other nations. Here, Bush has evoked the fear of invasion by emphasizing the probability of Al-Qaida and other terrorists' invasion of America and its friends. Bush also emphasized that he would confront such an event by completing the mission. In the previous sentence, Bush has clarified the mission as capturing terrorists and insurgents: "To complete the mission, we will continue to hunt down the terrorists and insurgents". It was obvious that capturing terrorists and insurgents necessitated fighting them which was only possible through war operations.

- ✓ **Fear of domination:** "This same tyrant has tried to dominate the Middle East, has invaded and brutally occupied a small neighbor, has struck other nations without warning, and holds an unrelenting hostility towards the United States".

In Chilton's term, fear is linked to fear of invasion and fear of domination. Scrutinizing the data showed that Bush has tried to evoke the fear of domination in 132 sentences. He emphasized the danger of terrorists' domination on Iraq, Iraq's neighbors, Middle East and U.S. All through his speech, he defined the dominators as Iran, Al Qaida and the most dangerous one as the Iraqi regime tyrant, Saddam Hussein.

In the above sentence, Bush has indicated Saddam's invasion and brutally occupation of Iraq's neighbors, striking other nations and attacking U.S as a sign of Saddam's endeavor for dominating the world and in particular Middle East. In fact by warning people of the consequences of terrorism domination, Bush tried to evoke fear of domination in people. And the only solution to eradicate such a danger was proposed as annihilating dominators. Therefore the war decision has been proposed and justified as a necessary operation for confronting the danger of terrorists' domination on Iraq, Middle East, U.S. and other nations.

- ✓ **Security:** "Whatever our differences in the past, the world understands that success in Iraq is critical to the security of our nations".

President Bush tried to evoke confidence emotion in both American and Iraqi people by instilling security emotions. According to Bush's statements, American security depended on some factors such as "American soldiers and their families' sacrifice", "American victory in Iraq", "defeating Saddam as the agent of terror" and so on.

In this sentence, Bush stated that American security depended on their military success in Iraq. Undoubtedly, victory in Iraq required fighting and defeating terrorists, the Iraqi and American enemy. To assure Iraqi and American people of security, Bush emphasized that other countries and nations had been providing military and non-military assistance for Iraq. Therefore, by evoking security emotion which was acquired through fighting against terrorists in Iraq, President Bush intended to indirectly persuade people to go to war.

As table 1 represented, 59% of applied arguments for evoking emotions were those proposed by Chilton (2004) and the remained 41% of applied arguments were not stated in Chilton's (2004) theory. In fact in addition to applying Chilton's (2004) eight proposed arguments, President Bush applied other argument strands to provoke some emotions in people in order to directly or indirectly persuade them to go to war.

To directly persuade people to go to war, some arguments relevant to fighting were used to evoke war-related emotions. To indirectly persuade them to go to war, Bush applied two opposite strategies of instilling fear and confidence emotions. To instill fear and confidence, three different arguments were used for each one.

It was found that although it was not stated in Chilton's (2004) theory, Chilton's eight proposed arguments for instilling emotions can also be classified to evoke either fear or confidence. Actually among Chilton's proposed arguments as listed in table 1, the first three arguments were applied to instill fear and the second five arguments were applied to instill confidence emotion. Table 2 represented the frequency of other applied emotions not stated in Chilton's (2004) theory.

Table 2: *The frequency of applied arguments other than Chilton's proposition*

Applying other Arguments for	Evoking emotions	Number of sentences Percentage
Iraqi regimes' possession of WMD	62	12.44%
Reminding the memory of 11/9 attack	34	6.62%
Reminding other horrible events	9	1.80%
Possessing powerful Army	45	9.036%
Possessing developed appliance of war	27	5.22%
Possessing strong supporter	10	2.008%
Invasion	24	4.81%
Total	211	41%

As table 2 shows, from among 211 sentences in which some arguments other than Chilton's propositions were used to evoke emotion, "Iraqi regime's possession of WMD" was the most frequent argument, "The memory of 11/9 attack" and "the memory of other horrible past events" were respectively the second and the third one to evoke fear.

On the other hand, Bush used three other arguments to evoke confidence emotion in people in order to indirectly persuade them to go to war. As table 2 shows, claiming "America's possession of powerful Army" was the most frequent argument used by Bush to instill confidence. "Possessing developed appliance of war" was the second and "possessing strong supporters" was the third one. Besides, to directly persuade people to go to war, Bush applied "invasion and revenge" arguments to instill fighting emotion in people and lead them to battlefield.

As it can be inferred from table 2, out of 41% applied arguments, the first three arguments with frequency of 20% were used to evoke fear, the second three arguments with frequency of 17% were used to evoke confidence, and the last argument with frequency of 4% was used to evoke invasion and fighting emotion. Therefore, regarding the frequency of applied emotions, fear had the most frequency, confidence and invasion, respectively had the second and the third one.

Regarding the fact that Chilton's eight proposed arguments can also be categorized to evoke either fear or confidence, Table 1 can be analyzed as follow. As table 1 shows, out of 59% of applied emotions, the first three arguments with frequency of 37% were used to evoke fear and the second five arguments

with frequency of 22% were used to evoke confidence. Below, table 3 represents the overall frequency of applied emotions by President Bush to his speeches on Iraq war and terrorism.

Table 3: *The frequency of total applied emotions to Bush speeches on Iraq war and terrorism*

Prevailing emotions	Number of sentences	Percentage
Fear	282	57%
Confidence	198	39%
Invasion	24	4%
Total	498	100%

As table 3 shows, 57% of applied emotions were used to evoke fear, 39% of applied emotions were used to evoke confidence and 4% of applied emotions were used to evoke fighting emotion. It shows that, as a means of indirectly persuading people to go to war, Bush appealed to evoking fear emotion more than confidence emotion. Furthermore, Bush appealed to evoking fighting emotion less than 5% that was indicative of his reluctance towards applying emotions that directly persuade people to go to war. For the purpose of clarification, some examples that are indicative of instilling the emotions stated in table 2 are stated and analyzed below.

A) Instilling fear emotion in people to indirectly persuade them to go to war
✓ Fear of terrorism's possession of WMD (weapons of Mass Destruction):"Saddam Hussein is a homicidal dictator who is addicted to weapons of mass destruction. He has ordered chemical attacks on Iran, and on more than forty villages in his own country. These actions killed or injured at least 20,000 people, more than six times the number of people who died in the attacks of September 11".

The important evidence for the Iraq war was Bush's Administration's claim on Iraq's possession of WMD. During his speech, Bush has proved his claim by alluding to Iraq's possession of A) horrible missiles B) biological, chemical and nuclear weapon E) chemical agents including mustard gas, etc. F) Exploring ways of using UAV (unmanned aerial vehicle) for missions targeting the U.S. Moreover Bush clarified the victims of such weapons as American people, Iraqi people and other free nations to produce fear in the citizens of those countries.

For the purpose of proving Saddam's possession of WMD and evoking fear, Bush reminded Saddam's killing of more than 20,000 people by such weapons. Bush reminded that Saddam has used it before against Iran, U.S, and surprisingly against his own people to instill fear and horror in audience. Therefore, indirectly Bush brought the war idea as a solution to confront the danger of being attacked by WMD.

✓ Memory of 11/9 attack: "After seeing the destruction of September the 11th, we concluded that America could not afford to allow a regime with such a threatening and violent record to remain in the heart of the Middle East".

For the purpose of constructing and introducing terrorists as U.S enemy, different accusations were used by Bush administration. President Bush used the evidence of September The 11th attack on the United States by terrorists as an accusation and reason to propose the idea of global war on terrorism. According to the data, Bush mentioned the disastrous events of September the 11th attack as the worst crime in order to provoke fear, danger and revenge emotion in American people. The above sentence

was an indicative of the fact that by alluding to the American trauma of September the 11th attack, President Bush provoked an imminent fear and danger such as "being attacked by terrorism again", "genocide of innocent people", "losing good men and women", "imminent horror experience and destruction". Here, President Bush accused the terrorism of such a danger and threat to ensure people that U.S can't remain silent and should confront such a hostile regime. And the only way that such a threat can be eradicated forever was implicitly proposed as fighting terrorism and defeating them.

   B) Instilling confidence emotion in people to indirectly persuade them to go to war
   ✓ Possessing strong supporters: We've increased intelligence-sharing with friends and allies around the world. We've provided training and support to counterterrorism partners like the Philippines, and Indonesia, and Jordan, and Saudi Arabia. These partners have made enormous contributions in the war on terror".

For the purpose of evoking confidence emotion in people, President Bush introduced some of the American and Iraqi supporters. Bush introduced those with well-developed capabilities for fighting as America's key partners and allies. "Twenty five NATO allies", "seventeen partner nations"‖ and "families of warriors" were defined as helpful war partners of America.

In the above sentence, Bush mentioned Philippines, Indonesia, Jordan and Saudi Arabia as counter terrorism partners of America to emphasize that America was not alone in the war on terror. Moreover he reminded the previous success of partners to emphasize their power and strength. Undoubtedly, claiming the America's possession of such strong supporters would evoke confidence in American people and assure them of victory. Consequently, American people would not have disagreed with Bush's war decision anymore.

   ✓ Possessing powerful army: "We will plan carefully, we will act with the full power of the United States military, we will act with allies at our side, and we will prevail".

In addition to evoking fear, Bush evoked confidence emotion in audiences to assure them of victory in Iraq war. During his speech, Bush tried to evoke confidence emotion by claiming the possession of numerous, courageous and powerful Army. Based on data analysis, Bush made some claims about U.S. Army such as A) possessing the greatest Armed forces on earth B) possessing a powerful Army that removed Taliban C) using troops from cold war garrison D) possessing numerous and courageous Army ready for fighting E) possessing a united Army with foreign partners.

In the above sentence, Bush spoke of a powerful Army that consisted of both U.S. Army and its' allies and gave them the hope of success and victory. Applying the deontic modality verb "will" was an endeavor on the part of Bush to emphasize the ability and power of U.S. Army. Therefore Bush evoked the confidence emotion in audiences to assure them of victory and lead them to war.

   ✓ Possessing developed appliance of war: "We've expanded America's arsenal of unmanned aerial vehicles from fewer than 170 when I took office to more than 6,000 today".

Accusing terrorism of possessing WMD as a central reason for the Iraq war would have evoked the fear of defeat in American people. To diminish such a fear, Bush claimed that U.S. Army has capabilities such as "advanced technologies like Global Positioning System", "more than 6000 arsenal of unmanned aerial vehicles", "the first-ever special operations command within the Marines", "the counterinsurgency capabilities".

In the above sentence, Bush provided a numerical information of possessing Unmanned Aerial Vehicles both to evoke confidence emotion in American people and to show that the information is exact and reliable. So possessing such an appliance of war and a leader that control and increase them, undoubtedly would evoke confidence emotion of winning war against terrorism. Consequently people would have been more persuaded to go to war.

C) Instilling Emotions that Directly Persuade American People to Go to War
- ✓ Invasion and Fighting: "And we fight today because terrorists want to attack our country and kill our citizens, and Iraq is where they are making their stand".

The data revealed that Bush put forward some rational and emotional reasons to persuade people to go to war. By reminding September the 11th attack, Bush proposed fighting, both to take revenge of those who killed innocent people and to prevent further similar attacks. Providing the security for America, Iraq and other nations were suggested as other reasons of fighting against terrorism.

In the above sentence, Bush defined the place of fighting and those whom American troops would fight against. Since terrorists chose Iraq as a safe haven for conducting their terrorists operation, Bush defined Iraq as the battlefield. Also he clearly named terrorists as the main aim of fighting. To justify the necessity of fighting, Bush claimed that fighting in Iraq would lead to the security of America and its' innocent people. Therefore the only choice of going to war and fighting terrorists was justified for American people.

5- Conclusions

In conclusion, political discourse is a powerful linguistic means in world politics that can define a countries' destiny in war condition. It is therefore worthwhile to examine what strategies politicians apply to their political speeches to reach their political goals. This is specially the case when President Bush as a political figure applied different linguistic strategies to reach his goal in the case of Iraq war. This study provided some interesting findings related to the strategies Bush applied to his speeches on Iraq war and terrorism. Firstly, emotion was proved to be such strategy used by Bush during his speeches. Analyzing the data revealed that, although Chilton (2004) did not put some arguments in his classification of arguments that instill emotion. Analyzing the data was indicative of their application by President Bush for instilling two prevailing emotions of fear and confidence. The researcher concluded that Chilton's (2004) eight proposed arguments for instilling emotion, can also be classified to instill either fear or confidence.

The prevailing arguments used to instill fear were: "terrorism"," possession of WMD", reminding "the memory of 9/11 attack", "memory of other horrible events", "invasion" and "domination". On the other hand, the prevailing arguments that Bush used to instill confidence emotion were claiming of America's "possession of powerful Army", "possession of developed appliance of war", "possession of strong supporters" and America's providing "security" and "protectiveness". In fact two emotions of fear and confidence were used to indirectly persuade people to go to war. To directly persuade people to go to war, Bush instilled the emotions of "fighting, invasion and revenge".

As a result, analyzing the data revealed the main and the secondary reasons behind the application of the investigated theory. It was found that the central reason of applying the examined theory was the legitimization of Iraq war decision by Bush Administration.

Regarding the secondary reasons of applying the examined theory, it was found that Bush applied the strategy with specific purposes. For example, President Bush applied emotion strategy as a powerful strategy to arouse some war related feelings in people and consequently to control their decision making. In fact, Bush intended to provoke some emotions in people to directly or indirectly persuade them to go to war. As a last concluding remark, it should be mentioned that since Bush applied the investigated strategy of Chilton (2004), it can be concluded that Chilton's theoretical framework is applicable in political discourse analysis, while some reformation is needed to be made in the researcher's idea.

While the present study investigated the application of Chilton's emotion strategy in President Bush's speeches on Iraq war and terrorism, further research can be done to investigate the applicability of

Chilton's other eleven proposed strategies to president Bush's speeches on Iraq war and terrorism. Also political linguists can conduct some extensive researches on the applicability of 12 proposed Chilton's theory to other politician's speeches and political discourse, to find and introduce the linguistic elements that politicians make use of them to succeed in world politics.

Regarding the importance of First World War and Second World War in history, future investigations of strategies that politicians applied to their speeches during these periods based on Chilton's (2004) propositions can be interesting and admirable. Also, the present research has not dealt with the other Scholar's propositions regarding political discourse and has only chosen Chilton.

References:
1. Chilton, P. (2004): *Analysing Political Discourse. Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.
2. Clark, W. (2003). The Real Reasons for the Upcoming War with Iraq: A Macroeconomic and Geostrategic Analysis of the Unspoken Truth. *Independent Media Center*, 6, 432-444.
3. Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power*. (2nd Ed.). London: Longman.
4. Foucault, M. (1982). The Subject and Power. In H.L. Dreyfus & P.
5. Fracer, B. (2010). Hedging in political discourse: The Bush 2007 press conferences. In O.,Urszula & C., Piotr (Eds.), *Perspectives on Politics and Discourse* (pp. 201-214). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
6. Geis, M. L. (1987). *The language of politics.* New York: Springer.
7. Habermas J. (1986) Communicative Rationality and the Theories of Meaning and Action, In: J., Habermas. (1998) *On the Pragmatics of Communication* (Ed.) Cambridge: Massachusetts.
8. Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *Introduction to Functional Grammar* London, New York: Arnold.
9. Hutcheson, J., David, D., Andre, B., & Philip, G.(2004). U.S. national identity, political elites, and a patriotic press following September 11. *Political Communication,* 21, 27-50.
10. Klein, G. A. (1998). *Sources of power: How people make decisions.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
11. Kress, G., & Hodge, R. (1979). *Language as ideology.* London: Routledge
12. Suslova, A. Y. (2008). New Linguistic Technologies in Modern Political Discourse. *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences*, 4(1), 500-507.
13. Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse, Context and cognition. *Discourse Studies*, 8(1), 159-177.
14. Van Leeuwen, T. (2006). Critical Discourse Analysis. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, 3*, 290-94.
15. Wenden, A. l. (2005) the politics of representations: A critical discourse analysis of an Aljazeera space report. *International Journal of Peace Studies,* 10(2), 118-134.
16. Wodak, R. (2001). What is CDA about - a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments? In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1-13). London: Sage.
17. Wodak, R. (2006). Mediation between discourse and society: Assessing cognitive approaches in CDA. *Discourse and Society*, 8(1), 179-190.
18. Wodak, R., & De Cillia, R. (2007). Commemorating the Past: The Discursive Construction of Official Narratives about the "Rebirth of the Second Austrian Republic". *Discourse and Communication*, 1(3), 315-341.