DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF PRESIDENT GEORGE W. BUSH'S SPEECH AT THE ISLAM CENTRE IN WASHINGTON

Abdullah Najim Abd Al Khanaifsawy

General Directorate of Education at Diwaniyah,
Ministry of Education, Iraq

ABSTRACT

The present research aims at providing a discoursal analysis of former president Bush's speech on Islam that was held at the Islam Center in Washington to show how the president claims and supports his views towards Islam. The researcher utilized Toulmin Model for analyzing the ways Bush delivers and supports his claims about Islam. This study is based on two hypotheses, that are: 1) President Bush's Speech at the Islam Centre in Washington about Islam and Muslims is positive, and 2) Toulmin Model is a very effective tool for analyzing political speeches. The researcher has come up with some results and conclusions, the most important of which, is that most of Bush's claims are value claims and some others are policy-based claims. This result shows that Bush has positive viewpoints on Islam and Muslims in his political speech initiated.

Keywords: Islamic Center, Toulmin Model, Islamophophea, Proclamations.

1. INTRODUCTION

This research is mainly concerned with the analysis of a speech delivered by president Bush" in 2001 after the attacks of 11/9. It is a very short speech, yet, an important claim raised in it to both, Muslims and Americans about the attacks and the consequences of it. Bush, in this speech has shown to the world and to the Muslim world in specific that the United States does not count Islam as the responsible for these attacks. Additionally, he states that Muslims have the full right to live in America and those how bother Muslim women when they go to their works because of a racial reason such as wearing hijab, don't represent the United States Bush knows. Although the United States had been attacked by Muslim terrorists, Bush did not address Islam in a negative way in this speech. What Bush's administration had done to some Islamic countries proves most Bush's speech on Islam as wrong. The United States under the administration of Bush, launched a war against Islamic countries. Boniface (2015, P. 25) comments on the contradiction of politicians' speech in regard to their external policy. He states that today the battle of public opinion is raging, and the access to the public is what politicians try to accomplish. their goal is no longer informing this audience and, on the contrary, influencing it for the benefit their own agendas. For them, access to public opinion becomes a means for marketing themselves; they use the audience, they don't put themselves in serve of it. In other words, Bush in his speech tries to justify his future plans by passing a moral argument while hiding a fewer noble goal. Starting with the American intervention in Cuba in 1898, to help the people free themselves from the yoke of colonialism. All the way to the 2003 Iraq war to help Iraqi people get rid of the despicable dictatorship, the list of "legitimate reasons" goes on and on, and it will not be closed soon.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

2.1 Research Problem

The problem of the present research can be summarized as below:

1. Most users of language are not aware of how to analyze political speeches and that causes crucial problem in understating the speeches communicative values initiated.

2. Most of the researchers are not aware of the effectivity of Toulmin Model in analyzing certain political speeches pragmatically.

3. Most users of language ignore the significance of context in determining the speaker's intended communicative value.

2.2 Research Limits

This study is limited to:

1. A discoursal analysis of the former president bush's speech at the Islam Center in Washington about Islam and Muslims after 11 September attacks.

2. The use of Toulmin Model for constructing and analyzing the president's political speech.

2.3 Research Objectives

The objectives of the present study can be summarized below:

1. Providing a discoursal analysis of Bush's political speech held in Washington about Islam and Muslims to show his viewpoints that most of listeners confused due to their ignorance to the context role in determining the speaker's intended communicative values.

2. This study could be of a special significance to those who are interested in analyzing political speech acts for pragmatic perspectives. It is also hoped to be important to the post graduate students who study the field of pragmatics.

3. Showing how effective *Toulmin Model* is for analyzing political arguments as it has been tested in analyzing Bush's speech in this study.

2.4. Research Objectives

The objectives of the present study can be summarized below:

1. Providing a discoursal analysis of Bush's political speech held in Washington about Islam and Muslims to show his viewpoints that most of listeners confused due to their ignorance to the context role in determining the speaker's intended communicative values.

2. This study could be of a special significance to those who are interested in analyzing political speech acts for pragmatic perspectives. It is also hoped to be important to the post graduate students who study the field of pragmatics.

3. Showing how effective *Toulmin Model* is for analyzing political arguments as it has been tested in analyzing Bush's speech in this study.

2.5. Research Hypotheses

The present study is based on the following hypotheses that read:

1. President Bush's Speech at the Islam Centre in Washington about Islam and Muslims is positive.

2. Toulmin Model is a very effective tool for analyzing political speeches.

3. THE CONCEPT OF RACISM

There seems no definite history of the term *race*. Very few words such as "*razza*", "*raza*", and "*race*" (respectively Italian, French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Spanish) have been documented from the thirteenth century (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001, P. 2). Grosfoguel (2016, P. 10) refers to racism as a global term of superiority and inferiority. This global term exists among the line of humanity that has been expressed culturally, economically and politically by the institutions of the capitalist/patriarchal western centric /Christian-centric modern/colonial world system. According to him, there are people above and below the line. Those who are above, can enjoy their different rights starting from their human rights ending with their labor rights, while people below the line are taken as sub-humans. In other words, their humanity is questioned and negated. For example, different colonial histories seem to have different and diverse social markers through which interiority and superiority can be constructed. From another point of view, racism can be clearly marked by language, ethnicity, color, culture and religion Grosfoguel (2016, P. 10).

As suggested by Van Dijk (1997, P. 31) within many forms of public discourse, race relations and ethnic minorities can be seen as practiced by white people. Their daily communication acquires their "attitudes and the ideologies" that determine their actions and/or speeches against minorities. Therefore, the role of discourse is distinct in the production of racism and prejudice.

4. RACISM IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Political discourse is frequently considered as a highly specialized form of texts. This produces a problem in approaching an exact definition of this linguistic phenomenon because it seems to be constructed in different ways according to the divers' contexts. However, in an attempt to answer to the question "what constitutes political discourse?"

The notion of "political discourse" should be limited to certain settings such as speeches and election campaigns, parliamentary proclamations, and applied to all linguistic usages that may be regarded as political (Zheng 2000, P. 1). Van Dijk (1993, P. 145) states that "although discourse may seem just "words" (and therefore cannot break your bones, do sticks and stones), text and talk play a vital role in the reproduction of contemporary racism."

471

5. ISLAMOPHOBIA

Itaoui and Elsheikh (2018, P.5) define Islamophobia as "a belief that Islam is a monolithic religion whose followers, Muslims, do not share common values with other major faiths; is inferior to Judaism and Christianity; is archaic, barbaric, and irrational; is a religion of violence that supports terrorism; and is a violent political ideology.". Islamophobia as a concept is widely believed to be used at first in Britain. This claim may not however be 100% true. Whilst the Oxford English Dictionary suggests that the term was first used in print in 1991 ,other sources suggest that it was first used by Etienne Dinet and Slima Ben Ibrahim in France, when in 1925 they wrote about the Prophet Muhammad. Dinet and Ibrahim were not employing the term in such ways that it reflects the contemporary concept or usage. Allen (2010, P. 5). Green (2015, P. 5) claims that the word "Islamophophea" appeared in its French form, *Islamophobie*, in 1918 in a book by the painter Etienne Dinet.

6. TOULMIN'S MODEL OF ARGUMENT

Mitchell &Riddle (2000) have written on the role of models in identifying the key elements of theoretical systems; ultimately, they can be seen in terms of metaphorical frameworks for distilling the salient from the residual. As far as argumentation and its applications in Education are concerned, there are a number of models that can be discussed. Of influential importance is Toulmin's (1958) model. The particular function of this model is to provide a test for the reliability of arguments. The main axes of this model are, first, the relationship between claims (propositions) and grounds (evidence), and second, the relationship between the warrant (means by which the claims are related to the grounds) and its backing (justification for the warrant within disciplinary or other contexts). The possibility of a qualifier is mediating between the claim and grounds, so that under certain conditions, or in certain circumstances, the relationship between the claim and its grounds can be adjusted. Furthermore, a rebuttal might be added to challenge the relationship between the grounds and the claim, either helping to strengthen the relationship or challenging it to change (and, for example, be qualified). It is clear, from the figures, that arrows directions in the model are all towards the confirmation of the claim. The various elements of the model are there to support the claim and to test its soundness.

7. DATA ANALYSIS

7.1. Argument One Analysis

The first argument in Bush's speech contains a claim which is a fact-based claim. In this argument, Bush claims;

> "*These acts of violence against innocents violate the fundamental tenets of the Islamic faith. And it's important for my fellow Americans to understand that.*"

This fact-based claim can be checked through taking a look on the rules and principles of the Islamic sharia. In this claim, Bush states that the terrorists who attacked the World Trade Powers in 2001 don't represent Islam, for Islam have no such ideology (attacking innocents). This claim is based on the data; "Both Americans and Muslim friends and citizens, tax-paying citizens, and Muslims in nations were just appalled and could not believe what we saw on our TV screens."

This data shows that Muslims are not satisfied with the attacks. Not only the Muslims of America who are referred to as "tax-paying citizens" refuse these attacks, but also the Muslims in other nations do so. The data strengthens the claim that Islam has no such ideology by showing how Muslims across the world refuse it. Bush, to strengthen his data, provides it with a warrant which contains a verse from the glorious Quran. Bush says:

> "*The English translation is not as eloquent as the original Arabic, but let me quote from the Koran, itself: In the long run, evil in the extreme will be the end of those who do evil. For that they rejected the signs of Allah and held them up to ridicule.*"

The previous warrant is an authority warrant for it relates the data to a highly-established and sound source which is adequate to support the claim. In this warrant, Bush, relies on a valid support which is a verse from Surah Al-Rum to support his data. The verse tells that those who go against the orders of Allah will be punished and the claim tells that the attacks don't represent Islam. So, since the verse refers to Islam and goes against the Ideology of the attackers, it strengthens the claim of Bush. This argument is best illustrated in the following diagram:

7.2. Argument Two Analysis

The second argument in Bush's speech shares the same theme with his first argument; they both contain claims which are addressed to talking positively on

Islam and to tell the audience that these attacks have no bond with Islam. In his second argument, Bush claims;

> "*The face of terror is not the true faith of Islam. That's not what Islam is all about. Islam is peace. These terrorists don't represent peace. They represent evil and war.*"

This is a value claim for it represent Bush's own point of view on Islam; Bush claims that these attacks don't represent the true faith of Islam. This claim might contradict with what had Bush's administration done for some Islamic countries such as Iraq and Afghanistan. This claim is based on the data;

> *"Islam is peace."*

The attacks don't represent Islam because Islam is peace. This is the way Bush makes his claim convincible. the data, in turn, is supported by the warrant;

> *"These terrorists don't represent peace"*

This is a sign warrant for it indicates that the evidence is the indicator of the claim. In this argument the evidence is an indicator of the claim for Bush says that the reason these attacks don't represent Islam is that Islam is peace. So, the warrant adds more support to the data by showing that the terrorists who committed the attacks don't represent peace. The warrant is also backed up by a backing to make the argument more convincible in this regard, Bush says;

> *"They represent evil and war."*

Bush adds in the backing that the terrorists represent war, the don't represent Islam. This is a way to support the warrant. The warrant is backed up when it is not adequate to stand as a support for the data, so it is supported by a backing. In this argument the argument pieces support each other one by one; Bush claims that Islam is not the responsible for the attacks because they contradict with its tenets and the reason for that is that Islam is peace while the terrorists who committed the attacks represent war and evil.

7.3 Argument Three Analysis
As the first and second arguments, the third one is dedicated to talking about Islam in a positive way. In this argument, Bush tries to tell his audience a fact that supports the first two arguments; he claims:

> *"When we think of Islam, we think of a faith that brings comfort to a billion people around the world"*.

This is a value claim which represents what Bush claims Islam is. It is a value claim, for different people have different points of view in regard to Islam; many people think Islam is the religion of terrorism, while for other people, Islam connotes peace. Even those who think that the terrorists who attacked the United States or other parts of the world do not represent Islam, believe that those terrorists must be Muslims. The current claim is based on the data: "Billions of people find comfort and solace and peace."

The data is added to support the claim in Bush's argument; he states that people see Islam as a source of peace. The data is backed up with a warrant which mediates the relationship between the claim and its data in a way that supplies the data with the adequacy to be a valid support. Bush states: "And that's made brothers and sisters out of every race—out of every race."
This is a generalization warrant since the claim is a result of the data; people think of comfort when they hear the word "Islam" because Islam brings peace for them. The warrant in the current argument works in this way; it connects the data to the claim.

7.4 Argument Four Analysis
Argument four, like the last three arguments in Bush's speech, is a traditional argument, since it contains only three elements from the six elements of Toulmin model. In this argument, Bush claims:

> *"America counts millions of Muslims amongst our citizens"*

This claim is a fact-based claim for its truthiness can be checked easily depending on a valid method. Many employees in the United States are Muslims and their religious identity is known. So, such claim can be proved easily. Bush states his claim to support the main theme in his speech and to prove to his audience what he says is trustworthy and to make sure that his speech is convincible. The current claim is built on the data:

> *"And Muslims make an incredibly valuable contribution to our country."*

Bush adds this data to support his claim; he states that Muslims work in the United States and they pay taxes

just the way other Americans do. In this speech, Bush talks to the Americans especially the Muslims and he represents his own point of view on the matter at hand because such mater is an external issue upon which politicians might contradict. This data is based on and supported by the warrant:

"Muslims are doctors, lawyers, law professors, members of the military, entrepreneurs, shopkeepers, moms and dads. And they need to be treated with respect. In our anger and emotion, our fellow Americans must treat each other with respect."

This warrant is an analogy warrant for it connects the data to the claim by listing certain types of works done by Muslim people in the United States. In the warrant, Bush, mentions the jobs of Muslims that ease the life in the United States. He says so to strengthen the claim and to tell his audience that Muslims are an important part in the American body. This validates and verifies the first hypothesis of the study that reads "President *Bush's Speech at the Islam Centre in Washington about Islam and Muslims is positive*".

7.5 Argument Five Analysis
Bush's fifth argument contains no explicit mentioning of Islam, yet has a strong bond with it and its claim is supported with a data, the main theme of which, is Islam. In this argument, Bush claims:

"This is a great country."

This claim is a value claim, since it represents Bush own opinion concerning the state of the United States

as a great country. Throughout Bush's speech, he revolves around one point that is to talk about Islam in a positive way. So, this claim, though dedicated to speaking on the greatness of the United States, is related to the Islamic issue, Bush wants to tackle. In other words, Bush does not want to speak about the greatness of the United States in regard to its military power or its economy; he states that this is a great country because people within its borders can live freely. This claim is based on the data:

"It's a great country because we share the same values of respect and dignity and human worth. And it is my honor to be meeting with leaders who feel just the same way I do."
The data is inserted by Bush here to give the support to the claim.

In the claim, Bush states that America is a great country and this is a statement that needs a valid support. the data is also backed up with the warrant.

"Those who feel like they can intimidate our fellow citizens to take out their anger don't represent the best of America, they represent the worst of humankind, and they should be ashamed of that kind of behavior."

This is an authority warrant. Such type of warrant is inserted by the speaker to relate his data to a source that enhances and supports the claim. In this argument, Bush adds such warrant to prove to his audience that this is a true great country by showing to theme how those who bother the fellow citizens don't belong to the United States.

Table 1: Types of Bush's claims in his speech "Remarks at the Islamic Center of Washington"

Claim No.	Claim Type
Claim 1	Fact-based claim
Claim 2	Value claim
Claim 3	Value claim
Claim 4	Fact based claim
Claim 5	Value claim

Table (1) shows that the total number of Bush's claims is five claims. four claims are value claims while the rest ones are fact-based claims. The result suggests that these claims represent Bush's point of view on Islam and Muslims; he does not raise a policy-based claims which are agreed upon among all the American politicians. Instead, Bush states what he thinks Islam is or what he claims it to be. Based on the results reached following Toulmin Model for constructing

and analyzing political speeches, it the second hypothesis of this study that reads "*Toulmin Model is a very effective tool for analyzing political speeches*".

7. CONCLUSIONS
The main conclusions that can be drawn from the study at hand are the following:

1. *Toulmin Model* provides a useful way for analyzing arguments; it helps in breaking down the arguments to their main constituent elements (claim, data, warrant, backing, rebuttal, and qualifier). Toulmin Model also helps in the construction of the arguments, since it makes the arguer to be aware of the parts of the argument.

2. Toulmin Model provides a useful way for analyzing political speech since the political speeches are, in most cases, arguments; when a politician speaks, s/he tries to make the audience convinced with what s/he says and there is a counterpart opinion that is meant to refute the delivered speech.

3. Speech on race is not necessarily negative depending on the circumstance or the context in which the speech initiated.

4. The political orientation is not the main factor that shapes the American presidential speech in all cases; politicians pay attention to other factor such as: national security when they speak. National security is much more important than the political gains and the personal ideologies.

REFERENCES

1. Allen C. (2010), **Islamophobia,** University of Birmingham, UK

2. Boniface P. (2011). **Les Intellectuals faussaires**, Paris.

3. Green T. H. (2015), The Fear of Islam; An Introduction to Islamophobia in the West, Fortress Press, USA.

4. Grosfoguel, R. (2016). **What is Racism?** Journal of World-Systems Research, 22(1), 9-15.

5. Mitchell, S. and Riddle, M. (2000). Improving the Quality of Argument in Higher Education: final report. Middlesex University

6. Reisigal, M. & Wodak, R. (2001). Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of Racism and Antisemitism. London: Routledge

7. Reisigl, M. and Wodak, R. (2001) Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of Racism and Antisemitism. London, New York: Routledge

8. Toulmin, S. E.: 1958, **The Uses of Argument**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

9. Van Dijk, T. A. (1993) **Elite Discourse and Racism**. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

10. Van Dijk, T., Ting-Toomey, S., Smitherman, G. and Troutman, D. (1997) '**Discourse, ethnicity, culture and** racism', in: T. van Dijk (ed.).

11. Zheng, T. (2000). "**Characteristics of Australian Political Language Rhetoric: Tactics of Gaining Public support and Shrinking Responsibility"**. Journal of Intercultural Communication, http://www.immi.se/intercultural/nr4/zheng.htm.