



The Discursive Mechanism of Representing Left Wing Politics

Sedik K. Oda

Dkar Centre for History Studies

ABSTRACT

Left-wing politics refers to the range of political ideologies that support social equality and egalitarianism. This involves the focus on reducing unjustified inequalities the left-wing believes to abolish for human development and mutually respectful relation and cooperation. The mechanisms of representation relate to the organization of politics and its consequences, and the processes through which interests or preferences are represented in the political system and the outcomes of public policy. This study aims to uncover the ways left-wing politics redirects advocates and persuades the audience to believe their ideology by employing the speech act of warning. The use of the speech act of warning has been attributed to the cultural and ideological diversity of politicians, and influenced media and social relations. The focus is on the speeches of George W. Bush, a distinguished former American president who saw major international events, namely 9/11 and the Gulf war. The analyses depart from speech act theory, making abstractions at different conceptual levels to demonstrate that warning is a complex speech act. It is found that Bush's speeches were rich in warning speech acts, using war discourse of challenging and fighting. He flourished his military ideology as a statement of fact and warnings against enemies of the US. War ideology was implied in Bush's speeches, so that his audiences would be persuaded to act accordingly.

Keywords: speech acts, warning, left wing politics, politicians, ideology

1. Introduction

We are attuned in everyday conversation not primarily to the sentences we utter to one another, but to the speech acts that those utterances are used to perform, such as requests, warnings, promises and apologies. These acts are parts of communicative life, and became a topic of sustained investigation in the English-speaking world since the middle of the twentieth century. This field of study is influential not only within philosophy, but also in linguistics, theory, and has become among legal theory, artificial intelligence, literary theory, and psychology (Fuss, and Gleason, 2016; Glover, 2011; Searle, 1969; Austin, 1962).

Speech acts (SAs) have illuminated recognition of the reality that language can do other things than language. SAs explain and construct the philosophy of action, aesthetics and political philosophy. In addition, speech acts have helped lay bare a normative structure implicit in linguistic reality and mind practice, part of this practice is concerned with describing normative structure underlying research aims at an accurate characterization of this linguistic practice. The concept of speech act is one of the most important notions in pragmatics (Searle, 1969). The term denotes the sense in which utterances are not mere meaning-bearers, but rather do things (Austin, 1962). Even though speech acts are central to an understanding of language use, they have been largely off the linguistics agenda since the 1980s (Green, 2010).

The structures of political discourse are seldom exclusive, but typical and effective discourse in political contexts, but certainly, they do have preferred structures and strategies that are functional in the adequate accomplishment of political actions in political contexts. Political discourse is not only about stating public propositions. It is about politics. It is about doing things with words. Words are used to affect the political body. Lexical items not only may be selected because of official criteria of decorum, but also because they effectively emphasize political attitudes and opinions, manipulate public opinion, manufacture political consent, or legitimate political power (Dylgjeri, 2017). Many studies of political discourse deal with the language of professional politicians and political institutions, some of which are discourse-analytical (Chilton, 2004: 14). Political discourse is identified by its actors or authors, viz., politicians. Politicians in this sense are the group of people who are being paid for their (political) activities, and who are being elected or appointed as the central players in politics. Therefore, we should also include the various recipients in political communicative events, such as the public, the people, and the citizens. All these groups and individuals, as well as their organizations and institutions, may take part in the political process, and many of them are actively involved in political discourse (van Dijk, 1997: 13).

The politicians' use of speech acts of warning carries a meaning which includes request and command in the sense that the addresser warns the addressee in terms of requesting and commanding him to stop doing a bad or unpleasant action. The propositional content of warning (as a directive act) must predicate a future act of the hearer. For example, the utterance 'I warn you to stop smoking shows that the hearer is directed to do a future action (which is stopping of smoking), but the utterance 'I warn you that smoking is so dangerous' does not predicate a future action of the hearer. It has an assertive meaning in the sense that the speaker asserts something to the hearer (which is smoking is so dangerous) (Parker and Riley, 2005, Searle, 1975). My aim in this study is to analyse George Bush's speeches as a reaction to what happened in 9/11 by drawing up on Austin's (1962) and Searle's (1969) SAs framework. Searle's classification of speech act verbs has been applied in many studies and has achieved the aims it was applied for. SA's theory is applicable in presidential speech in general and in Bush's speech in particular because the use of implicit speech acts is the best way to deliver a message

flexibly with less harm (see Levinson, 1983). This implicit speech can be expressed by many linguistic forms, such as modal + operator construction, where the speaker's intention and determination to do something desirable soon can be expressed.

2. Speech Act Theory

Communication has always been a necessity in human life. Through communication, the trade of thought among people, which directly contributes to the development of the quality of life itself, can be performed. The ability to percept utterances in communication can determine the actions followed (see Hidayat, 2016). Communication can be conveyed through verbal and nonverbal communication. Buck (2002) states that there are two types of communication, they are verbal and nonverbal communication. Verbal communication is the way of communicating messages by using words as elements. Nonverbal communication is the way of communicating messages by using gestures, body movements, eye contact, facial expression, or general appearances as the elements.

Speech act, a variety of verbal communication and also a subdivision of pragmatics, often takes place in verbal and nonverbal communication. Yule (1996) states that speech acts are a study of how the speakers and hearers use language. Bach (1979) explains that action in verbal communication has a message in itself, so communication is not only about language but also about action. There are certain aims beyond the words or phrases when a speaker says something. Austin (1962) explains that speech acts are acts that refer to the action performed by produced utterances. In line with this, Yule (1996: 47) states that speech act is an action which is performed via utterances. Stating the same idea, Birner (2013) also says that uttering something means doing something. Here, people can act by saying something. Through speech acts, the speaker can convey physical action merely through words and phrases. The conveyed utterances are paramount to the actions performed.

2.1 The construction of speech acts and types

When considering the construction of a SA, three linguistic tactics need to be taken for granted, namely Locutionary, Illocutionary **and** perlocutionary. Locutionary speech act is roughly equivalent to uttering a certain utterance with a certain sense and reference, which again is roughly equivalent to meaning in traditional sense (Austin, 1962: 108). Cutting (2002: 16) states that locutionary is what is said, as proposed by Yule (1996) who states that locutionary act is the act of producing meaningful utterances. **Illocutionary SA** is performed via the communicative force of an utterance, such as promising, apologizing, or offering (Yule, 1996:48). This act is also called the act of doing something in saying something. The most significant level of action in a speech act is the illocutionary act because the force, the real description of the interaction condition. **Perlocutionary** is the act that is carried out by a speaker when making an utterance causes in certain effect on the hearer and others (Searle, 1969; Hidayat, 2016; Hufford and Heasley, 1983). Perlocutionary act is also the act of offering someone. Perlocutionary act refers to the effect the utterance has on the thoughts or actions of the other person (Searle, 1969).

Speech acts can be classified into five categories, namely representatives, expressive, declarations, commissives and directives (Searle, 1969; Levinson, 1983). **Representatives** are speech acts that the utterances commit the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition (see also, Hidayat, 2016). The utterances are produced based on the speaker's observation of certain things then followed by stating the fact or opinion based on the observation. For example, *The sun shines from the east*, which represents the speaker's assertions and opinion about the sun. **Expressive** speech acts express the psychological state of speakers. These speech acts include thanking, apologizing, welcoming, and congratulating. For example, *He likes to stay alone*, as a representation of the speaker's state of mind to be left alone. **Declarations** are speech acts made by speakers to make immediate changes in the institutional state of affairs. These speech acts include excommunicating, declaring war, christening, and firing from employment. For example, *We won the fight*, as a declaration of the end of war and starting a new era of peace and security without threat. **Commissives** are speech acts that commit the speaker to some future course of action, including promises, threats, offers, warnings and pledges. For example, *We need to take action against terrorism*, as a warning to future actions against security. **Directives** are speech acts that the speaker uses to get someone else to do something, including direct command and order, and indirect request, questioning and suggestion. For example, *Open the window*, as a direct command, and *It is hot in here* as an indirect command. One of the directive speech acts is warning which will be discussed in the next section.

2.2 Felicity conditions

Any type of speech act should never overlook the so-called 'Felicity Conditions'. According to Austin (1962:14), the term 'Felicity Conditions' refers to the criteria which must be satisfied if a speech act is to achieve its purpose. In other words, for a speech act to be appropriately performed, there are some conventions. These are referred to as Felicity Conditions or the so-called social conventions. The speaker and the hearer should heed these conditions to guarantee the achievement of the purpose for which any given speech act is performed

According to Searle (1969), there are necessary and sufficient conditions for the speech act to be performed correctly and efficiently when uttering a specific utterance. Thus, the act uttered by the speaker should meet such conditions to be performed successfully (Searle, 1969: 54). Searle's felicity conditions are:

Propositional Content Conditions specify the propositional and the force that must be expressed when the speaker intends to do an action. Under preparatory conditions, the future event must be a future act of the speaker when he/she promises to do an act.

Preparatory Conditions that relate to the speaker's background knowledge when he/she performs any act. Under preparatory conditions, if the speaker intends to do an action, the event will not happen by itself and that event will have a beneficial effect.

Sincerity Conditions relate to the degree of sincerity with which a speech act is performed. Accordingly, the speaker must be sincere when he/she acts, and his/her utterance must include the appropriate feeling and thought.

Essential Conditions that relate to the way that the speaker is performing an action, is committed to a certain kind of belief and behaviour. Under essential conditions, when the speaker intends to do an action, he/she finds himself/herself obliged to carry out that action and his/her state of act performed, is changed from non-obligation to obligation (See also Mey, 1993; Ahmed, 2018).

3. Modelling the speech act of Warning

Warning is the directive act by which the speaker warns the hearer against doing an action. That is, to warn someone from doing an action is to suggest that he/she should not do it, and it would be a matter of risk (Searle, 1969; Austin, 1962). Austin (1962: 118) classifies warning under exercitives in which one exercises the power, right and influence over others. Searle (1969: 67) suggests that most warnings are essentially hypothetical for example 'if-then' statements, as in if you fail to obey orders, then you will be fired. Searle (1979) maintains that warning is a speech act which belongs to not only directive but to assertive syntax, such as in the statement "it is boiling outside", as a warning not to go outside. Warning also might be conventionally realized by its illocutionary force. For instance, the utterance, 'the ice over there is very thin' might be uttered by the speaker to issue warning (Strawson, 2007:444).

Without the context, it is hard to decide what speech act we have. Consider the example "Don't go near the stove". Is this a warning, an order, a request or perhaps an instance of some other speech act category? Apart from context, it is impossible to tell. But once context is supplied the answer is typically quite evident.

- If you touch the stove, you will burn yourself. So don't go near the stove. (warning)
- The player who avoids touching the stove usually wins the game. So don't touch the stove. (advice)
- I can't take another one of your casseroles. If you want to live don't touch the stove. (threat)

What these cases have in common is that they are all examples of what philosophers since Aristotle have called practical arguments, that is, arguments whose conclusions name action to be performed by an agent and whose premises provide reasons for the agent to perform that action. Warning carries a meaning which includes request and command in a sense that the addresser warns the addressee in terms of requesting and commanding him to stop doing a bad or unpleasant action. The propositional content of warning (as a directive act) must predicate a future act of the hearer. To warn X not to do A, on the other hand, is to imply that X's interests will suffer if X does A. That implication in turn functions as the premise of a general practical argument whose conclusion is "X, do not do A". This implication is the premise of the general practical argument being advanced by the speaker. Hinkle (1997:5) shows that it is conditional that warning hearers from doing a bad action imply that their interest will suffer if they do it. This means that politicians' use of warning

3.1 Felicity Condition of Warning

In this condition, the speaker believed that the events will occur and be detrimental to the hearer where the speaker believes that is not obvious to the hearer that the condition will occur (Van Dijk, 1997). This condition also focuses on whether the authority of the speakers and circumstance of the speech act is appropriately being spoken successfully as it looks at whether the speech act is being performed seriously. For example, a politician can say:

I warn you support Afghan leaders.

In this example, there are:

Propositional content: Future event (terrorism).

Preparatory condition:

- (i) S (politician) thinks the event (terrorism) will occur and is not in the public interest
- (ii) S (politician) thinks it is not obvious to the public that the event (terrorism) will occur.

Sincerity condition: S (politician) believes the event (terrorism) is not in the public best interest.

Essential condition: Counts as an undertaking that the event (terrorism) is not in the public best interest.

4. Data analysis and discussion

4.1 Data

Three texts were selected as the data of the present study. They are speeches delivered by former US president G. W. Bush. The first text is the first inaugural address by Bush. This speech took place on Saturday, January 20, 2001, at the West Front of the United States Capitol in Washington, D.C. the second text is a joint session of the congress on the united states response to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 attack. The third text is Bush's

addressing the United States as president-elect for the first time on Wednesday night, urging the nation to close ranks behind a new Republican administration after a hard-fought election and a five-week recount battle in Florida.

4.2 Analysis and discussion

Bush is distinguished from the other former American presidents by his employing many different illocutionary acts, since the use of SA can shed light on the development of the plot of the texts (Chilton, 2004; Cutting, 2002). The context of situation played a major role in deciding the SA of warning, hence Bush's speeches following 9/11 attacks were full of warnings and other illocutionary forces not common before the incident.

4.2.1 Bush's Inaugural address

In the first inaugural address by Bush, which took place on Saturday, January 20, 2001, at the West Front of the United States Capitol in Washington, D.C. Bush's use of warning speech act was implied in three examples:

1. America remains engaged in the world, by history and by choice, shaping a balance of power that favours freedom

Bush uses the simple verb form of *remains* to express two indirect illocutionary forces in this example. The first one implies his warning to the states that try to breach the balance of power and engage in repression. The second is a reminder that America has the right to act to keep the balance of power because of its historical and strategic role in the world, against repression.

In this example, the propositional content of the future event is implicitly repression, on the preparatory condition, that (1) Bush thinks the event (repression) will occur and is not in the public interest, (2) Bush thinks it is not obvious to the public that the event (repression) will occur. The sincerity condition is that Bush believes the event (repression) is not in the public best interest, and the essential condition in this example counts as an undertaking that the event (repression) is not in the public best interest

2. But the stakes for America are never small. If our country does not lead the cause of freedom, it will not be led.

Bush's words involve indirect illocution, trying to say that America is responsible for leading the world. The use of conditional- if is less common in this kind of speech but it is impressive in expressing the illocutionary act of warning.

In this example, the propositional content of the future event is the US being led, on the preparatory condition, that (1) Bush thinks that being led (idle) will occur and is not in the public interest, (2) Bush thinks it is not obvious to the public that the US being led will occur. The sincerity condition is that Bush believes the US being led is not in the public best interest, and the essential condition in this example counts as an undertaking that the US being led is not in the public best interest

3. We will defend our allies and our interests. We will show purpose without arrogance. We will meet aggression and bad faith with resolve and strength

In this example, Bush reuses the modal operator (will)+ infinitive to express his determination and intention to do something in the future. While this can be a speech act of promise, the felicity condition shows that this use is a construction of the speech act of warning. Since, defending allies is commonly carried out through engaging in fight and war, and using strength to meet aggression are all examples of the use of power against enemies and antagonizing forces. The propositional content of the future event is to fight, on the preparatory condition, that (1) Bush thinks that war/fight will occur and is not in the public interest, (2) Bush thinks it is not obvious to the public that the US will engage in war. The sincerity condition is that Bush believes war is not in the public best interest, and the essential condition in this example counts as an undertaking that war is not in the public best interest

4.2.2 Bush's joint session of congress

In the second text which is a joint session of congress and the American people in September 21, 2001, many linguistic forms are used, frequently the use of modal operator + infinitive. Bush frequently uses this form to warn and express his determination to do something in the future.

1. We will starve terrorists of funding, turn them one against another, drive them from to place, until there is no refuge or no rest, and we will pursue nations that provide aid or safe haven to terrorism.
2. I will not yield, I will not rest, I will not relent in waging this struggle for freedom and security of the American people.
3. From this day forward, any nation that continues to harbour or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime.

In all three examples above, Bush reuses will + infinitive to express his intentions that what are coming next are actions, not words. The propositional content of the future event is again to fight, as Bush uses *will starve terrorists of funding.... will not rest.... will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime....* The preparatory condition is that (1) Bush thinks that military/challenging actions will take place and such actions are not in the public interest, (2) Bush thinks it is not obvious to the public that will take place. The sincerity condition is that Bush believes military/challenging actions are not in the public best interest, and the essential condition in this example counts as an undertaking that military/challenging actions are not in the public best interest

4.2.3 Bush's address as president-elect

In the third text when Bush addressed the United States as president-elect for the first time on Wednesday night, he urged the nation to close ranks behind a new Republican administration after a hard-fought election and a five-week recount battle in Florida. In this speech, Bush emphasized the idea that the US has the ability to defeat and overcome his enemy everywhere, reiterating the warning that war and fight may occur in the future.

4. We will have a military equal to every challenge and superior to every adversary. Together we'll have a bipartisan foreign policy true to our values and true to our friends.
5. Americans are asking: How will we fight and win this war? We will direct every resource at our command -- every means of diplomacy, every tool of intelligence, every instrument of law enforcement, every financial influence, and every necessary weapon of war.
6. This is not, however, just America's fight. And what is at stake is not just America's freedom. This is the world's fight. This is civilization's fight. This is the fight of all who believe in progress and pluralism.

In his speech as a president-elect, Bush explicitly uses military words, such as challenge and fight. In all three examples above, Bush expresses his intentions that what is coming next are war and fight actions. The propositional content of the future event is again to fight, as Bush uses *will have a military equal to every challenge... We will direct every necessary weapon of war... This is the fight of all who believe in progress and pluralism*. Again, the preparatory condition, is that (1) Bush thinks that military/challenging actions will take place and such actions are not in the public interest, (2) Bush thinks it is not obvious to the public that will take place. The sincerity condition is that Bush believes military/challenging actions are not in the public best interest, and the essential condition in this example counts as an undertaking that military/challenging actions are not in the public best interest

Bush is utilizing and manipulating warning speech act by using verbs of challenge and fight. By the use of *will*, Bush commits himself to doing something in the future, since the well-known acts used in this category are those of promising, threatening, warning and challenging (See Bach and Hrnish, 1979; Searle, 1979). In discussing this kind of SAs, it is important to indicate that the acts of promising, warning and threatening are the dominant ones and they usually come together in one single utterance to convey two or more different illocutions instead of one illocution (Leech, 1983).

It is important to note that in some examples, Bush's promises are considered 'empty' acts that contain many forms of pragmatic aspects. When he makes a promise, he commits himself to do something for the hearer while threatening and warning are said to do something to the hearer that may not be desirable to him. The boundaries between warning and promise in Bush's political discourses are not obvious but the common point in both of them is future events (Yule, 1997). This was clear in that Bush's speech was rich in the use of contempt and intimidation expressions to shame others and make them submit to his desperate administration. Bush is described as a symbolic war man. The uses of speech acts are frequent and made intentionally by President Bush in his speeches after the events of 11 September. This use is due to match what happened to America on that day which was a disaster to it and changed its policy. Most of the promises made by him after that incident carry a sense of warning or threatening to revenge upon those terrorists wherever they are found. Bush is talented in his use of SAs to assure the Americans and the world that what happened on that day won't be without punishment.

5. Conclusions

The study aimed at uncovering Bush's use of warning speech act and the ideology behind the application to persuade the public to believe in/ follow the US policy, especially following 9/11 attacks. The analyses depart from speech act theory, making abstractions at different conceptual levels to demonstrate that warning is a complex speech act. It is found that Bush's speeches were rich in warning speech acts, using war discourse of challenging and fighting. He flourished his military ideology as a statement of fact and warnings against enemies of the US. War ideology was implied in Bush's speeches so that his audiences would be persuaded to act accordingly. Bush is utilizing and manipulating warning speech acts by using verbs of challenge and fight. By the use of *will*, Bush commits himself to doing something in the future, since the well-known acts used in this category are those of promising, threatening, warning and challenging (See Bach and Hrnish, 1979; Searle, 1979). In discussing this kind of SAs, it is important to indicate that the acts of promising, warning and threatening are the dominant ones and they usually come together in one single utterance to convey two or more different illocutions instead of one illocution (Leech, 1983). The use of warning SA was also characterised in terms of criteria for effectiveness, and instruction on what to do or not to do to avoid harm to the US. The uses of speech acts are frequent and made intentionally by President Bush in his speeches after the events of 11 September. This use is due to match what happened to America on that day which was a disaster to it and changed its policy. Most of the promises made by him after that incident carry a sense of warning or threatening to revenge upon those terrorists wherever they are found. Bush is talented in his use of SAs to assure the Americans and the world that what happened on that day won't be without punishment.

References

- Austin, J. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ahmed, O. (2018). *A pragmatic analysis of advice, prohibition and warning*. Maref University.
- Bach, K. and R. M. Harnish. 1979. *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Birner, B. (2013). *Introduction to Pragmatics*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. Oxford.
- Buck, R and Vanlear C. Arthur. 2002. Verbal and Nonverbal Communication: Distinguishing Symbolic, Spontaneous, and Pseudo-Spontaneous Nonverbal Behavior. *Journal of Communication*. 15, 522-528.

- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Donaghy, K. (1990). *Recognizing advice, warnings, promises and threats*. New York: School of Computer Science and Information Technology.
- Dylgjeri, A. (2017). ANALYSIS OF SPEECH ACTS IN POLITICAL SPEECHES. *European Journal of Social Sciences Studies*. 2, 2: 19-25.
- Fuss, D. & Gleason, W. (2016). *The pocket instructor: Literature: 101 Exercises for the College Classroom*. New Jersey: Princeton.
- Glover, N. (2011). Does security exist outside of the speech act?. *E-International Relations*. Retrieved from <http://www.e-ir.info/2011/10/09/does-security-exist-outside-of-the-speech-act/>.
- Green, Mitchell S. (2010). *Speech acts*. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.
- Hidayat, A. (2016). Speech Acts: Force Behind Words. *English Education: Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris*. 9 (1): 1-12
- Hinkle, E. (1997). *The Appropriateness of Advice, DTC and multi choice data*. London: Routledge.
- Hufford, J & Heasley, G. 1983. *Semantics: A course book*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Mey, J. (1993). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, Ltd.
- Parker, F. and Riley K. (2005). *Linguistics for Non-Linguistics*. Library of Congress Cataloging in Publishing Data, printed in USA.
- Searle, J. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Strawson, P. (2007). *Intention and Convention in Speech Acts*. Cornell, University. Oxford: University Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is political discourse analysis. *Belgian journal of linguistics*, 11(1), 11-52.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is political discourse analysis. *Belgian journal of linguistics*, 11(1), 11-52.
- Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press