

# A Critical Discourse Analysis of Iraqi Political Discourse

**AssitLec. Omar Hmood Ahmed**

Al-Maarif University College, English Department, Iraq

## Abstract

This study deals with analyzing the political discourses of Iraqi politicians from a linguistic aspect. It studies generally the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and it deals with analyzing aspects and functions of discourse analysis. As such, it deals with the study of discourse analysis in general and with the Iraqi political discourse and criticism in particular. It also follows the cooperative principles of H.P. Grice and its four maxims and will determine if the Iraqi politicians are following such maxims or not. This study also attempts to show the power of the action performed by the Iraqi politicians and to what extent their action has been communicated in an explicit and implicit way. Further, it attempts to show the pragmatic function concerning discourse analysis, and it also aims to convey meaning of Iraqi politician utterances in an appropriate and a successful way and to clarify their indirect speech acts on the basis of the pragmatic interpretation.

## 1. Introduction

According to many linguists, Discourse can be defined a behavioral component or a social unit that has a pre-theoretical standing in the study of linguistics. Discourse Analysis (DA) can be considered as a set of sentences which are used to form identifiable recognizable speech event, for example, conversations, jokes, sermons, interviews, political texts...etc. Many of language users (speakers and hearers) consider Discourse as the study of any language from a scientific point of view. That, it is a significant part of linguistics. On this basis, there would be very different aspects, expressions, appearances and features relating to the study of language from an implicit aspect in order to deal with analyzing the forms and the structures of language in a systematic way. As such, Discourse tends to deal with the linguistic ways by which words, phrases and sentences grouped together to form texts that can be explained and analyzed in a pragma-linguistic way (Fairlough, 2003:3; Rodney; 2010:2; Yule, 2010: ).

Further, speakers and hearers are not only dealing with the study of a selected language by differentiating for instance, between grammatical sentences and ungrammatical sentences, but also, they give a main interest to many important aspects of how to communicate in a successful way for the aim of interpreting discourse. That is, the time and the place must be taken into account; there must be a main concern to the context of the utterances, to the speaker and the hearer(s), as well as when the utterances are uttered, by whom, for whom they are addressed and why.

Discourse Analysis (DA) is defined as a branch of linguistics which is concerned with analyzing and investigating written and spoken language or any other communicative events. Discourse analysis (DA) deals with analyzing its data in terms of comprehensive sequence of sentences, utterances, speech or discussions. In addition, discourse analysis (DA) does not only deal with language use, but it analyses natural occurring data revealing the socio-pragmatic

and socio-psychology features of a speaker rather than focusing on a linguistic discourse (text and structure).

Schiffrin et al 2001:1-2 argue that Discourse Analysis (DA) is a speedily expanding approach that overlaps with many linguistic aspects of textual interpretations and analyses. This approach can be taken as one of the important academic fields that is completely different from the others. It is somehow similar to aspects concerning linguistics in general, and other fields in particular, such as philosophy, sociolinguistics, psychology, artificial intelligence and others.

It is worth noting that Discourse Analysis (DA) is the study of sentences beyond language, or the study of language in use. It is the study of the meaning of words, phrases and sentences. We give language and the actions we carry out when speaking a specific language in a specific context. That is, language users must give an interest to the language and the action from one side, and to the time and the place from the other side. Discourse Analysis (DA) also refers to the linguistic and non-linguistic ways that combine sentences together to produce perfect meaning, relevant meaning, coherent meaning and cohesive meaning. However, any single sentence can be analysed literally from one aspect, and consequently such sentence must be grouped together with other sentences in the rest of the full text in order to create a linguistic discourse (Paul et al, 2012:1).

Recently, the study of Discourse Analysis (DA) has been described by Norman Faircough in his book "**Language and Power**" as a new 'cross- discipline' to which many constituted control such as sociology, linguistics, cognitive psychology and anthropology that have contributed among other disciplines (Faircough, 1989:11).

Norman Faircough also suggests that the goal of a certain study relating to Discourse Analysis (DA) is to make a critic examination of the main elements of discourse-logical studies as it has been expanding for about two decades. So the main concern would be on the basic and the systematic approaches. He also adds that it may be a danger and an opportunity in terms of practically losing communication with the "*ground*". (Ibid).

In addition, Discourse Analysis (DA) is centered on the assumption that when people speak to each other, they communicate much more than simply conveying information. It is not a way of understanding literal meanings; but instead it is the exploration of what language does or what people or social communities achieve through language. This field of study poses questions such as how people construct and transfer meaning to others, and how social status and political power can function in a specific society.

Concerning Discourse Analysis (DA) methodology, Discourse Analysis (DA) is neither a qualitative nor quantitative research. It is a way of investigating the essential assumption of qualitative and quantitative research methods. Discourse Analysis (DA) does not give a real solution to a specific problem based on scientific research, but it enables the reader or the listener to arrive at some suitable assumptions that help him/her to, at least understand the intended or the required meaning. Discourse Analysis (DA) also facilitates understanding both motivation for using a specific text or a specific speech and reasons for using particular methods of research for analyzing the text or the speech. Thus, dealing with the everyday expressed discourse whether spoken or written. Discourse Analysis (DA) is a hearer-reader oriented and it is noting that more than critical and deconstructive reading that implies explaining and interpretation of a specific problem implied in a text or in a speech. We can

conclude that Discourse Analysis (DA) will not offer absolute solutions or answers to what the hearer or the addressee inquire about but instead, it can pave the way for us to understand the conditions behind that problem and to make us realize a line of reality by viewing the problem from a different perspective to draw a comprehensive interpretation of the "problem" and other conditions related to that "problem". Discourse Analysis (DA) is meant to show a developed mindfulness of the unknown or concealed motivations in speakers and hearers and therefore, it enables us to solve some concrete problems not by providing unambiguous solutions, but by making us ask ontological and epistemological questions.

## 2. Cooperative Principles

From a linguistic point of view and by giving a main interest to the study of Discourse Analysis (DA), it is said that conversations and talks permit the information to exchange between participants. For the aim of making a successful communication, the speaker must utter by giving important information that must be needed by the hearer. Then he/she must stick on the basic points of the conversation. The way of exchanging information between speaker and hearer is considered to be the major aim of such concern depending on the cooperation between speaker and hearer in making successful communication. The successful communication can be performed by following the term "Turn Taking". This term involves that when the speaker talks, the hearer must listen and they cannot speak at the same time, but they must follow the rules of conversations that must overlap with the four maxims proposed by H.P Grice. Participants must be informative, truthful, relevant and clear. H.P. Grice argues that the cooperative principles is basically concerned with the differentiating between 'saying' and 'meaning', and attempting to answer the fundamental question: How can the hearer recognize the invisible meaning of the speaker? That is, especially when we take into account that the words, phrases and sentences have meaning, but the speakers may intend a completely different meaning. Therefore, as Davies (2000) stresses, that the Cooperative Principles is the basic underlying assumption that speakers must make when they connect with each other by exchanging speech (Ayunon cited in Davies, B.(2000). As such, Cooperative Principles is one of the important linguistic theories proposed by H.P. Grice which appeared in the past, and many linguists are still using it, as it is a theory that can be updated in the modern time. This theory is based on an important principle in daily conversations between individuals and how to exchange speech between the speaker and the hearer, and states that the person must provide what he has as required, no more and no less, and through the main objective of exchanging speech between the speaker and the hearer. Accordingly, '**Cooperative Principle**' which is proposed by Grice (1989) crystallized his cooperative principle in four conversational 'maxims,' which direct people that they should follow and obey to certain extent the conversation etiquettes in order to achieve communication happily and successfully. So people attempt to communicate with each other on the basis of the four maxims. These maxims are summarized as follows:

- **Quantity Maxim:** One should not say less nor more than required.
- **B. Quality Maxim:** One should not say what is believed to be false.
- **C. Manner Maxim:** Avoid being unclear or ambiguous. Don't be vague. Be brief and orderly.
- **D. Relevance Maxim:** Be relevant. (Aithcison,1999:98 and Yule,2006:147).

**Is It Possible To Break These Four Maxims?**

Listeners will normally assume that a speaker is following these criteria. Then, pragmatics is found anywhere, and with its interference with discourse analysis, speakers may break these maxims through specific conversational turns: lying, sarcasm, political texts, debates, quarrelling... etc. But conversation proceeds on the assumption that they do not. It is then possible to deduce implications from what has been said concerning what has not been said though the extent to which this can be done consistently and generally is somewhat controversial

### 2.1. Political Discourse (Analysis): Strategic Functions

Political Discourse Analysis(PDA) is characterized by some strategic functions. These strategic functions include: (a) Strong-arming, e.g. censorship, laws, command, edicts and assumptions that make the hearers accept at least for a short time; (b) Opposition, protest and resistance, these strategies might be represented by making demonstrations and rallies, petitions that clash with and oppose with existing powers; (c) Dissimulation by which politicians tend to conceal realities and try diverting people's attention from difficulties and debatable matters; (d) legitimation and deligitimation where politicians can legislate and deligitimate laws according to their situations and according to what keep them safe, strong and accepted ( Chilton and Schaffner , 1997: 212–213).

Thompson (1990: 60) explains another category of Discourse function which is modes of operations which includes "*unification*". That is a kind of unity embracing people in a collective identity regardless to their social, racial, religious or political orientations. Another form is "*division*" which is represented by fragmenting the individuals whose unity threatens the dominant people or groups. Two more strategic functions added by Chilton(2004:46) are "representation and misrepresentation". These strategic functions can be corresponded to Van Dijk's ideology theory (deemphasize good/ bad things of them/us), as well as the earlier pragmatic theory of politeness in (Brown and Levinson's (1987) model and Leech's (1983).

Then the term refers to how a particular expression is used on a particular occasion. The discourse function of any utterance sentence depends on the type of the utterance context, whether linguistic or nonlinguistic (physical). For example, the sentence "Can you show me the way to the library?" is taken by the hearer as a request, not an interrogative question. Discourse functions include orders, requests, commands, statements advice, warning, questions and many of the other types of speech acts that overlap with discourse analysis. Many aspects of study that pertains to scientific and literary knowledge may fall under what is called 'Discourse Analysis'(DA). The aspect of knowledge that is concerned with Discourse Analysis(DA) is interesting from one hand, and from the other hand, we must take into account that human knowledge takes place through formation and acquisition, and this leads to an understanding of discourse in particular. Thus, the uneasy relations between knowledge and discourse must be examined(van djick,2014:5). By focusing on historical and social things, we note that discourse studies do not pay much attention to some linguistic phenomena, such as some of the approaches to semantics and sentence structures, as well as the sounds. Rather, the focus is on giving great importance to pragmatic ideas and events, as analysts use the linguistic discourse in this important context that was followed by Chomsky. Linguists analyze discourse by taking many of the functions that are related to the study from the pragmatic side(Johannes, et al,2014:2).

### 3. Critical Discourse Analysis

According to many linguists, the best definition of Critical Discourse Analysis(CDA) is a diversified field and an intervener process that can overlap generally with the study of discourse, and particularly can view any language as a specific variety of social application for such selected language. which can linguistically construct discourses and can preserve; and how to validate the social discriminations in such a way that must be far away from injustice and oppression on the basis of using language function in an appropriate way among individuals ([https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Critical\\_discourse\\_analysis](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Critical_discourse_analysis)).

Critical Discourse Analysis ( CDA) can be proposed according to(Wodak&Meyer,2009)as a qualitative systematic method for how to analyze, to explain, to discuss and to interpret in successfully appropriate method which discourses construct, maintain, and legitimize social inequalities. (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997:261).

According to Machin and Mayr,2012:2 "*The word 'critical has been central to CDA*". In a very similar way, the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) tends to leave the idea that is concerned with the descriptive study of language regarding the Discourse Analysis, and the main concern would be on the describing and analyzing the features of linguistics not on how and why such features are produced and by whom (Machin and Mayr,2012:5).

We can infer that Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) can be considered as a modern kind of discourse analysis methods. That is, a new branch that many researchers and scholars give a great interest in recent years. One of the most advantageous study in Critical Discourse Analysis(CDA) is that there is a main concern on why a certain language depicts to be such a state, not only on what that language is. In the other words, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) attempts to identify the concept of discourse and how such kind of concept is created by discourse. The central orientation of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) comes back to the Frankfurt school of philosophy. The word "critical" refers to self-reflexive. Self-reflexive as well as ideology, power and control are the main outlining characteristics of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). However, power among others is the prominent factor that shapes and influences the linguistic structure.(Fowler and Kress,1979).

By regarding the social cognition on such basis, the discourse areas managements illustrate one important and crucial social attribute of the expression: fake authority, that is, who is allowed to represent. We have emphasized that the basic cognitive attribute comes from what is named "The Modern Power). Furthermore, and for instance ( according to Wyer and Srull, 1984 cited in Farr and Moscovici),except in the multiples, different or the several varieties of judicial, police, military, or male force, the exercise of such authority can usually make a presupposition of how to manage or to control understanding in a way of involving the knowledge effect procedures, thinking , theories, beliefs, philosophy, principles, criterion and usefulness. Ultimately, the mode control of access is prepared towards this access to the general understanding which we conceive in connection with social cognition.

As such, socially shared representations of societal arrangements, groups and relations, as well as mental operations such as interpretation, thinking and arguing, inference and learning, among others, together define what we understand by social cognition (Farr and Moscovici, 1984; Fiske andTaylor,1991;).

Communications concerning society, discourse and the varieties of activities, actions, reactions and interactions are said to be discovered and noticed by social cognition (Van Dijk, 1989a).

According to Resnick et al., (1991), it can be considered that the same is not false, for our knowledge of happenings, organizations, practices, cultural and authorities and relations relating to the society. As such, social cognitions treat or negotiate between the group and individuals, between actions and discourses; and between the two levels of society (macro and micro) and so on. Social cognitions are social ones although incorporated in the individual minds because they are shared, divided and also presupposed by members of social statuses, monitor actions, reactions and interactions affected by the society, and because they identify the varieties relating to the cultural and to the social arrangement, planning and organization of the whole society (Van Dijk, 1989, Resnick et al., 1991).

For our hypothetical aims, then social cognitions would allow us to connect or to reach an authority and discourse. Then, they can explain the producing with the understanding and the knowledge influence of dominant discourse whether written and spoken. The complicated cognitive theories rely on such operations cannot be clarified in details. Indeed, many of their components are as yet obscure. We do not know much about how texts are produced and understood, and how their information are searched, memorized, stored or activated (Van Dijk and Kintsch, 1983).

We know that understanding plays a distinguished part in these procedures, e.g. in terms of understanding construction such as scripts and schema (Schank and Abelson, 19).

By considering the language form, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) has an important aim which is revealing the belief of effectiveness on discourse, the opposite effectiveness of discourse on the belief and how the two elements derive from and serve for social structure and authority links. It attempts to release the relation between language, belief and authority. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) depends basically on what is named "*Systematic Functional Linguistics*" (SFL) which is derived by M.A.K Halliday in his contribution concerning the functions of languages as its basic hypothetical institution. Besides, it also realizes the study accomplishments of many other aspects such as sociology, psychology, ethnology, mass media, philosophy... etc. and to unite them with the study of linguistics which brings the care of scholars to look forward another approaches of linguistic study.

It has been confirmed by many linguists that the study of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) has begun in the late 1970s, and it was developed later on in the middle of such Century. So far, both in China and abroad, great accomplishments concerning Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) has been made (Ke Liu & Fang Guo, 2016: 1076).

Depending on the basis of the more hypothetical theme from many the widespread knowledge generally in linguistics, sociolinguistics in particular, must be taken into account. So linguists whose specialists are sociolinguistics that deal with social context and language have emphasized on language and power, but they have broken the appropriateness and successful communication from a social point of view, and there may be a violation of linguistic-social communication. For example, many studies of 'standard' and 'nonstandard', social dialects, and of "formal" and "informal" ones, and of how the quantity of one's social status which can assign to such dialects may depend on the power of people who talk them. There have also

been studies of the ways in which power is exercised in conversation and other forms of talk between people, though perhaps surprisingly few (Norman Fairclough, 1982:2).

From a theoretical point of the view regarding Discourse Analysis (DA) study, the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) concept overlaps with 'theories of language'; and as 'interdisciplinary' aspect, it can be used to refer to the conceptual and corrective or rigid structure disorders of discourse systematic studies. Discourse Analysis (DA) gives an interest the theories establishment procedures and it has emphasized on the interdisciplinary essence of its study since its beginning (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997; van Dijk, 1997; Wodak, 2001b). So It seems very suitable to give an interest to these two sides through checking the basic essentials and trying to analyze the rank or status quo concerned with society that can affect the process of analyzing the texts and so on. Making explicit relations between knowledge and discourse can be considered as one of the basic challenges that faces Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Both knowledge and discourse are not simple phenomena used effectively in all humanities aspects and approaches as well as science relating to society. As such, it is supposed to imagine that any theory of the two relationships has linguistic, philosophical, socio-logical, psychological and anthropological dimensions. Philosophical research places its primary focus and expanded interest on the so-called epistemology. It focuses on the basic issues of the nature of knowledge which can traditionally be defined as "justified small beliefs" that pertain to groups of activities in the so-called epistemology and where this is discussed the content is also criticized. (Wodak, 2001b).

Ordinarily, modern linguistics abandoned knowledge! Knowledge is rarely shown in the so-called epistemological bases as a feature of great importance (Deborah T, 10003 cited in Langacker, 1983; Fauconnier, 1985).

Where the late Paul Wetherell made contributions concerning linguistic discourse and also made many proposals of great importance concerning knowledge and its role in discourse (Wetherell, 1999).

Norman Fairclough argues that from the one hand, knowledge appears in particular as knowledge of implicit discourse (grammar) through what can be called generative grammar theory shared by members of the linguistic community, which gives discourse analysis a good importance. Commonly informed approaches explore the relationship between knowledge and meaning and, on the other hand, mask the traditional distinction between thought and its accompanying language. In modern metaphor theory, it is assumed that virtually all meanings are organized by underlying metaphorical concepts and processes, whose 'embodied' nature also shapes the ways we know the world (Tanen et al, 2001 cited in Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, 1999).

From the side of sociolinguistics, social relations are often uneven. This can be neither simple nor easy, but very difficult or very complex, and these relations are "multi-layered" and if this social aspect is linked to the discourse, the discourse may effect on the process of analyzing that discourse. Also it can be essentially seen as a complex set of relationships with which people communicate. They communicate through speech, writing, and many means of communication which fall under the framework of language, through which conversations are analyzed between them, regardless to the language used, whether spoken or written, or any other means. But there are also other important relationships between uneasy things and discourses, including things that exist in our daily lives and groups of people with different

strengths and relationships, as well as practical institutions. All of these elements are related to social activities in our daily life. The essential point associated with all these things is that it is difficult to answer the question: What is discourse? Unless we take into account its internal and external relations with all other things. It can be said that discourse is not just an entity that can be understood independently of other aspects of life. It can be known, understood and valued by knowing, interpreting and analyzing many relationships of all kinds. Norman Fairclough adds that it is possible to say what is discourse in particular, as it overlaps in social relations that are somewhat complex, and it has an impact on meaning and how meaning is made (Norman Fairclough, 1995:2).

Therefore, it must be taken into account that Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is done in a very deep and accurate way which tends to dismantle the indirect and implicit linguistic devices, as well as explicit speech. It must be transferred to the theories of pragmatic studies in order to clarify, discover, interpret and analyze the discourse in a fundamental, systematic and objective manner as well. (Wodak, 2007:204).

#### **4. The problem of the study**

The present study deals generally with the Critical Discourse (CDA) and with analyzing aspects and functions of discourse analysis, and particularly with the investigation about the Iraqi political discourse. The paper tends to establish the strategies used by Iraqi politicians (IPs) to convey their meaning in a successful way and clarifying their indirect speech acts depending on pragmatic interpretation in terms of Grice's Cooperative Principle (CP) maxims as well as revealing the features of Iraqi political discourse. It shows the strategic functions that widely give a critical study concerning the Iraqi texts, and to identify how the Iraqi political texts is performed appropriately or not, and to follow the linguistic factors of interpreting the political discourse such as speech acts, performative utterances and other pragma-linguistic aspects that rely on the study of discourse analysis. Also, in the study of discourse analysis (DA), the nonlinguistic factors such as the situational context, the time and place, the speaker and hearer(s) must be taken into consideration when dealing with analyzing discourse in general, and to give a suitable criticism to the selected study.

However, the current study is carried out to deal with the following problems:

1. Whether the functions of Discourse Analysis (DA) can be applied to the political texts especially the Iraqi ones.
2. Giving a critical study only from a linguistic point of view to the selected Iraqi Political Texts by following the aspects of discourse analysis in general, and by following their strategic functions in particular.
3. To what extent the Cooperative principles (CP) proposed by H.P Grice can be applied to the Iraqi discourse analysis.
4. Whether it is possible to break the cooperative principles maxims (quantity maxims, quality maxims, relevance maxim and manner maxim).
5. The Aim of the Study

#### **6. Hypothesis of the Study**

This paper analyzes Iraqi political discourse depending on the following hypotheses:



1. This study follows the so-called Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) which is concerned with the study of Iraqi political discourses in a period of time by dealing with it from a linguistic point of view.
2. Iraqi politicians (IPs) follow different pragmatic approaches relating to the study of discourse analysis (DA) and Iraqi politicians (IPs) are considered to be indirect oriented speakers and to certain extent persuasive and influential at the same time in their discourse.
3. The speaker's implied meaning can be explained depending on assuming that the addressee takes into his/her consideration the discourse referents that were the speaker's utterances presented.
4. The paper focuses on the political implicature which are specifically based on political context. The implicature inferred from the Iraqi Politicians (IPs) speeches are defined within the political situation (context) in Iraq in particular and the Middle East in general.

### **7. The Limit of the study**

1. The study is limited to analyze ten written texts of Iraqi Politicians.
2. This study is limited to analyzing the Iraqi discourse in general and then criticizing it by relying on the aspects of the critical analytical discourse, by selecting texts and dealing with them in a purely linguistic manner from one hand, and from another hand, we must take other elements that affect discourse analysis such as context, time, place, speaker and listener...etc
3. The limitation of this study is carried out on the discourse analysis overlapping with the pragmatic speech act proposed by the Iraqi politicians, and to show whether the speech act is directly or indirectly performed on the bases of Cooperative Principle (CP) of H.P. Grice.
4. The adopted model of this study will be that of Grice's Maxims, and to identify whether they are successfully performed or whether there is a break for such maxims.

### **8. The Value of the Study**

1. The study is hoped to be of the theoretical significance. Theatrically speaking, it can contribute to theoretical pragmatics on the basis of the discourse analysis functions as it would shed light on the universal principles of the political text.
2. As far as the comprehension of the political discourse analysis, it is hoped that this study will provide a contribution to research in discourse aspect regarding language universal.
3. This study can contribute to providing a critical analytical discourse for many other political texts in a certain period of time in the coming days.

### **9. Procedures and Data Analysis**

The data upon which the analysis are based will be collected from Iraqi politicians in their interviews. The selected texts will be analyzed according to their contexts by taking the appropriate situation into account. Political interview as an event type has its own unique, special and exclusive features, of which one is the stereotype of politicians' ambiguity and indirectness. However, and it should be put in mind that the politicians and through some of the media do not have any direct contact and may not know who exactly the audience is listening to in a private speech event. Therefore, it is possible for the receiving audience to rely on situational cues that may help them to indicate the speech that is not being directed explicitly, but rather in an indirect or an implicit way. The selected data will show a brief

indication of how Iraqi Politicians (IPs) engaged in political discourse and to what extent they manage it in an appropriate and a successful way. The data will be analyzed in terms of critical discourse approach aiming to reveal the functional strategies and linguistic characteristics of the Iraqi political discourse and to identify how the Grice's Cooperative Principles Maxims correspond with the selected data.

### **The Selected Texts:**

#### **1. In Iraq, there is only one city that has the right to issue political decisions.**

**Discussion:** The speaker is performing the act of threatening indirectly. By following the H.P. Grice's maxims of cooperative principles, here is a violation in a way that the speaker is not identifying the city. So he is not following the quantity maxim and the quality maxim. Also, the speaker is irrelevant, there is an ambiguity and there is a lack of the clearness. So, he is not following the relevance maxim and the manner one. By taking the critical discourse analysis into consideration, it seems that the speaker neglects the role of others in this case.

#### **2. The failure of service projects is caused by Iraqi politicians.**

**Discussion:** The speaker is performing a direct speech act by giving a clear, direct justification for a problem. He is following the four maxims of H.P. Grice. He is *identifying a true* by saying no more no less, he is a clear, a relevant and not an ambiguous. So there is no a break for such four maxims. The speaker is proposing a reason of a problem in an explicit way.

#### **3. Al-Kadhimi was the best choice for all political forces.**

**Discussion:** Depending on our days communications in Iraq, there was a struggle over who would take over the presidency. The speaker here is saying a clear declaration that is, he is directly performing the speech act of suggestion and his declaration carries a strong illocutionary force. Then he is following the four maxims of H.P. Grice. There is no violation for the quality and quantity maxim. That is, he is saying as required, no more no less. Then he is a clear, no ambiguous and his statement is a relevant one. So he is following the relevance and the manner maxim.

#### **4. We have directed the security services to release all detainees who participated in the demonstrations.**

**Discussion:** This declaration can be analyzed by overlapping discourse analysis with pragmatics. The speaker is performing the speech act of directives in a way of commanding that a certain action must be performed which is "releasing all detainees". Linguistically, a clear declaration is performed by the speaker. As such, he is not breaking the four Grice's maxims. Quality maxim, quantity maxim, relevance maxim and manner maxim are performed correctly.

#### **5. Dear brothers, I ask you to be careful about what information or rumors you receive regarding the Council of Ministers.**

**Discussion:** This declaration can be analyzed literally in a way that the speaker is starting his speech by uttering the friendly phrase "dear brother". Then by following strategic functions of discourse analysis, it can be noticed that he is performing a request and an advice through using the verb "ask". Here is a strong following for the four maxim of H.P. Grice. That is, the speaker is saying an explicit declaration that carries a request and an advice. He is not breaking the maxims. He is uttering a direct directive, he is relevant, so clear and not an ambiguous.

**6. We are all corrupt.**

**Discussion:** Here is a dangerous admission by the speaker as he describes himself and other Iraqi politicians as corrupt! This declaration can be easily interpreted by taking the four maxims of H.P. Grice into account. The speaker is following such maxims and there no violation.

**7. This decision is a dangerous and it affects the sovereignty and the security of Iraq and could divide Iraq into four states.**

**Discussion:** By overlapping pragmatics with discourse analysis, the speaker here warns directly and strongly through this statement that such a decision could lead to very serious consequences in the near future. The decision contained political differences, and the speaker directly asks politicians to unify their decisions. Such decision contained political differences, and he directly asks politicians to unify their decisions. The action is explicitly performed. Then the speaker utters such statement by taking the cooperative principle into account. He is following the four maxims and there is no violation.

**8. The roots are now more separated from their branches. Baghdad government has no choice but either it faces these challenges, or it accepts a new Iraq and a militarized society.**

**Discussion:** The speaker indirectly explains the situation that has become in Iraq through this phrase which carries an expression that contains the difference and distinction between the parts of united country that could disintegrate. He adds that the government must either solve this problem or the situation will be very miserable in the future. Pragmatically, such two sentences can be interpreted. That is the first sentence is a metaphorical one which has a strong illocutionary force, and the second one explains the meaning at all. So they are relevant to each other. It can be inferred that the speaker is so clear, relevant and not ambiguous as well as he is not violating the quality and quantity maxim. He is following the four maxims of H.P. Grice.

**9. The visit of "Sheikh of Al-Azhar" to Iraq will carry a great importance.**

**Discussion:** By taking the discourse analysis into account and from a linguistic point of view, that declarative utterance carries an implicit aspect. It is an indirect utterance carries a pragmatic function. Here is an Iraqi politician making a statement bearing religious dimensions. Further that indicates the importance of this visit through the unification of the religious rank in Iraq, which consists of several religious sects. This issue has great political dimensions as well, so the unification of the religious rank can lead to the unification of the political rank, and that shows the implicit importance. It is By following the four maxims of H.P. Grice, we can notice that the speaker is not identifying the importance particularly. So his utterance is less than is required, but at the same time it seems that such declaration is clear, not ambiguous. He is breaking the quality and quantity maxims, but he is following the relevance and the manner maxims.

**10. I demand the establishment of a citizenship state in Iraq.**

**Discussion:** This declaration can be interpreted in an explicit and in a direct way. The speaker requests that Iraq must be a civil state and adds that it is not possible to establish a state under any specific religious slogan, because Iraq is a multi-sectarian and multi-religious country with many nationalities and carries intellectual and cultural diversity and many different matters among its people. So depending on discourse analysis and pragmatic function, it can be inferred

that such short declaration carries relevant aims. The speaker is covering the four maxims of H.P. Grice. There is no violation for such maxims.

It can be concluded that most of the Iraqi politicians are addressing their declarations in a direct and in an explicit way. By taking the discourse analysis into account, we notice that in most of the selected sentences, there is a following for the Grice's maxims of the cooperative principles.

## 10. References

- Aitchison, J.(1999). **Teach Yourself Linguistics**. British Library Cataloging Publishing data
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S.(1987). **Politeness: Some Universal inLanguage Usage**. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Chilton, A.(2004). **Analyzing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice**. London: Routledge.
- Chilton, P. and Schaffner, C.(1997).**Discourse and Politics. Discourse As A Social**

## References

1. ChirbetAyunon. TESOL International Journal 82. Cagayan State University, Philippines.
2. Chomsky, Noam (2004). Language and Politics. Cambridge: Polity Press. ISBN 0-7456-1888-X.
3. David Machin and Andrea Mayr.(2012).How to Do Critical Discourse Analysis. British Library Cataloging in Publishing Data. Ltd.
4. Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen, and Heidi E. Hamilton.(2001). The Handbook of Discourse Analysis. USA Blackwell Publishers Ltd 108 Cowley Road Oxford.
5. Fairclough, N and Wodak, R (1997).Critical Discourse Analysis. The Critical Study of Language. London/ New York: Routledge.
6. Fairclough, N (2003). Analyzing discourse. Library of congress cataloguing in publishing data
7. -Fowler, R and Kress, G. (1979). Rules and Regulations. London.: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
8. James Paul Gee and Michael.(2012). Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Routledge. Handford individual press.
9. Johannes Angermuller .(2014).The Discourse Studies., John Benjamins University, Publishing Company Amsterdam/Philadelphia
10. ke Liu& fang Guo, (2016).A Review on Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Practicain Language Studies, Vol. 6, No.Schoolof Foreign Languages,Beijing, China.
11. Leech, G.(1983). Principles of Pragmatics. London: Longman Group, Ltd.
12. Norman Faircough.(1989). Language and Power. Longman group UK limited. New York
13. Orwell, George (2006). Politics and the English Language. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
14. Rodney H. HONES.(2010) Discourse Analysis. Routledge. Handbook. By earns wend Land.
15. Ruth Wodak.(2014). The discourse studies reader. John Benjamin Publishing Company. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
16. Ruth Wodak, Titscher, S, and Vetter E.(2000). Methods of Texts and Discourse Analysis. British Library cataloging in Publishing Data.
17. Schiffrin, Tanen and H.E. Hamilton. (2001). The Handbook of discourse Analysis. Research Gate 2008.
18. Thompson, J.(1990).Ideology and Modern Culture. Cambridge: Polity Press.
19. Van Dijk. Teun A (1977). Text and Context: Exploration in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse. London, Longman Group Ltd.

20. Van Dijk. Teun A. (1993)Critical discourse analysis: The handbook of Discourse analysis. Library of congress cataloging – in- publishing data.
21. Van Dijk. Teun A. (2009). Society and Discourse. Cambridge. Cambridge University press.
22. Van Dijk. Teun A (2014). Discourse and Knowledge: A Socio-cognitive Approach. Cambridge. Cambridge University of Cambridge.
23. Yule, George (2006).The Study of Language. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
24. Yule, George (2010) 4<sup>th</sup> edition. The Study of Language. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.