

---

## **Critical discourse analysis speech of Hillary Clinton through the American Election**

**Dr. K. Umaraj**

Department linguistics, Madurai Kamaraj University,

Madurai, Tamil Nadu, India

E-mail: [umarajk@gmail.com](mailto:umarajk@gmail.com)

**Ali Mohammed Hasan**

Department linguistics, Madurai Kamaraj University,

Madurai, Tamil Nadu, India

E-mail: [hasanzick@gmail.com](mailto:hasanzick@gmail.com)

**DOI: 10.53032/TCL.2021.5.6.01**

### **Abstract**

This paper sheds light on the American election from the side of one candidate its name Hillary Clinton she was candidate for American election in 2016. We chose this candidate because it is a female and also the mind of this candidate will be different from her opponent. Also Clinton is considered as the most effective woman in the American politics. In this paper we will talk about critical discourse analysis and what is meant by critical discourse analysis and how it works and analyses the politician's discourse. The model used in this paper is Van Dijk's model of critical discourse analysis. Discourse analysis is the main point of this paper and we will focus on how critical discourse analysis works in politics. The objectives of this paper- (1) what are the ideologies which are used in this discourse; (2) Clinton used her power in a perfect way; (3) Hers is the female speech different from male speech. The result shows that any new admiration first thing do they are want to run the race for the presidency should be under estimate the previous leader so Clinton start expressing her negative rejection to the previous government for some points. The result shows that she shows herself as a great leader and the successful one. She talks about Iran and the fears for attacking Israel and also fears from Hezbollah for striking Israel. Clinton's speech is not completely different from male speech because they used same the ideology, lexical words and exaggeration.

**Keywords:** Discourse, Politics, Ethics, Strategy, Security, Governance

### **1. Introduction**

Critical discourse analysis is new field which deals with analyzing the political speech and discover the hidden meaning of them and it also does analysis of the texts and its features through the different discourses; the context in which the text is produced. It is concerned with the dynamics of language usage in a given community. This dynamism is read through

social forms of society such as inequality, dominance, social power abuse, marriage, insecurity, marginalization and politics related actions. It equally looks at how these forms are enacted, legitimized, reproduced, and resisted by text and talks in the social and political context (Van Dijk, 1993).

According to Fairclough and Wodak (1997), CDA does ideological work where it constitutes society and culture with the nature of being interpretative and explanatory. Therefore in this case, the social language management which can be classified under micro and macro level; discourse verbal interaction belongs to micro level of social order while power, dominance and inequality between social groups belong to macro level of analysis. In relation to this matter and one of the reasons it has been chosen as the important aspect in this study because its nature that is primarily interested and motivated by pressing issues. It can also be considered as an attempt to better understand any text through discourse analysis. In short, CDA is a field of study that has diverse ways of creating or reproducing meaning from language use, that is using language consciously or unconsciously to express the original minds. These layers of meaning can be explored critically, in details and interestingly when it concerns on important aspects that control human's life in the concept of power and ideology. News has become an important source of information for everyone in this world which revolves on the current state, situation and condition of every aspect which occurs daily, already happened and will happen. People will look and read this source of information every day and it becomes daily habit for almost everyone. To make it more efficient in terms of the selection of news, headline is the first thing that they will be considered before you head for more feeds. In line with the development of internet and technology, everyone at some point is exposed to and preferred to read daily news headlines in the online news portals, especially now that the use of internet have rapidly grown. Almost all existed traditional newspapers all around the countries have owned an online news portals and platforms in order to meet the demands of technological growth and people. In the world of media, headlines are as important part of the news as titles are of any books or essays. They are often considered as the most important element on pages as they give readers an overall picture of the news and through them, readers may determine whether to read the entire article. It can be seen how the words used in the headlines present the article's content, attract the attention of the readers and create interest in the story, and, at the same time, show the hidden meanings behind the words and phrases used by writers. All the captions in the headlines are attractively designed news summary, intended to induce or, attract the attention of the readers into must wanting to read the articles in the, newspapers. Newspaper headlines are purposely shaped to speak the mind of, the presenter or the publisher. The shape and the structure of the headlines reflect the content, which is politically oriented and ideologically driven.

## **2. Previous Studies**

Taifoor, A. (2010) the title of this study “a critical discourse analysis of Hillary Clinton, Angela Merkel and Julia Gillard’s speeches on immigration”. “Critical Discourse Analysis” (CDA) is the suitable methods of studying the “ideological discourses” for finding the eclectic characteristic. (CDA) could be used to deal with the dialectical ideology also finds the link “discourse”. The main basis of the “social group”. “Ideologies” could be served the benefit of group members and also could protect them. So the most important and useful one in “social practice” can be gained is the “discourse”. The present study aims to gain the most essential goals to clarify what kind of ideology in the speeches of Hillary Clinton, Angela Merkel, and Julia Gillard about the immigration can be found. Further, it enquires to show up the ideological strategies which are present these speeches. It exposes the repetition of the ideological strategies in these speeches by finding out why certain ideological strategies are used frequently more or less than the others, and illustrating the impact of ideologies on mental models, hence, discourse structures.

Al-Kaabi, S. (2018) the title of this study “A Contrastive Critical Discourse Analysis of the American Constitution and Imam Ali’s (p.b.u.h.) Epistle to Malik Al-Ashter”. The above study tries to examine and also aptly do “critical discourse analysis” by analysing two texts: one belongs to the American Constitution and another one belongs to Imam Ali’s (p.b.u.h.) Epistle to Malik Al-Ashter. This study tries to do analysis and answering questions: (1) how the AC and IAE can be constructed linguistically?; (2) Which of these texts can depend on?; (3) How ideologies can be expressed in AC and IAE by depending on linguistic and intertextual analyses. In this study the author focuss on the “ideologies” and the role that are built in the AC and IAE.

Al-Jiburi, N. (2017) the title of this study “A Contrastive Critical Discourse Analysis of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Risalat Al-Huquq of Imam Ali Al-Sajjad (p.b.u.h.)”. This study deals with two types of the linguistic field with the theory of “critical discourse analysis” by analysing two important topics that both of them deal with the Human rights. The first topic is that Universal Declaration of Human Rights, this one will be mentioned as (UDHR) and the second one will be Risalat Al-Huquq “Treatise on Rights” of Imam Ali Al-Sajjad, this one will be mentioned as (RH). This study tries to find the aim of exploring the “linguistics structure” of both UDHR and RH by examining the “interpretative procedures”, and also explain the use of “ideologies”. The most important thing that each study or exam can be mysterious but when we make it clear, we can use is “ideology”. As studies find that the ideology can create a limit to show that study or that thing is forbidden or restricted, here the ideology is a tool to rate a wall to make people following certain idea or believe.

### 3. The Objective

- (1) What ideologies are used in this discourse?
- (2) Clinton used her power in a perfect way.
- (3) Is the female speech different from male speech?

## 4. The Model

Van Dijk's (2006) model, *Politics, Ideology, and Discourse*, is adopted in this study because it fits the data analyzed in this article. The structures of the political discourse should be studied and analyzed through studying the relations that occur between the discourse and political ideologies such as the use of biased lexical items and syntactic structures like the use of passive and active constructions or the use of the pronouns *us* and *them* and many other strategies. As the discourses make ideologies more noticeable whether they are expressed and formulated explicitly or implicitly, so political ideologies are not only comprised in understanding and producing the political discourses and other political practices, but they are also reproduced by them (Van Dijk, 2006b:732).

The ideological analysis of political discourse involves the overall strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation introduced by Van Dijk which is very typical to be applied to the selected speeches used by the two candidates during their election campaigns to attract the people and convince them to win. In other words, each group always tries to present themselves in positive terms and the other group in negative terms (Van Dijk, 1995b:22). Van Dijk presents these two macro-strategies of what might be called "the ideological square".

## 5. Data Analysis

This speech was presenting in DC on March 21<sup>st</sup> 2016. This speech considers the most lovely speech by her, and she used her ideologies and strategies to manipulate people for electing her. This speech was introduced in front of different levels of people who are loved and encourage the relation between Israel and USA. She starts using some simple positive and direct words and active sentence "*friends*" for showing her side and her love to the people in front of her and calling them as her family and because of them she will win. She start using her first strategy using hyperboles "*the biggest*", "*so many*", "*thousands*", and "*hundreds*". She begins with a simple strategy to well the people she is happy to make an allies between the USA and Israel because of the future of the USA with Israel is bright and the USA needs this kind of relationship. She used the pronoun "*you*" to show that people who are in front of her with different levels are the same and all of them united in this land (USA) also the pronoun (I) to show how her power and strength. Clinton used some positive words to show that she is a friend of Israel by mentioning some examples to show that her relation with Israel like "*friends*" and "*great*". She used some words to show how she is a powerful and strong woman ever like "*As a Senator*" and "*Secretary of State*". Also some adjectives are used to give an emphasis on the positive and self-representation like "*strengthen*", "*deepen*", "*unwavering*", "*unshakable*", "*secure*", and "*democratic*". She starts presenting herself as the only one leader who can take the lead of the USA and protect the American's life by using the words like "*we*" and "*our*". Clinton also discloses the negative points of her opponent as "*foolhardy*" and "*oppressor*" to show how they are bad and negative by using some words "*dictators*", "*cede*", and "*no longer has national interests*". She creates a negative image of

her opponent. She uses a strategy to show herself as powerful and more positive and effective by using words like “*intense security*”, “*diplomatic cooperation*”, “*closer*”, “*stronger*”, and “*determined*”. Clinton sheds lights on the Palestinians case and the dangerous of the terrorists and she asks Israel to face this danger and portrait the Palestinians as a barbaric and monsters. She further speaks that they cannot be stopped only by force, so used one strategy called generalisation by showing the Palestinians case and the people in a negative way to convince the audience as really they are bad. She uses an example that illustrate the brutality and cruelty of terrorists so she used some words like “*brutal*”, “*stabbing*”, “*shooting*”, “*murdered*”, and “*violence*”. These words are really negative so she compares these words with the Palestinians people who are really fighting for their lives. Clinton focuses on the Palestinians case and Israel and the historic entente with USA and Israel to face the danger presented by HAMAS (Palestinians movement to fight the Israel Occupation ) because it will affect people and portrait Palestinians as danger. Again she mentions some lexical words like “*momentous*” to show for the people that if they elect her she will face those (HAMAS) and fight them will Israel, its creates a kind of negative image for all Palestinian people. Clinton all the time show herself in a positive way and portrait herself as a powerful leader and all this will happen if they elect her and also shed light on the audience because they are the key for everything, also the USA will be safe and secure if they are in harmony with Israel alliance using some words like “*peaceful*”, “*stable*”, and “*secure*”. She focuses deeply on the USA-Israel alliance because all the American people need this alliance if they elect her she will do this historic Alliance and promise the people to do this alliance ,so we can find that her promises to people by saying that American need this alliance to secure her country. She focuses on the promise that gives it to the people about the alliance with Israel because this alliance will improve both two countries economically and this ideology will draw a positive image in the mind's people. She portrays herself as the hope and the future of this alliance between USA and if she is elected by the audience. She always used the pronoun “I” to show herself as a powerful leader and to show the dominance, also the used of pronoun “we”, “our” to show how she believes in unity and collaboration with the American people. Clinton manipulates people’s mind by showing herself as the suitable and power leader for the USA and this universal alliance between America and Israel. Clinton insists on positive image to emphasize on the positive self-representation and also insists on using the pronoun “I”. This ideology draws a positive image in the mind of the audience. She is telling the audience in indirect message that they must reject the opponent who will destroy the country; this great nation and further invokes people to choose her because only she is the suitable leader. Clinton used a negative words like “*embolden*”, “*not engage*” and “*not defeat the adversaries*” to show that her opponent is so weak and so silly to lead this great nation all these words draw a negative image for any kind of opponent either male or female. Clinton shifts to the next point which is terrorism and the danger will do it for the Americans’ lives, so she mentions some examples for this universal truth about terrorism. This example is very necessary for her because it draws an image for her as the leader who will destroy all terrorists

in world and will be the Universal savior for the America. She uses a metaphor “*when rockets rain down on residential neighbourhoods*”. She describes them as the rockets of the terrorist who destroyed the lives of America. Clinton uses a rhetorical device to make her sentences more emphasis and more effective to show herself as positive-self representation and tells the people to reject her opponent Trump who is not enough good to be the next president of America. She opens new topic and new threat represented by Iran and the nuclear program and showing Iran as the real threat for Israel. So she used some negative words to tell the people and warn them; “*existential danger*”, “*nuclear weapon*”, “*an extremist regime*”, “*annihilate Israel*”, and “*enriched uranium*”. These words are completely negative to show how Iran is a great lurking danger. This metaphor is more dangerous than Iran itself “*thousands of centrifuges have stopped spinning*”. Its means that Iran is like a machine that is responsible for separating the countries and will make them weak and poor but with the help of Clinton every kind of conspiracy will be stopped. Clinton exaggerates the number of centrifuges which is responsible for making the nuclear weapon which had been increased by Iran based scientists. This picture is very negative and bad. She talks about Hezbollah fighters who are fighting for their lives and independence. She portrays her opponents as only a boaster who keeps on talking without any action; without doing anything. This creates a bad image of Trump. She assures that she is the only true leader who will do everything for her people. This negative representation draws for her positive image for the representation of the country. She starts and promises all the people of America will be defended from any kind of external threat posed by Iran and the nuclear program. She speaks as most of the politicians do to get the votes and support of the people. In her speech we can see positive words to reflect for the audience like “*firmly*”, “*quickly*”, “*act*”, and “*force*” to prove herself as determined and well wisher of the country. She used another metaphor “*Israel should be wiped from the pages of history*”. She spoke that Iran tries to delete or erase Israel from history this metaphor is very danger because she wants to say that Iran is very dangerous and we as Americans we should be ready to face any danger. She used an exaggeration by using a hyperbole like “*the tens of thousands of American troops*”. She wanted to say that Iran would strike the American soldiers; this means that she portraits for the audience as Iran in a negative presentation

## 6. Result

- The result shows that any new admiration first tries to present the other ones as under estimated. So does Clinton. She condemns the previous leaders as good for nothing by posing their negative aspects and points.
- She shows herself as a great leader and the successful one.
- She talks about Iran and the fears for attacking Israel and also fears from Hezbollah for striking Israel.
- Clinton’s speech is not completely different from male speech because they used same ideology ,lexical words and same exaggeration they used

## 7. References

- Al-Kaabi, S. *A Contrastive Critical Discourse Analysis of the American Constitution and Imam Ali's (p.b.u.h.) Epistle to Malik Al-Ashter*. Babylon University, 2018.
- Brandenstein, D. E. *Sensational and Political Headlines: an exploration of front page headlines* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Departments of Arts and Letters, San Diego State University, San Diego, California, 1911.
- Dor, D. "On newspaper headlines as relevance optimizers." *Journal of Pragmatics*, 2003. 35: 695-721.
- Fiske J. *Media Matters: Everyday Culture and Political Change*. University of Minnesota Press, 1994.
- Fowler, R. & Hodge, B. *Critical linguistics. In Language and Control*. (Eds, Fowler, R. et al.) Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1991. pp. 185-213.
- Mohammadi, M. "A Critical Discourse Analysis of Donald Trump's Language Use in US Presidential Campaign, 2016." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, Australia, 2017.
- Van Dijk, T. *The Semantics and Pragmatics of Functional Coherence in Discourse*. Milano, 1980.
- Wodak, R. (1987). "and where is the lebanon? "a socio-psycholinguistic investigation of comprehension and intelligibility of news". *Text*, 7.4: 377-410.
- Taifoor, A. *A Critical Discourse Analysis of Hillary Clinton, Angela Merkel and Julia Gillard's Speeches on Immigration*, Al-Qadisiyah University, 2010.