



**WAR, POWER, AND IDEOLOGY: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF
DONALD TRUMP'S RHETORIC ON IRAN**

Fariha Anjum

University of management and technology

Farih.anjum@umt.edu.pk

Sumaira Saleem (corresponding author)

Lecturer in English, COMSATS University Islamabad, Lahore Campus

Sumairasaleem@cuilahore.edu.pk

Samia jameel

Mphil scholar, The Women University, Multan

Samiayounas34@gmail.com

Abstract

In this paper, the concept of the "discourse" of the former United States President, Donald Trump is explored with a critical focus on his discourse on Iran, with a particular emphasis on the interrelated aspects of war, power and ideology. The study explores the context of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) where the role of language as a tool of government to shape political narratives, legalize military interventions and ideologically consolidate. The study examines the selected speech samples of presidential rhetoric as well as some of the public statements and press briefings concerning tensions between Iran and the United States from the theoretical prism of both the 3-D Model of the Norman Fairclough and the Teun A. van Dijk's Ideological square. An analysis of Trump's rhetoric shows that he regularly frames Iran as an existential threat, using fear-inducing lexical options, militaristic analogies, binary oppositions (like "us" and "them") and other linguistic strategies. This means that such a linguistic move validates the choices made by USA policy makers on the one hand and communicates the messages of "U.S. superiority," "security," and "global leadership" on the other. The study also reveals that power is manifested not only in formal political statements but one can also instrument it subtly through ideologic inference within language. Furthermore, the findings indicate that rhetoric from Trump will lead to the normalisation of conflict oriented ideologies as notions about war come across as a tool for national security, and not a political decision. This research seeks to underline the fact that political language can determine public perception and relationship between nations by bringing the underlying ideas of the selected discourse to the fore. Finally, the paper highlights how CDA is relevant to shed light on language as a battleground and the product of ideology, in current geopolitical skirmishes.

Keywords: Rhetoric concerning Iran, interrelated dimensions of war, power, and ideology

Introduction

Political discourse plays an important role in the current dynamics of international relations because it produces images, effects and meaning in politics, influences decisions in a certain policy field and develops an ideology related with world field events. Political leaders are heavily reliant on language – they must persuade and explain, they must justify and legitimise. Political oratory, therefore, is a far from neutral process of communication but a means with which to convey ideological positions that can only be used as a working tool of power. However, Trump is among recent politicians whose speaking has—or indeed more generally speaking whose language—more or less prompted scholarly discussion for being forthright, populist, and authoritarian-nationalist in national security and military matters.



The struggle between the United States and Iran was one of the most controversial political issues of Trump's reign. Earlier, in 2018, the USA pulled out from the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) following which, the disputes between the two countries continued to increase in large amounts. All Trump's speeches, press conferences and his public messages always depicted Iran as a "big threat" for the security of the region and the world. Often, there was talk of terror, Iranian nuclear and destabilising activities suggesting that Iran was an enemy state whose actions posed a threat to American interests and international stability. These were not just descriptive images, but also one based on ideological imagery that helped to build ideas about geopolitics.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) supplies a beneficial lens by way of which the elements and operation of language in power relations and ideology might be viewed. CDA sees discourse as being a social practice which reproduces, sustains and legitimate dominance, inequality and ideology. Discoursing about a specific topic related to the political can be understood as a social communication which can also 'naturalize' certain worldviews and shape consciousness in society in favour of dominant institutions (e.g. Norman Fairclough, Teun A. van Dijk, Ruth Wodak). Political actors construct identities, define enemies and rationalize actions, which may be interpreted and resisted by the public, with language techniques.

A discourse-practices of power analysis of Trump's rhetoric on Iran may serve as something of a case study. Trump's speeches produced highly emotional language with binary oppositions and were also propagandistic in their use of militaristic imagery, not only to make America seem to be the defender of freedom but also to cast Iran as a chaotic, aggressive instigator of turmoil. Linguistic methods were used for the secularization of the purposes of economic sanctions, military activities and other foreign policy actions.

This study aims to critically analyse the discourse of Trump about Iran using the lens on power, ideology and war discourse. The study of selected speeches and public statements aims to reveal the linguistic strategies that are used in the construction and sustaining of political discourses. It focuses on analysing Trump's discourse, characterisation of Iran as a threat, the ways in which power is displayed in his text and the way ideology is ingrained in his rhetoric in particular.

This paper is a contribution to the literature on the analysis of language in political discourse as this helps to expose geopolitical conflicts of the contemporary world. It also demonstrates the potential and applicative value of CDA in relation to the understanding of the latent ideological aspects of political communication. Under the current days' importance of the media and the polarization of politics in the international stage, it is crucial to understand the discursive formations on the international conflict.

Research Objectives

The objectives of the study will be to:

- To analyze linguistic strategies that Donald Trump uses when speaking about Iran.
- In order to examine power dynamics as one of the parameters of Trump's speech.
- To analyse Trump's image of Iran as an ideology.

Research Questions

- What are Trump's discursive strategies of establishing and reinforcing power relations?
- What is or are the possible ideology(s) of Trump's rhetoric regarding Iran?
- How does Trump's rhetoric validate military and political measures towards Iran?

Literature Review



Speech and power have always been an important issue in the discourse studies. In the literature one of the effective methods by which the political elites shape the public opinion and affect the social reality is known as political discussion. Discourse is not just a reflection of society for Fairclough (1995), but it is one that "produces" and "reproduces" social structure. Language is used by political actors to confer authorisations, create social identities and validate associated with ideological views.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a significant advancement in language and power research during the last twentieth century. CDA is supposed to be used for the purpose of discovering ideology which might not be present in discourse and how language can help create inequality and dominance in society. Fairclough (1989) defines the negotiation and reproductions of space of power relationship within the discourse. Group identities are also formed and ideological polarization takes place through discourse as Van Dijk (1998) also noted.

Political speeches are an important context for CDA, as they are likely to be crafted with language and aim to persuade audiences, and justify policy decisions. Chilton (2004) says threat and security representations can be found in political speech to mobilize popular support. Leaders forge enemies and allies through language, an integral component of an ideology. Such buildings are particularly prominent in war time, foreign war.

We have seen how rhetoric can help legitimate U.S. foreign policy actions in the study of presidential rhetoric. Since 11 September, Bush called for a 'War on Terror' to be waged against Afghanistan and Iraq to justify military action and intervention. In fact, scholars have shown that this discourse was picking up and employing binary oppositions between good and bad, civilized and barbaric, and freedom and terror (Lazar & Lazar, 2004). But there are similar discursive trends later on.

Populism, Nationalism, Antagonistic Framing are key rhetorical elements of Trump that have been investigated in the study. Oppositional discourses of the Populist movement were a hallmark of populist discourse by commonly positing a dichotomy between "the people" and "the other, the enemy" (Wodak (2015)). The same logic holds true for world affairs, because the rhetoric of Trump's makes the nations of the world appear to be "bad" to America. His approach to communicating, is one that has to repeat and simplify; evaluative language and communicating to emotion.

There have been a number of scholars who have studied Trump's rhetoric on immigration, China, and terrorism. Yet not much has been paid attention to his rhetoric as it relates to Iran. Previous studies suggest that Trump's rhetoric of Iran revolves around the notions of danger, hostility, and instability. Iran is portrayed as a mortal threat that must be met, with terror and nuclear intentions continually mentioned. These depictions fit with more general themes of American superiority and worldwide dominance.

The notion "war rhetoric" is of great relevance to the analysis of Trump's rhetoric on Iran. Terms used in a way that imply that military action is necessary, right or inevitable are known as war rhetoric. Political leaders tell us stories and use metaphors that "metamorphose" us to a state of normalcy, and make it seem a moral duty to do battle (Lakoff, 1991). So, by this discourse, wars are no longer a question of politics and strategy, but a duty of a defence.

Another aspect of political debate is ideology. As a collection of beliefs shared in the society, ideologies serve as a guide to the activity of groups and their identities (Van Dijk, 1998). Political debate as a tool of ideology dissemination and legitimation is an important forum. Trump's rhetoric



is ideological, as he often codes his ideology into his text, including U.S. superiority, U.S. sovereignty, and U.S. national security.

The depiction of Iran in the political sphere of the West has also been studied. Edward Said (1978) through orientalism helps one understand the way societies not western in nature tend to be portrayed as irrational, threatening and inferior. Constructed in this way, the self of the west produces a rational, progressive and civilized view of self. In this context, Trump's rhetoric can be explained through the eyes of these descriptions that are often employed to describe Iran as other and threatening.

Nevertheless, extensive research on political discourse and foreign policy rhetoric have yet to be conducted on Trump's politics of Iranian language. In an attempt to bridge this gap, the current research employs Fairclough's Three Dimensional Analysis concept and van Dijk's ideology model to thoroughly examine the discourses of war, power and ideology in Trump's discourses.

Theoretical Framework

The 3D model made by Norman Fairclough.

One significant theoretical approach in the present study is the critical discourse analysis (CDA) which is presented in three-dimensional by Fairclough. As Fairclough (1995) suggests, discourse can be considered a complex phenomenon consisting of three interrelated aspects, namely, text, discursive practice and social practice.

The textual level refers to linguistic elements such as lexical, grammatical and syntactic properties, metaphor and rhetorical devices. Through textual analysis, the researchers attempt to find any pattern judiciously and get the hidden meaning of the text and any assumption of ideology expressed in it. Lexical analysis is the approach that deals with lexical choices: "terrorist," 'aggressive', 'dangerous', 'threat' are all part of Trump's rhetoric on Iran.

The second dimension that is that of discursive practice, production, distribution and consumption of discourses. This bachelor course looks at political message production and interpretation within communicative circumstances. The analytical perspective used is that of communicative events aiming at the positioning of the speaker and the audience, both domestically and internationally, as shown in Trump's speeches or media briefings.

Social practice is the third dimension that places discourse in the wider social and political forms. In this level, the role of discourse and sustaining the power relationship and ideology systems are discussed. So it looks as though Trump's rhetoric isn't simply "just his words" but something more, geopolitical and ideological.

Teun A. van Dijk's talks on ideological square

The second theory which is used in this study is van Dijk's ideology square. Van Dijk (1998) has theorised the following four 'fundamental strategies' of ideological discourse:

1. Emphasize our good qualities.
2. highlight the negative attributes.
3. Give less attention to our negative attributes.
4. Take the emphasis off their good qualities.

It is through these processes that positive self representation and negative other representation is developed. All of these are discursive strategies that politicians can and do play to entrench a sense of group identity and legitimate policies.

Square in Trump's words about Iran is an ideological picture of America as the protector of peace, freedom and security and Iran as sponsor of terrorism and source of instability in the region



separately. In this polarization, complicated geopolitical dynamics are boiled down into a fight between good and evil.

If a researcher combines Fairclough's model with the ideological square are embedded in the research world in van Dijk, then the whole picture of the model is ready to use and can not only be visualised but also give a clear view on how political reality is built in the process of discourse. Whereas van Dijk emphasizes on the cognitive and ideological level of discourse, Fairclough stresses the relationship between language and social structures. These frameworks can be combined to examine the concept of war, power and ideology in Trump's rhetoric in relation to Iran.

Research Methodology

Research Design

This is a qualitative research based on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to explore the discursive representations of war, power, and ideology in Donald Trump's discourse on Iran. Qualitative research is well suited to this investigation because it allows for a close examination of the linguistic patterns, rhetorical strategies and ideological meanings within political discourse. Qualitative discourse analysis aims at revealing the embeddedness of attitudes, prestige and power relations and ideological positions within political communication and is more than just a purely numerical pattern analysis and statistical measurement.

The counting of CDA related methodology was chosen as the main methodology to be applied as it offers tools for language and social power study. CDA considers language a social act through which the political actors have constructed realities, reproduced ideology and thus maintained systems of dominance. Considering the fact that Trump's talk about Iran often involved concepts of national security, military occupation and geopolitical conflict; the CDA provides a fitting approach for exploring the use of language as a tool for political persuasion and ideological control. Astright's study is an interpretive paradigm, that is, one which presumes language does not just describe but also shapes reality, or construct, reality. Political speeches are thus not passive statements about events but as communicative acts that are strategically planned to influence public opinion and perceptions of international politics. In this interpretive eyesight, Trump's rhetoric about Iran is examined as a discursive method or a political and ideological activity.

A specific focus of the study is to analyse the linguistic strategies and elements used to present Iran as a threat, the United States as a "legitimate" global player, as well as military and political interventions as justifiable. The study aims at highlighting how language helps to create and maintain power dynamics in international politics, by focusing on the discourse, where not the policy results.

Research Approach

This study adopted descriptive and analytical approach. The descriptive part is to find common characteristics of language, rhetorical tactics, and discursive elements in Trump's speeches and public messages. The analytical part involves reading and understanding the ideological meaning of these aspects by means of Fairclough and van Dijk's theories.

The analysis is on a transition from text to context. Initially, language aspects are identified – namely lexical, metaphor, use of pronouns, modality and evaluation expressions. Secondly, these textual features are analysed by way of wider discursive processes, such as strategies of communicating politically and disseminating media. Finally, these results are analyzed through the bigger socio-political atmosphere of the U.S.-Iran relationships.



The multiple layers framework enables this study to delve beyond superficial readings to expose the concealed and embedded ideologies in political discourse. It also enables the realization that language helps in the normalisation of specific foreign policy positions and geopolitical stories.

Data Collection

The selected speeches, press conferences, public addresses, and interviews are primary data that are attributed to Donald Trump's Presidential years (2017-2021), whereas the official statements are collected and documented from other Presidential websites. The selection of the texts reflects the fact that they deal directly with the issues concerning Iran, such as nuclear negotiations, economic sanctions, regional conflict, military operations, and national security concerns.

The timeframe analysed represents a period of change in relations between the USA and Iran. These include:

Since the United States withdrew from the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) in May 2018.

Implementing “maximum pressure” policy toward Iran.

Rising conflict in the Persian Gulf.

The death of an Iranian General, Qasem Soleimani, in January 2020.

Follow-up public statements on military readiness and in the region's security.

The events resulted in considerable political discussion and offer rich substance for the discussion of interaction between language and power and ideology.

Data were gathered from publicly available sources such as presidential archives, media briefings, television speeches, and White House transcriptions of these events. The corpus had only those texts which had significant references to Iran.

The chosen texts display a range of communicative situations, where it is possible to see that the rhetorical strategies are different in each of the texts, but ideologically homogeneous within each text.

Sampling Procedure

Purposive sampling technique has been used to select the appropriate texts. Purposive sampling is very common in qualitative studies as it helps the researcher to select the most informative data sources to address research questions.

The following selection criteria were used:

Explicit mention of Iran, its leadership or its policies.

Comments on war or national defence or foreign policy.

Quotes from talks made at important times of tension between the United States and Iran.

Documents with explicit evaluative statements on Iran.

Materials for which there is heavy public and media exposure.

These criteria were meant to make sure that the chosen corpus was adequate for study of the discursive construction of the concepts of war, power, and ideology. The study takes a non-exhaustive approach in examining statements as only those that are strategically significant in the evolution of U.S.-Iran relations are included. This method allows for detailed qualitative analysis and of course allows for a high level of analysis.

Data Corpus

The corpus comprises several types of political discourse:

Addressing the President before domestic / international audiences.



Press Briefings at the White House.

Official statements concerning national security.

Postings of public views after significant geopolitical incidents.

Interviews with the media on topics related to Iran.

References to the Iranian policies and threats in campaign speeches.

The speech is really political, with thousands of words in the corpus, thus presenting a great deal of material for qualitative analysis.

The variety of the corpus will also help the findings be more reliable and present repeating patterns in various communicative contexts. Thus, if the same discursive moves are seen again and again in his texts, they may be considered to be some of the tendencies of Trump's rhetorical language and not merely singular use of linguistic devices.

Analysis

Units of analysis are word, phrase, clauses, sentences and higher discursive structure.

In lexical level, the analysis of the text shows the keywords that are repeated with regard to Iran.

These are just some of the terms you will see used for example:

"Terrorist"

"Threat"

"Dangerous"

"Aggressive"

"Radical"

"Hostile"

These lexical choices play an active part in setting up specific images and ideologies.

At syntactic level, sentence structure, the attribution of agency and transitivity pattern are addressed. Specific use of this analysis is to find out who is being held responsible and to whom blame is attributed in discourse.

The rhetorical level of the study refers to the use of metaphors, repetitions, parallelism and persuasive techniques.

On the macro-discursive level, themes and stories bigger than any can be found and interpreted.

Data analysis procedures

Several stages exist in the analytical process.

The first stage is the initial reading and re-reading of all the chosen texts to become familiar with the texts in the corpus. In this stage, initial themes and recurring patterns of language exist.

Data Analysis

The results of this study show that Donald Trump's speech on Iran serves as an effective discursive tool, a tool that interpellates war, power and ideology upon each other and mutually supports one another. Through his strategic use of language, Trump is creating certain representation of Iran; in doing so, he is allowing for certain actions of the American foreign policy and reproducing broad ideologies about a viable and legitimate national identity, American security and leadership of the world. Critical Discourse Analysis demonstrates that these findings revealed this discourse is not a mere means of disseminating the policy measures but is an active instrument of adding or taking away the political reality and exerting influence upon the consciousness of the masses.

The key discovery relates to the systematic building-up of the image of Iran as a threat. Starting with the selected Corpus, corpus keep pointing terror and violence towards Iran once, twice and again and categorize Iran itself as dangerous and aggressive and unstable. As Fairclough puts it,



such representations are not only a reflection of the social reality, but they also contribute to creating it. Trump has consistently portrayed Iran as a "state sponsor of terror," a "dangerous regime" and the "cause" of "regional instability," in order to convey a "mythical picture" about Iran, with certain political objectives. These decisions, about language, speak not just about Iran, but they tell people how to read Iran's attitudes and moves.

This finding is in line with the "ideological polarization" idea of van Dijk. Van Dijk (1998) states that both making positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation are frequent in the politics discourse. As always, Trump's rhetoric is negative about Iran, pointing towards the positive attributes of the United States. This polarization makes the complexities of geopolitical realities into a polarized good-bad binary opposition, an order-chaos binary opposition, or a civilization threatening binary opposition. In this way, ideological differences are made 'natural', considered as common sense.

Another way to examine Iran-as-an-existential-threat is to regard it in the context of the larger picture found in the research into security discourses. As Chilton (2004) and others have argued, every time political leaders tell the story of fear they create the possibility of extraordinary policy. Trump's rhetoric about risk tends to support use of economic sanctions, military force, aggressive foreign-policy acts. When a threat is determined to them, then actions which are not popular in other eyes can be seen as being a threat management and acceptable response. This demonstrates a connection of discourse and political power.

The results also suggest that fear "was integral to Trump's rhetoric. Statements emphasizing the threat of military force can be taken as fear appeals, as well as encondumtion and support of terrorism and regionalism that Iran is doing. These appeals are especially persuasive as they elicit feelings, which tend to bring down the critical thought put into political decisions. At other times, the discourse will not coerce anyone but have soft influences as Fairclough (1989) argues. This takes the form of "fearmongering", which attempts to have an audience take a certain policy decision on faith rather than through careful thought.

Critical Discourse Analysis has made a huge contribution towards the documentation of the function of fear in political discourse. As Wodak (2015) pointed out, the political communication of a populist discourse will also likely run on the back of an outgroup danger in order to strengthen national identity and cohesion. That is reflected in the kind of rhetoric that Trump uses about Iran, The message is one of danger and insecurity, one of group vulnerability which can only be overcome with strong leadership and action – and action that is taken at the right time. Political power is thus linked to security and protection.

Another significant finding is related to the functionalization of the military. Consistently, in Trump's rhetoric, military force is a huge asset to a nation's security. Many sources in the corpus relate to the usage of high tech weaponry and the strategic superiority associated with it as well as military preparedness. This is what is known as part of the militarizing of political discussion.

The tendency to militarize power is particularly evident in positions that try to "preserve peace" as the reason for employing force. Unmatched American strength" is, according to Trump, the best way to avoid conflict. The military is not seen as a potential instrument for violence but used as a reassurance of stability. This packaging of war-related institutions and practices as means of peace will diminish potential resistance to military expansion by the public.

A particularly relevant addition to understanding this phenomenon is Fairclough's new term "ideological naturalization." An ideological assumption actually works best if left unchallenged,



if it appears as a matter of course — when they are a second nature. In any case, Trump's rhetoric implicitly suggests that many listeners are likely to become accustomed to the correlation of military force with peace, and thus view military force as a commonplace — and acceptable — part of national life. In the few instances that actual military involvement in conflict is mentioned, it tends to be a minor aspect of the story.

This is the big picture, consistent with the analysis of Lakoff (1991) with regard to war rhetoric. Lakoff believes that political leaders frequently make use of conceptual metaphors which endeavor to “moralize” and “necessary-ize” military operations. But Trump's rhetoric also elevates the importance of military power as a protecting force to ensure the well-being and interests of the country, and the world at large. That this is represented can assist in “legitimising” defence spending, defence operations and arms dissuasion measures.

But the findings also reveal the clear importance of America's exceptionalism in Trump's rhetoric. American exceptionalism: The idea that the United States stands out, and has a net positive impact, in the international system. Miraculously, for the entire body of analyzed texts, the United States is tied to ideals relating to freedom, democracy, justice and peace. Through these positive images, a national image of moral leadership and responsibility to the world is upheld.

Analysis of these patterns can be done based on an ideological square, a model developed by Van Dijk. The positive portrayal of America fits with the approach of reinforcing the positive traits of the country. Meanwhile, Iran gets bad treatment and that is characteristic of telling people about their negatives because that was exactly what the argument was about saying Iran's bad. Such discursive practices help to create an understanding of one worldview; one in which the legitimacy of actions taken by the U.S. is assumed at least within the frame of the discourse and actions taken by Iran, likewise at least only within the frame of the discourse, are viewed with suspicion and hostility.

Under proper rhetorical use, the concept of ‘American exceptionalism’ serves several key ideological functions. It is the first to empower national identity by developing a positive national collective image. Secondly, it is undoubtedly a means of legitimating policy-making under the banner of “moral responsibility” and not political interest. Thirdly, it helps to solidify existing power dynamics in a natural and desirable way, by putting the American leadership in this kind of light.

Results also suggest that while Trump's seemingly rhetorical change helps to maintain larger ideological frameworks of geopolitical supremacy of the western nations. This can be explained with respect to Said's theory on orientalism. To say (Said, 1978) that the discourses of the West characterize the society of the East as irrational, dangerous and inferior. These images are used to validate cultural and political supremacy by depiction of the Western world as civilised and rational.

On the surface there are different aspects of Trump's language that have been described as ‘orientalist’. The U.S. is characterized as rational, responsible and peace-seeking, whereas Iran is seen as aggressive, unstable and hostile. These pictures rank the two nations and somehow serve to validate and lend credence to American might. The period of discourse he has created is one that has been inou as part of a political moment, but what about the pattern of his discourse generated as a mode of representation of the Middle East in the west?

It is in the area of leadership that the orientations of the Iranians can be perceived most distinctly as orientalist directions. Many times Trump's remarks on the Iranian regime refer to its



irrationality, extremism and aggression. This kind of description is part of a different narrative that suggests that about the Iraqi insurgencies is mostly due to Iranian actions and not to greater geopolitical forces. As a result, while Iran is no genius when it comes to knowingly ratcheting up tensions, it has been isolated for its role in the tensions to a greater degree than it has been the United States.

The results also reveal the importance of the process of legitimizing the language in the political text. We speak about legitimation – that process in which one tries to make an action or a tendency to do it appear “good,” or “right,” or simply “nonsensical” without it, or unavoidable. Inverts reality and makes bold claims to appear to validate sanctions, military action and other foreign policy goals.

One of the common strategies of legitimization relies on the use and appeal to security. Policies are based on the premise that they are needed to counter threats from Iran. The talk focuses on the dangers and vulnerabilities and allows one to understand the need for taking extraordinary measures. Another way is to perform moral evaluations. American actions are with values of peace and Iranian actions are with values of violence, instability. One implication of this moral approach is that one ought to be thinking about policy choices as moral commitments.

The findings are in line with Fairclough's idea on how discourse serve to maintain power relations. Political leaders harness not only institutions and policies to entrench their power, but language as well. Discourse can shape people's interpretation and reaction to political gestures, and make them legitimate or not.

This study also has revealed repetition as an important feature. But there are elements in Trump's speeches that are repeated regularly, such as “maximum pressure,” “dangerous regime” or “state sponsor of terror.” Repetition and ideology: this is essential, to re-enforce certain perceptions of reality. There's a greater perception of credibility of familiar messages and repetition renders credibility.

Ideology is most effective when it is not recognised as ideology, as is the case with Fairclough. Through repetition, the ideology becomes language, a part of people's consciousness. The public at some stage might start taking such assumptions as true, and not like in the movies. The constant linkage with Iran terrorism and danger, is an example of this process. With the iteration, such associations will solidify a lasting impression and form public opinion and preference for policies. The results also made it more salient that there was a link between hegemony and discourse. In line with the thinking of Gramsci, Fairclough believes that the dominant hold on power is not only through coercion but consent. It is essential that political discourse plays a pivotal role in this consent, not only for promoting a consensus on the social and political reality, but also for shaping a common sense understanding.

By analyzing Trump's rhetoric about Iran, it can be understood that Trump is trying to create and strengthen a hegemonic discourse in the field of national security and foreign affairs. The discourse further marginalizes other views of events – that is to say, certain views of the events are made to seem unchallengeable and obvious. In this way, political dominant interests are consolidated by means of the process of ideological normalization.

It is also revealed through the analysis that there are layers of discourse. Particular language choices are indicative of meaning and representation at the Textual level. From a discursive perspective, the communicative practices influence the processes of messages' production/consumption. Social level understanding: Discourse is related to structures of power



and ideology. Fairclough's three dimensional model can capture the above processes and can be useful as an understanding of the complex nature of the relationship between language and politics. Overall, it is possible to claim that, the outcome confirms the key assumptions of Critical Discourse Analysis. Language isn't an unbiased means of communication, it is a clash of ideology and a way to negotiate power. Trump's remarks on Iran provide a prime example of how atmospheres of threat and authorisation can be created, opinions on the conflict with Iran can be formed, and political ideologies can be reinforced through political rhetoric. Political leaders mould confidence in an occasion, and they get policies accepted by managing their language strategically.

As indicated by the discussion, war, power, and ideology are all closely related in Trump's discourse. The threat can be presented and constituted as a legitimate or justifiable threat; the power is legitimised via representation through the discursive representation of the threat; The repetition of discursive representations of threat reiterates ideology. These processes bring to light the key role language plays in today's geopolitical war by emphasizing Critical Discourse Analysis as a powerful instrument in the analysis of language in political communication.

Conclusion

The aim in doing this research was to contextualize the discourse of Donald Trump towards Iran, war, power, and ideology based on the perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Selected speeches in the tense moments between Iran and the United States of America were used as the basis of the research which analyzed it with the Three- Dimensional Model of Norman Fairclough and the Ideological Square of Teun A. van Dijk. The purpose of analysis was to uncover the instrumental nature of language to assert the form of a reality in the international arena and validate the decisions to be taken in the global arena (foreign policy), ideology, perception of international conflict).

This finding indicates that Trump is orchestrating threats in his discourse on Iran in a systematic way, polarizing the ideologies, using militaristic language, moral legitimations, and self-representing nationalisticly. Such vection analyses will also identify that political discourse, as a communicative process, can affect the audience's opinion, can invent foreign policy stories, can even re-confirm dominant ideologies.

An important finding of this study is that throughout Trump's rhetoric, Iran has been portrayed as an existential threat. Persistent usage of the terms "terrorist", "dangerous", "hostile", "aggressive", and "radical" to describe Iran, contributes to the unbalanced depiction of it as a potential source of instabilities and insecurity. These images also create a discursive field in which waging a military and political campaign against the Iranians appears justifiable and necessary. The idea of security and the threat, order and chaos, between civilization and danger is portrayed in a simplicity of international relations—a story.

Moreover, the analysis uncovers that threat is constructed by using different strategies of the language, such as lexical, repetition, metaphor and evaluation. Each of these policies helps to forge a more gentle genteware of Iran that plays a better role in U.S. foreign policy objectives. Negative perceptions about Iran, often cited in concert with terrorism and unrest in the region, serve to perpetuate and justify funding for hard-line policy actions.

Another important finding relates to the working of ideological polarization in the discourse of Trump. Along the van Dijk's square of ideologies, the strategy is strongly on the line of positive self presentational and negative other presentational strategies. The U.S. is juxtaposing itself as a “country that is promoting freedom, peace, democracy and global security” versus Iran as a



“country that is promoting violence, extremism and instability. This binary opposition creates a moral attitude in which America's doing appears to be right in itself, and Iranians doing appears to be wrong in itself.

This 'us versus them' building of the text has a number of notable ideological functions. This strengthens nation units, promotes political national unity and facilitates complex geopolitical issues to be made understandable. The way the distinctions between the United States and Iran are portrayed views international dynamics as a moral one rather than a political one. Another discovery in the study is that the militaristic rhetoric features prominently in Trump's language. The military is always presented in a positive, necessary and legitimate light in connection with the security of its nation. Use of military forces, military supremacy, military preparedness contributes to normalisation of militarisation in the context of political discourse. On the whole, in any environment of peace, stability and protection, the use of war-terminology is likely to reduce the overall likelihood of opposition from the general public to military activities and defense strategy. The results show that military is not considered as a means of conflict but rather as a means of averting conflict. These are ideologized images, and images of deterrence and strategic supremacy. In this process strength is no longer only accepted, but it is desired because of the need to safeguard national interests and International order. The analysis also shows the extent to which the idea of American exceptionalism features in Trump's rhetoric. The U.S. always comes across as an international actor, morally strong and responsible psychistically. By employing the terms freedom and democracy, justice and leadership, they help to project a positive national image, which can be utilized for American participation in foreign affairs. This speech is an element in a process that has served to reinforce the ideology of the United States as the "natural" leader in the world political system.

References

- Bourdieu, P. (1991). **Language and symbolic power**. Harvard University Press.
- Chilton, P. (2004). **Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice**. Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change**. Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). **Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language**. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). **Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research**. Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1972). **The archaeology of knowledge**. Pantheon Books.
- Gee, J. P. (2014). **An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method** (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). **Selections from the prison notebooks**. International Publishers.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1990). New ways of meaning: The challenge to applied linguistics. **Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6*(1), 7–36.
- Lakoff, G. (1991). Metaphor and war: The metaphor system used to justify war in the Gulf. **Peace Research*, 23*(2/3), 25–32.
- Lazar, A., & Lazar, M. M. (2004). The discourse of the New World Order: "Out-casting" the double face of threat. **Discourse & Society*, 15*(2–3), 223–242.
- Said, E. W. (1978). **Orientalism**. Pantheon Books.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. **Discourse & Society*, 4*(2), 249–283.



- van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In C. Schäffner & A. Wenden (Eds.), **Language and peace** (pp. 17–33). Dartmouth Publishing.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1998). **Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach**. Sage Publications.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Politics, ideology, and discourse. In K. Brown (Ed.), **Encyclopedia of language and linguistics** (2nd ed., pp. 728–740). Elsevier.
- Wodak, R. (2001). **Methods of critical discourse analysis**. Sage Publications.
- Wodak, R. (2015). **The politics of fear: What right-wing populist discourses mean**. Sage Publications.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2016). **Methods of critical discourse studies** (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.