International Journal on Integrated Education (IJIE)

e-ISSN: 2620 – 3502
p-ISSN: 2615 – 3785

Volume: 8 Issue: 1 | March 2025

https://journals.researchparks.org/index.php/IJIE

Article

Emotional Rhetoric in Political Discourse: Analyzing President Bush's Speeches on the Iraq War through Chilton's Emotional Theory

Mohammed Hameed Rasheed[1]

1. College of Education for Women, Kirkuk, Iraq
* Correspondence: Mohammed-hameed@uokirkuk.edu.iq

Abstract: This study critiques President Bush's speeches on the Iraq war and terrorism through the lens of Chilton's emotional theory, highlighting the complex relationship between language emotion and politically persuasive belief. The study, which deconstructed five significant speeches between 2001 and 2003, reveals how Bush used emotional rhetoric to stir public sentiment and justify military action. Using a rigorous approach to discourse analysis, the study identified eight vital emotional components, such as fear of attack and safety. It showed. It showed that 59% of the sentences analyzed were designed to evoke specific emotional responses. The findings underscore the strategic use of language in political discourse, demonstrating how emotional manipulation serves as a means to influence public opinion and legitimize the legitimacy of controversial policies. Moreover, Political speech is a powerful linguistic tool in world politics that can identify the destiny of countries under the conditions of war. Therefore, it is worth investigating the strategies that politicians apply in their political speeches to achieve their political goals. This study critically examines President Bush's speech on the Iraq war and terrorism through Chilton's emotional theory. The study shows that political discourse is not just a means for information but a powerful tool for shaping public sentiment and guiding decision-making. Using emotional language, Bush effectively instilled feelings of fear and belief that were critical to winning public support for military action. The dominant themes of lingering memories of 11 served to incite fear, while assertions about American military strength and security boosted confidence.

Keywords: Political linguistics, Iraq war, Chilton's theory, Emotion theory

Citation: Rasheed M. H. Emotional R Political Discourse: Analyzing Presid Speeches On The Iraq War Through C Emotional Theory. International Jour Integrated Education (IJIE) 2025, 8(1), 25-35

Received: 29h Dec 2024
Revised: 11th Jan 2024
Accepted: 13th Feb 2025
Published: 31th Mar 2025

Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

1. Introduction

The use of language as a means of communication has a long history. It is a social tool that delivers messages and communicates people's ideas. People express their thoughts and ideas through language. People often use language with a clear and distinct idea in mind. If they use language to express their thoughts and ideas, then if language is used correctly, it can be used effectively to control others. There is power in language, and there is power in the expression of ideas, literally and rhetorically. Undoubtedly, the relationship between language and power is very close. Political discourse is an excellent place to examine politicians' ideas and rhetorical strategies and to reveal the relationship between language and power. Political speeches show a strategy for winning over their rivals, who make political discourse distorted, but they measure how people can have a strong political influence.

Political language describes the language used in politics. It is primarily used to realize a politically motivated project or to communicate politics.

Political linguistics covers the various fields involved, including speech acts, textual linguistics (CDA), and critical discourse analysis: general linguistics, translation and literature biology, social sociology, anthropology, and philosophy. The field of critical applied linguistics is CDA according to [1].

In the 1970s, this method emerged as a response to the seminal work of Kress, Hodges, and Foucault from 1972. The foundational ideas of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Critical Linguistics (CL) have been outlined by [2, 3]. in their respective publications. He argues that critical discourse analysis (CDA) always incorporates four viewpoints: power, history, ideology, and critique. The dominant language is not dominant from a CDA point of view; instead, strong people use language to establish and retain their authority [1].

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a study approach that analyses how social power abuse, domination, and inequality are expressed, maintained, and challenged through written and spoken language in social and political settings [4]. The primary aim of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is to uncover the tactics a speaker employs to convey their messages and the specific linguistic tools utilized to accomplish these methods [5, 6]. Recently, political discourses in general and presidential speeches in particular have been analyzed primarily in light of CDA. Indeed, CDA is primarily used to analyze political discourse across languages. Because politicians worldwide are harsh when they speak, the result is misunderstanding and distrust.

Analysts often grapple with the challenge of deciphering the true intentions behind a politician's speech, a task that is further complicated by the hidden agendas often present in policy debates. The lack of a standardized methodological approach in political discourse analysis only adds to the complexity, making it a fertile ground for further research.

Political linguistics has developed as a subfield of linguistics research, addressing the issue through the CDA approach. This study is designed to assess the application of emotion theory to Twelve Chilton's 2004 theories of structural linguistic strategies, particularly in universal and political discourse. While there is a vast body of research contributing to linguistic analysis in the case of all politicians and President Bush

Given the gravity of war and the exceptional communication efforts it demands, uncovering the strategies employed by political figures in their speeches becomes imperative. This study focuses on President Bush and his speeches justifying the decision to go to war with Iraq. Recognizing the significance of the Iraq war, the researcher has diligently analyzed Bush's speeches on the Iraq war and terrorism to identify these strategies. The importance of this study lies in its potential to support the notion that politicians use specific strategies to conceal their political agendas and sway public opinion. Therefore, the study poses a crucial question: To what extent did Bush utilize Chilton’s strategies in his speeches on the Iraq war and terrorism[7].

The Previous Studies

Political scientists, linguists, anthropologists, sociologists, IR specialists, communication studies, and political science majors have all participated in the analysis of political speech. Nonetheless, political and intellectual circles have always centered on political speech. In the 1960s, this school of thought arose in Europe as a subset of the post-structuralism and policy, or "language revolution" (a more generic term) resurgence of the social and human sciences. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) was one area that this method expanded to in the 1970s. He explored how they functioned within the context of socially constructed challenges and problems [1].

The ancient work of Aristotle on rhetoric provides the theoretical groundwork for critical discourse analysis (CDA). Critical Marxist theory, as seen in the Frankfurt School

and continued by [8, 9]. is seen as a significant forerunner of critical discourse analysis (CDA) in modern philosophical thought.

Many modern sociocultural shifts may be better understood by employing CDA he demonstrates [10]. CDA is a subfield of applied linguistics that has been developed by researchers including [4, 11]. They state that studies based on CDA manages several data sources and procedures while concentrating on numerous ideas [12]. In particular, this literature review places critical discourse analysis (CDA) within a larger philosophical tradition of metaphor, critical thinking, and language alteration; it then emphasizes CDA's modern applicability to the study of cultural change through socially discursive transformation. The terms "critical linguistics" (CL) and "critical discourse analysis" (CDA) are often used interchangeably in the field. Initially, C.L.

A comprehensive grasp of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) necessitates a deep comprehension of Halliday's fundamental concepts of grammatical structure and his approach to linguistic analysis according to [1]. He did not use Hallidean linguistics as the foundation for his analyses and theories. He found it insufficient to address pragmatic and semantic aspects like presupposition, implication, metaphor, and the significance of conceptual mixing [7].

Despite Chilton's reservations, Hallidean systemic functional grammar has forged a close connection with linguistic approaches to critical discourse analysis, mainly due to the evolving influence of CDA (including CL). Moreover, the field of psycholinguistics has recently presented a fresh theoretical foundation for CDA, underscoring the dynamic nature of the field.

This section highlights the evolving relationship between language systems and the development of critical discourse analysis. Halliday's systematic functional linguistics plays an important role, albeit with conflicting perspectives, like Chilton's new approach.

He, as an emotional linguist, focusing primarily on issues of politics and international relations, continued to work in psychological processes. In particular, Chilton (2004) explored the possibility of "radicalization". There may be innate influences which may occur in politics [7].

In addition, he conducted an extensive survey and provided a linguistic theory of politics, forming the present study's starting point [7]. This section highlights Chilton's psycholinguistic approach to analyzing political discourse. His approach enables a critical examination of the ideological mechanisms that can give rise to potential influences on individual autonomy in political negotiations, a topic of increasing importance in our current political climate. In response to the traumatic experiences of World War II and the Iraq War, many researchers examined politics and war. One such study involved a content analysis of Iraq War reporting. Through this research, Clark sought to discover the real reasons for the impending war with Iraq [13].

Clark's research concluded that the answer to the "Iraq mystery" was simple and surprising - that the war was a "war for oil money". At the same time, Clark said the real motivation behind the war was the regime's goal to regulate the flow of oil trade OPEC (Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries). This comprehensive volume delves into the meticulous scrutiny of political discourses and the justification of military conflicts such as the Iraq War. The aim is to uncover deeper, often obscure, geopolitical-economic drivers and how such practices have been reflected In currency and oil market developments.

On September 10, just before the September 11 attacks, the U.S. government and military leaders addressed the nation with a speech aimed at uniting the American people and supporting the upcoming "war on terror." They conducted a timely analysis of articles from time and Newsweek published in the five weeks after September 11. Their research showed that government and military officials consistently paid particular attention to issues related to the armed forces, emphasizing the continued importance of their research [14].

Furthermore, the media effectively portrayed and amplified these nationalist discourses in the news and commentary. In doing so, the media played an essential role in disseminating and reinforcing messages and statements issued by government and military leaders.

As a unique contribution to this study, he conducted a comprehensive analysis of special reports from the Al Jazeera news network [15]. In a survey examining the role of language in public life, he analyzed 12 articles published on the Al Jazeera English website commemorating the Al-Aqsa Intifada. The study perceived speech as a site of political struggle and representative power. The results emphasize the importance of considering linguistic aspects when developing activities aimed at creating a culture of peace with social and environmental contexts, as evidenced by the Al Jazeera news report.

Many American politicians in contemporary political discourse use various discourse strategies to achieve their political goals through lobbying or communication, often with the help of speechwriters and image consultants [16]. Politicians particular simplify their language to attract the ordinary people directly creating effective strategies. These approaches allow them to introduce socially and culturally significant ideas, thereby maintaining their power and strengthening their influence on public opinion, especially in the context of war. Critical Discourse Analysis is an approach of analyzing of a text or an extract by relating its marked linguistic forms to a relevant context of community or culture [17].

He examined the use of hedging in President Bush's responses to challenging media questions finding multiple examples of neutral hedging [18]. However, the study noted that hedging was not used to moderate or soften statements. Instead, Bush appeared to use hedging tactics for strategic purposes, consistent with Partington's observations. Similarly, she argues that many American politicians frequently employ discourse strategies to achieve their political objectives through lobbying or communication with the help of speechwriters and image consultants [16]. Politicians may simplify their language to appeal directly the ordinary people, creating strategies that introduce socially and culturally significant ideas. Such approaches help maintain political power and strengthening influence on public opinion, especially in contexts like wartime. Applying criticality to discourse analysis and genre analysis needs first establishing, though briefly, the theoretical basis for the critical theory [19].

2. Methodology

This study, of significant novelty, employed functional and qualitative research to delve into the emotional tactics by President Bush in his pivotal speeches on the Iraq war and terrorism. To conduct this analysis, five speeches delivered by President Bush on these topics between March and May 2012 were sourced from the official White House website, providing a unique and valuable dataset for this research.

The corpus chosen for the current study is five speeches of Bush on the Iraq war and terrorism, including 812 sentences taken from the White House Websites. Website contains five speeches that provide a solid foundation for research purposes.

The study utilized digital transcripts of every presidential address available on the Internet. It analyzed speeches made by President Bush from 2001 to 2003, namely

following the September 11 attacks. These speeches mainly addressed the Iraq war and terrorism, which were significant issues then.

The current study, which has a strong and reliable methodology, aims to analyze these discussions utilizing the extremely pertinent theoretical framework established by [7]. The study aimed to investigate the degree to which President Bush used the tactics proposed by Chilton in his speeches on the Iraq war and terrorism, considering the constraints of geography and time. The researchers diligently adhered to a systematic procedure to achieve the study's objectives by gathering President Bush's speeches.

Initially, the researchers chose to examine "Emotional Regulation" as the main topic of their study. This decision was made due to space and time constraints. This selection was made from a list of twelve political discourses established by [7]. In addition; the researcher identified and expressed linguistic cues of sensory processing in each discourse.

Furthermore, to determine the extent to which Bush used an emotional channel and what motivated such use, the researcher examined the linguistic characteristics of these speech cues, building upon how this research takes place, emphasizing its magnitude and potential impact. Additionally, the researcher analyzed the speeches comparatively to determine how often Bush used different emotional strategies.

3. Results

Based on his theoretical framework, eight politically relevant feelings emerged spontaneously in speech and political participation [7]. Chilton's eight proposed points, including one example from Bush's speech, are at the bottom. Some emotions were not found.

1) Fear of invasion: "Alliances with terrorists could allow the Iraqi regime to attack America without leaving any fingerprints".
2) Fear of domination: "He would dominate the Middle East".
3) Fear of intruders: "Al Qaeda is still active in Iraq".
4) Love of family: "We are removing a source of violence and instability and laying the foundation of peace for our children and grandchildren."
5) Security: "The United States of America has the sovereign authority to use force in assuring its national security".
6) Protectiveness: "Just as we prepare to ensure victory in Iraq, we are taking further actions to protect our homeland".
7) Territorial belonging and identity: No example was found.
8) Loyalty: No example was found.

The analysis showed that out of 812 sentences in the tested speeches, 498 sentences were used to evoke emotions. Specifically, these 287 sentences used the arguments presented by Chilton's theoretical framework to evoke emotional responses. In the remaining 211 sentences, other shapes were used for the same emotionally arousing purpose.

Table 1 below shows the frequency with which President Bush used each of Chilton's eight proposed arguments to stir emotion in the speeches that focused on the Iraq war and terrorism.

This quantitative interaction illustrates the strategic and systematic way in which Bush employed Chilton's persuasive techniques in his political speech and emphasized the importance of understanding elite rhetorical strategies to underscore public sentiment on important issues.

Table 1. The frequency of Bush's applied arguments for evoking emotions based on Chilton's propositions

Chilton's proposed arguments for evoking emotion	Number of sentences	percentage
Fear of invasion	107	21.48%

Fear of domination	71	14.25%
Fear of intruders	4	0.80%
Security	59	11.84%
Protectiveness	43	8.63%
Love of family	3	0.60%
Loyalty	-	-
Territorial belonging	-	-
Total	287	59%

The data in the table above indicate that the most frequent emotional appeals President Bush used to in his speeches were "fear of attack" followed by "fear of security," "security," "defending them," "fear of intruders," and "family love" which appeared on multiple occasions.

Interestingly, the table shows that Bush did not use the "regional" and "loyalty" arguments in the analyzed speeches. Overall, the frequency analysis reveals that 59% of the emotional arguments used by Bush are consistent with the strategies proposed by [7]. Nevertheless, the data also suggest that Bush used other forms of emotional reasoning not identified by Chilton, which we will explore further.

Fear of invasion: "To complete the mission, we will prevent Al Qaida and other foreign terrorists from turning Iraq into what Afghanistan was under the Taliban: a haven from which they could launch attacks on America and our friends".

'fear of invasion' is often based on events during the Second World War and presenters' experiences according to [7]. However, data analysis has shown that in some cases, Bush approved or appreciated them—monuments from the Second World War.

Instead, Bush sought to instil fear of attack in the audience by reminding the audience of Saddam Hussein's dangerous weapons and dangerous gas; primarily, by emphasizing this perceived threat, Bush sought to develop a sense of vibration and urgency around the need for action.

To further emphasize the threat of attack, Bush defined the targets as the U.S., Saudi Arabia, Turkey, the American people, and other allies. In this way, he threatened and threatened al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups by potentially attacking the security of the United States and its allies.

Additionally, Bush insisted that he would "complete the mission" to confront this threat. He explained that the operation involved capturing terrorists and insurgents, which would require military action and combat operations.

Fear of domination: "This same tyrant has tried to dominate the Middle East, has invaded and brutally occupied a small neighbor, has struck other nations without warning, and holds an unrelenting hostility towards the United States".

According to Chilton's framework, the concept of "fear" can manifest as "fear of attack" and "fear of domination." Data analysis showed that President Bush frequently used the "fear of domination" argument in his speeches, using 132 words to highlight the perceived threat posed by terrorists preying on Iraq, his neighbour, the Middle East region and the United States

Throughout his speeches, Bush identified the key "hegemonies" as Iran, al-Qaeda, and, most notably, the Iraqi regime led by Saddam Hussein. He pointed to Saddam's past aggressions, including his brutal takeover of Iraq's neighbors and attacks on other countries and the United States, as evidence of Saddam's desire to dominate the region and potentially dominate the world on the snow.

By warning audiences of the consequences of the terrorist takeover, Bush was attempting to evoke a sense of fear and urgency around this threat. Bush's proposed solution called for the destruction of this "fortress" by military action.

Thus, Bush framed and justified the decision to go to war as a necessary measure to counter the perceived threat of terrorists led by Saddam Hussein ruling Iraq, the Middle East, America, and other countries.

Security: "Whatever our differences in the past, the world understands that success in Iraq is critical to the security of our nations".

In his speech, President Bush sought to instil a sense of trust and security among Americans and Iraqis. According to Bush's words, American security was linked to several fundamentals:

With the sacrifices made by American soldiers and their families winning the war in Iraq, Saddam Hussein was defeated as a suspect. Specifically, Bush insisted that American security depended on military victory in Iraq. "This victory will require Iraq and the United States to engage and defeat terrorists and other adversaries," he said.

To further assure the security of Iraqi Americans, Bush encouraged states and other nations to provide military and civilian assistance to support efforts in Iraq. By suggesting that this sense of security was through the successful prosecution of the war against terrorists in Iraq, President Bush was attempting to build public support for the decision to go to war after the fact, albeit indirectly. Specifically, Bush's rhetoric was intended to tie America's security and victory over terrorism directly to the military intervention in Iraq to justify and garner support for this controversial policy decision.

According to the data presented in Table 1, 59% of emotional statements used by President Bush were based on the eight statements proposed by [7]. theoretical framework. However, the remaining 41 arguments used. The remaining % were not initially included in the Chilton model. In addition to using the specific tactics described by Chilton, President Bush used other rhetorical tactics to stir up certain emotions in public, with the direct and indirect aim of persuading them to support the resolution as they decided to go after the war.

President Bush's use of rhetoric was not only strategic but also highly effective. He emphasized the need for and propriety of military action to directly appeal to postwar support, effectively stirring up postwar sentiment and influencing public opinion. However, to further misconvince the public, Bush used two opposite strategies: he promoted fear-based and confidence-building emotions, and three specific statements were used to evoke an emotional response in the audience. Mixing Chilton's proposed strategies with other rhetorical devices, this multifaceted approach highlights Bush's efforts to manipulate public opinion into accepting the controversial decision to go to war and its sophistication and emphasis on style.

The study showed that although not explicitly stated his theoretical framework, the eight instances proposed by Chilton for emotional arousal can also be classified as fear-based or trust-inducing responses [7]. Specifically, they found that President Bush used the first three arguments from Chilton's model to promote fear-based emotions. In contrast, the other five arguments were used to evoke confident emotional responses. Table 2 shows President Bush's frequency of additional emotional appeals not initially considered in his theory [7]. This finding suggests that Bush employed a strategically balanced approach, using the strategies provided by Chilton to induce fear-based emotional self-destruction in his audience with n 'aimed at them in. This multifaceted rhetorical approach was intended to shape public sentiment broadly in favour of the controversial decision to go to war.

Table 2. The frequency of applied arguments other than Chilton's proposition

Applying other Arguments for	Evoking emotions	Number of sentences Percentage
Iraqi regimes' possession of WMD	62	12.44%

Reminding the memory of 11/9 attack	34	6.62%
Reminding other horrible events	9	1.80%
Possessing powerful Army	45	9.036%
Possessing developed appliance of war	27	5.22%
Possessing strong supporter	10	2.008%
Invasion	24	4.81%
Total	211	41%

As shown in Table 2, the 211 sentences most frequently used by the arguments presented in the Chilton framework and most likely to arouse emotional concern are "Iraqi regime weapons of mass destruction (WMDs)."

The second and third most common arguments were “reminders of the 9/11 attacks” and “reminders of other terrible events,” which were intended to incite fear.

On the other hand, President Bush used three other statements to inspire public confidence and motivate support for the war effort. As Table 2 shows, Bush's most frequent argument to build trust was the claim that "the United States has a powerful military."

The second and third most common arguments for reliance are "with advanced military power" and "strongly supported," respectively.

This study finds that, in addition to capitalizing on the emotional appeal offered by Chilton, President Bush strategically used fear-based arguments about WMD and recalled past tragedies when he confidence-building information about American military strength and the ability to shape public opinion broadly to approve the decision to go to war.

Furthermore, while Bush apparently misled people into supporting the war effort, he used the "violence and revenge" argument to stir up the fighting spirit and galvanize public response. As can be inferred from Table 2, in the 41% of cases that exceed Chilton's recommendation, The first three arguments, which accounted for 20% of the total, were used to induce fear. The following three arguments, which accounted for 17% of the total, were used to evoke confidence.

The final argument, which accounted for 4% of the total, was used to evoke emotions associated with violence and war. Thus, fear was most common for frequency of emotions, followed by confidence, and then attack/resistance emotions. Concerning Chilton's eight postulates, which can also be categorized as fear or trust motivations, an examination of Table 1 follows. Based on Chilton's presentation, in 59% of the emotions used, the first three arguments produced fear, accounting for 37% of the total. The remaining five arguments, 22% of the total, and were used to evoke confidence.

Finally, Table 3 provides an overview of the emotions President Bush used regarding the Iraq war and terrorism. As can be inferred from Table 2, in the 41% of cases that exceed Chilton's recommendation, The first three arguments, which accounted for 20% of the total, were used to induce fear. The following three arguments, which accounted for 17% of the total, were used to evoke confidence. The final argument, which accounted for 4% of the total, was used to evoke emotions associated with violence and war.

Table 3. The frequency of total applied emotions to Bush's speeches on the Iraq war and terrorism

Prevailing emotions	Number of sentences	Percentage
Fear	282	57%
Confidence	198	39%
Invasion	24	4%
Total	498	100%

As Table 3 shows, 57% of emotions were used to inspire fear, 39% to inspire confidence, and 4% to inspire a fighting spirit. This suggests that Bush primarily presented fear as an indirect way to persuade people to support the war rather than to support the trust of the war. Furthermore, the fact that war emotions were used less than 5% of the time suggests that he is unwilling to use emotions that directly encourage people to go to war. For clarity, examples of emotions listed in Table 2 are given and analyzed below.

A) Instilling fear emotion in people to indirectly persuade them to go to war

Fear of terrorism's possession of WMD (weapons of Mass Destruction):"Saddam Hussein is a homicidal dictator who is addicted to weapons of mass destruction. He has ordered chemical attacks on Iran and on more than forty villages in his own country. These actions killed or injured at least 20,000 people, more than six times the number of people who died in the attacks of September 11".

The assertion that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction (WMD) was the central argument presented by the Bush administration in support of the Iraq. Bush emphasizes this claim in his speech by referencing Iraq's possession of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons as well as specific chemical agents, such as mustard gas. He also mentioned the potential for unscrewed aerial vehicle (UAV) missions targeting the United States. Bush warned that the likely that the victims of these weapons would be the people of the United States, Iraq, and other free nations, aiming to instil fear.He pointed to Saddam's use of these weapons to kill over 20,000 people, as evidence of Iraq's capacity for destruction. By referencing Saddam's use of WMDs against Iran, the United States, and even his own people, Bush sought to evoke fear and justify the threat posed by Iraq. This set the stage for introducing the concept of war as a response to the WMD threat.

The memory of the 11/9 attack: "After seeing the destruction of September 11, we concluded that America could not afford to allow a regime with such a threatening and violent record to remain in the heart of the Middle East".

The Bush administration used indictments to arrest terrorists and identify them as enemies of the United States. President Bush used the evidence of the September 11 terrorist attacks on the United States as an indictment and rationale to propose the idea of a global war on terror. According to the facts, Bush described the horrific crimes of September 11 was defined as the worst kind of crime intended to arouse fear, danger, and a desire for revenge in Americans This refers to the fact that President Bush described the American trauma of September 11, as in "Again." the. brutal attacks", "killing of innocents", "loss of good men and women" and "imminent catastrophe".

Here, President Bush attributed such grave dangers and threats to terrorism, raising awareness of the U.S.'s commitment to the threat of terrorism. They cannot remain silent and have to face such a hostile regime. Implicitly, they suggested that the only way to eliminate this menace was to fight terrorism and defeat the terrorists.

This rhetorical approach was intended to use the collective shock and fear of the American public after the 9/11 attacks to justify and garner support for the administration's decision to launch a global war on terrorism.

B) Instilling confidence emotion in people to indirectly persuade them to go to war

Possessing strong supporter: The United States has strengthened its counterterrorism efforts through increased intelligence sharing, training and assistance to key international partners such as the Philippines, Indonesia, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia. These allies have contributed significantly to the global "war on terror".

President Bush brought in some American supporters to instil confidence in the people, both domestically and internationally. Bush presented the United States as a key partner and ally with well-developed military capabilities. Expressly, he referred to "twenty-five NATO allies," "seventeen partner countries," and "fighter families" as auxiliary American combat partners.

Possessing powerful army: “We will plan carefully, we will act with the full power of the United States military, we will act with allies at our side, and we will prevail”.

To convince his audience that the Iraq War would be won, Bush did double duty by appealing to their fears and confidence. Bush attempted to inspire confidence in his audience throughout his address by boasting about his powerful, brave, and large army. Data analysis supported Bush's assertions about the United States Army, including (A) having the strongest military forces in the world and (B) having defeated the Taliban. C) Drawing on forces from Cold War garrisons D) possessing several and fearless armies prepared to battle E) having a united army with foreign partners.

In the preceding statement, President Bush referred to a formidable army that included the United States Army and its allies, and he offered them the optimism that they would be successful and win the battle. Bush's use of the deontic modality verb "will" was an effort to highlight the capabilities and strength of the United States Army. As a result, Bush was able to instil a sense of self-assurance in his audience, which enabled him to reassure them of triumph and lead them to war.

Possessing developed appliance of war: “We’ve expanded America’s arsenal of unmanned aerial vehicles from fewer than 170 when I took office to more than 6,000 today”.

Claiming that terrorists possessed weapons of mass destruction (WMD) were an essential factor in the Iraq war, as it probably scared Americans of possible losses. To alleviate these concerns, Bush spoke about the capabilities of the United States. The military cites "advanced technologies such as (GPS) Global Positioning System”, "more than 6,000 unmanned aerial vehicles," "Marine Corps First Special Operations Command," and "counterinsurgency capabilities. “Bush tried to prove the accuracy and reliability of this information by providing specific figures and strengthening the American people's trust. Therefore, having such a military force and a capable commander are likely to enhance confidence in the ability to defeat terrorists by convincing more people to support the fight.

C) Instilling Emotions that Directly Persuade American People to Go to War

Invasion and Fighting: “And we fight today because terrorists want to attack our country and kill our citizens, and Iraq is where they are making their stand”.

The results demonstrated that Bush used intellectual and emotional reasons to convince voters to go to war. By recalling the September 11th attack, Bush recommended fighting both to get retribution on those who killed innocent people and to prevent future similar attacks. Other motivations for battling terrorism were ensuring the security of America, Iraq, and other nations.

In the preceding statement, Bush identified the battleground and the opponents of American forces. Because terrorists picked Iraq as a haven to carry out their operations, Bush designated Iraq as the battleground. He also explicitly identified terrorism as the primary target of the struggle. Bush said that fighting in Iraq would ensure the security of America and its innocent people. As a result, the American people saw war as the only viable option for combating terrorism.

5. Conclusion

Analyzing President Bush's speeches reveals the tremendous impact of emotional rhetoric in political communication, especially in war. Drawing on Chilton's emotional theory, this study shows how Bush strategically appealed to fear, security, and loyalty to shape public opinion, gaining support for the Iraq war Results. The finding suggests that a significant portion of Bush's rhetoric was designed to scare off, underscoring the effectiveness of emotional appeals in swaying public opinion at critical moments in history. This research contributes to the study of political language and highlights the importance of understanding the emotional context of politics. As political leaders

continue navigating complex issues, analysts and the public need to recognize the role of emotions in communication in critically analyzing political issues. The researcher determined that he proposed eight dimensions that could cause emotions, fears, or beliefs [7]. This implies that Bush employed a variety of rhetorical devices to creatively frame his audience's emotional response to his policies on the Iraq war and terrorism, in addition to Chilton's original approach. The initial discovery of research was that emotion was a critical strategy in Bush's speech

The study has shown some interesting findings and conclusions about the strategies that Bush applied in his speeches on the Iraq War and terrorism. First, it has been proven that Bush uses emotions during his speeches. Data analysis shows that President Bush used this to instil two dominant emotions: fear and trust. The researcher concluded that all eight arguments proposed by him for evoking emotion can be classified as instilling fear or faith [7]. The duality of fear and trust created a compelling narrative that encouraged citizens to embrace the idea of war as both a necessary and justified response to perceived threats.

This study highlights the importance of understanding the political strategies used by politicians to achieve their goals, especially in times of conflict. Finally, although our current research focuses on Chilton's emotional strategy in President Bush's speeches on the Iraq War and terrorism, there is a clear and urgent need for a more thorough investigation.

REFERENCES

[1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], [10], [11], [12], [13], [14], [15], [16], [17], [18], [19],

[1] R. Wodak and C. What, "is about-a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments, dalam Ruth Wodak & Michael Meyer (eds.), Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis, London: 2001," ed: Sage Publications (1.

[2] G. R. Kress and R. J. Hodge, "Language as ideology," 1979.

[3] N. Fairclough, "Language and Power. 2nd edn. London and New York," ed: Routledge, 2001.

[4] T. A. J. D. Van Dijk and society, "Principles of critical discourse analysis," vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 249-283, 1993.

[5] R. Wodak, R. J. D. De Cillia, and Communication, "Commemorating the past: the discursive construction of official narratives about theRebirth of the Second Austrian Republic'," vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 337-363, 2007.

[6] T. Van Leeuwen, *Discourse and practice: New tools for critical discourse analysis*. Oxford University Press, 2008.

[7] P. Chilton, *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge, 2004.

[8] J. J. O. t. p. o. c. Habermas, "Communicative rationality and the theories of meaning and action," pp. 183-213, 1986.

[9] M. J. B. S. Foucault and H. H. Wheatsheaf, "The subject and power," 1982.

[10] N. Fairclough, *Language and power*. Routledge, 2013.

[11] R. Fowler, *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. Routledge, 2013.

[12] G. Weiss and R. Wodak, *Critical discourse analysis*. Springer, 2007.

[13] W. J. S. Clark, "The Real Reasons for the Upcoming War with Iraq," vol. 20, p. 39, 2003.

[14] J. Hutcheson, D. Domke, A. Billeaudeaux, and P. J. P. C. Garland, "US national identity, political elites, and a patriotic press following September 11," vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 27-50, 2004.

[15] A. L. J. I. J. o. P. S. Wenden, "The politics of representation: A critical discourse analysis of an Aljazeera special report," pp. 89-112, 2005.

[16] S. A. J. Ж. С. ф. у. Г. н. Yu, "New linguistic technologies in modern political discourse," vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 500-507, 2008.

[17] M. B. J. J. o. K. U. H. S. Muhammad, "A Discourse Analysis of Samuel Beckett's" Krapp's Last Tape'," vol. 7, no. 2, 2012.kirkuk University- Humanity Studies

[18] B. J. P. i. p. Fraser and discourse, "Hedging in political discourse," vol. 36, pp. 201-213, 2010.

[19] F. A.-M. Jawad, "A Contrastive Critical Study of Intertextuality in Critical Discourse Analysis and Critical Genre Analysis in Political Discourses," *Kirkuk Journal,* vol. 14, 2024.