

Solidarity, Power and Ideology in Selected Iraqi Political Speeches: A Critical Discourse Analysis

Thaer Farhan Muhammad^{1*}, Ismael F. Hussain AL-Bajjari²

¹ Department of English Language College of Arts/University of Mosul Mosul-Iraq

² (PhD in Linguistics) Head of the Department of English Language College of Education for Humanities

Citation: Muhammad, T. F., & AL-Bajjari, I. F. S. (2025). Solidarity, Power and Ideology in Selected Iraqi Political Speeches: A Critical Discourse Analysis, *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change*, 10(4), 3889-3898. <https://doi.org/10.64753/jcasc.v10i4.3681>

Published: December 26, 2025

ABSTRACT

This study applies Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to examine selected Iraqi political speeches by Abdul Rahim Al-Shammari, Mohammed Shia' Al-Sudani, and Jalal Talabani, exploring how power, solidarity, and ideology intersect in political communication. Using an integrated framework—Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model (1989), Halliday and Matthiessen's Transitivity System (2014), and Quirk et al.'s Modality framework (1985)—the study analyzes how linguistic choices, discourse practices, and sociocultural contexts shape meaning. The research focuses on performative and expressive speech acts—including congratulations, blessings, and welcomes—to assert authority and foster solidarity. Findings show that Iraqi politicians use inclusive and emotionally charged vocabulary, collective pronouns ("we," "our"), and material and relational processes to construct shared identity, present themselves as agents of progress, and reinforce national and regional ideologies. Religious, cultural, and historical references strengthen legitimacy and cultural identity, while appeals to justice and international norms situate Iraq within global political discourse. Overall, the study concludes that Iraqi political discourse strategically blends local cultural values with global ideological currents, using solidarity as both a rhetorical and ideological tool to legitimize authority, promote national cohesion, and project Iraq as an autonomous, globally engaged nation.

Keywords: Solidarity, History of Solidarity, Power, Ideology, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), Iraqi Political Speeches.

INTRODUCTION

The exploration of political discourse within the Iraqi context presents a unique opportunity to understand the interrelations of language, power, and ideology. This research, "Solidarity, Power and Ideology in Selected Iraqi Political Speeches: A Critical Discourse Analysis," seeks to dissect the complex mechanisms through which political language not only reflects but also shapes societal structures and individual perceptions. It posits that political speeches serve as a conduit for the dissemination of ideologies, reinforcing or challenging existing power dynamics and fostering a sense of solidarity among listeners. By applying Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) to a curated selection of speeches, the study aims to uncover the linguistic strategies employed by Iraqi politicians to exert influence and rally support. It investigates how these speeches may reinforce hierarchical structures or serve as a platform for advocating change, thereby playing a pivotal role in the socio-political fabric of Iraq. The thesis further examines the role of cultural and historical references in bolstering the persuasive power of political rhetoric, and how such speeches can act as barometers for the prevailing ideological currents within Iraqi society. In doing so, it contributes to a deeper understanding of the interplay between language and power in a region marked by its rich history and contemporary political evolution. Through this analysis, the thesis

illuminates the ways in which political discourse can both mirror and shape the collective identity and aspirations of a nation.

Statement of the Problem

The research problem centers on the lack of comprehensive Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) frameworks that specifically address how power, solidarity, and ideology interact in Iraqi political discourse. Although Iraqi political speeches are rich in rhetorical and linguistic complexity, there is limited systematic analysis of how they reflect or challenge existing power structures. The role of solidarity—especially in Iraq's post-conflict efforts toward unity and national identity—has also been insufficiently explored. To fill this gap, the study proposes a nuanced analytical model that examines both the linguistic features of political speeches and their broader sociopolitical context. It aims to reveal how ideological stances are constructed and communicated through language, thereby deepening understanding of the relationship between power and solidarity in Iraqi political communication. By analyzing a corpus of contemporary speeches, the research offers new insights into how Iraqi leaders use discourse to shape public opinion and influence policymaking.

Aims of Research In the light of the problem, questions and hypothesis that are raised above the study aims at achieving the following goals:

- 1 Examining how the speaker's lexical choices function to support persuasive strategies and foster solidarity with the audience.
- 2 Analyzing the dominant transitivity patterns in the discourse and evaluate how they contribute rhetorically to the representation of agency, responsibility, and social roles.
- 3 To examine how performative and expressive illocutionary acts—particularly congratulatory messages, welcoming statements, and blessings or wishes—are used in selected Iraqi political speeches to assert authority and foster solidarity.
- 4 Exploring how linguistic features, discourse strategies, and broader sociocultural contexts interact to produce meanings related to power and solidarity in the text.
- 5 Aims about ideology

Research Questions In order to approach the problem objectively and logically, the study asks the following questions:

- 1 How do the speaker's choices of vocabulary contribute to the overall persuasive strategy and the construction of solidarity?
- 2 What is the rhetorical significance of the dominant transitivity processes in the discourse?
- 3 How do the speaker's performative utterances and illocutionary acts function to establish power and solidarity?
- 4 How does the interplay between textual features, discursive practices, and social practices work together to construct a power and solidarity?

Theoretical Framework The current study is limited to applying Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model (1989). With regard to the data, this study is limited to selecting its data from the three most outstanding Iraqi politics; more specifically, three letters of the most prominent and leading figures of Iraq are selected. They are Member of Parliament Abdul Rahim Al-Shammari, Prime Minister Mohammed Shia' Al-Sudani, and the late President of Iraq Jalal Talabani.

Methodology and Data Collection In order to achieve the aims of the present study and verify or refute its hypotheses, the following steps are followed:

- 1 Conducting a comprehensive literature review on CDA, its foundational principles, various approaches, and its application to media language, specifically in the context of solidarity. This review will establish a robust theoretical framework for the analysis.
- 2 Collecting and analyzing data from solidarity political speeches. This involves a detailed examination of the use of language, including rhetorical devices and representations, to directly address the study questions.
- 3 Presenting the results and drawing conclusions to verify the hypotheses set forth in the study. This step includes a detailed discussion of the outcomes, highlighting how the results align with or differ from the anticipated outcomes based on the theoretical framework. Recommendations for further study and implications for the practice of media discourse analysis will also be formulated.

Hypothesis of the Research

As an attempt to answer the above questions, the study sets the following hypothesis:

- 1 The speaker uses inclusive, emotionally charged, and ideologically aligned vocabulary to strengthen persuasive appeals and build a sense of shared identity with the audience
- 2 The speaker predominantly uses material and relational processes to highlight actions and states in a way that positions themselves.

3 Iraqi political speakers utilize a range of solidarity-enhancing performative acts to perform ritualistic and ideologically charged functions.

4 Speakers use religious and collective expressions to build solidarity, invoke international law to assert moral authority, and promote anti-colonial ideologies to challenge dominant global narratives and affirm regional identity.

Solidarity And Power

Solidarity

The notion of solidarity has deep historical and philosophical roots. Etymologically, it derives from the Roman Law of Obligation, *obligatio in solidum* (Bayertz, 1999), and was first employed as a social concept by French philosophers such as Charles Fourier (Stjerno, 2005). Solidarity broadly refers to unity within a group or class, based on shared interests, objectives, or standards (Web source). It gained prominence after the French Revolution, appearing in political discourse, and has been defined as a shared consciousness, experience, or identity (Scholz, 2008). It also encompasses mutual obligations and attachment between individuals, combining factual commonalities with normative duties to aid one another (Bayertz, 1999; Trifunovic, 2012).

Functionally, solidarity motivates individuals to act collectively and strengthens group identity, fostering a sense of equality and common purpose (Wordhaugh & Fuller, 2015). It reflects perceived similarity or like-mindedness between speakers and addressees, influencing linguistic choices, such as social deixis, in communication (Web source 2). Solidarity thus not only represents unity and reciprocity but also serves as a mechanism through which social bonds are enacted and maintained.

The relationship between power and solidarity is complex and intertwined. Power governs asymmetrical relationships, where one participant can control the behavior of another, often based on factors such as wealth, age, physical strength, or institutional role (Brown & Gilman, 1960, 1972). Solidarity, in contrast, characterizes symmetrical relationships, reflecting equality and shared characteristics such as education, profession, or social background. However, as Tannen (1986, 1993, 1994) argues, displays of solidarity inherently entail elements of power, because asserting closeness or similarity constrains independence, while exerting power inherently involves establishing relationships with others.

In discourse, these dynamics are realized through linguistic choices. Nonreciprocal forms of address, such as pronouns, often signal power, whereas reciprocal behaviors and expressions indicate solidarity (Brown & Gilman, 1972; Jaworski, 2009). For instance, French second-person pronouns demonstrate hierarchical differences, while shared language or common social markers signal solidarity. Both dimensions shape the construction of social identities, as participants' actions in communication define and influence the relationships and identities of others within the group (Johnstone, 2008; Jaworski, 2009).

Overall, solidarity and power are two interdependent aspects of social relatedness, constantly interacting in discourse. Solidarity reflects shared identity, mutual recognition, and social cohesion, while power shapes asymmetry, control, and authority. In practice, effective communication often involves balancing these forces: establishing trust and reciprocity while acknowledging hierarchical or structural constraints. The interplay between power and solidarity thus underpins much of human interaction, highlighting the dual role of discourse in creating both social cohesion and social differentiation.

History of Solidarity

The study of speech acts of solidarity in political discourse is grounded in the idea that everyday linguistic norms help explain normative public discourse (Habermas, 1990; Young, 2000). Public speech acts—such as congratulating, wishing, or apologizing—transcend dyadic communication, as they are disseminated through media platforms across political communities. They allow political actors to influence social and moral outcomes, such as mobilizing shame against transgressors or addressing historical injustices, while enabling communities to monitor politicians' ethical and emotional stances (Kampf, 2013; Kampf & Katriel, forthcoming; Augoustinos et al., 2011). Through these acts, ideological struggles emerge, and public discourse may be transformed by challenging or negotiating established norms.

When political actors perform solidarity-oriented acts, they engage in what Goffman (1967) describes as a “ritual game”, signaling concern for others' well-being—even if only ostensibly (Clark, 1996). These acts consolidate communities by publicly demonstrating shared feelings, creating community-level solidarity (Clark & Carlson, 1982).

Solidarity acts also have important moral and communicative functions. Greetings, for example, acknowledge the subjectivity of others and foster trust, respect, and discursive equality (Young, 2000). They establish a ritual equilibrium (Goffman, 1967), counter aggressive or face-threatening communication (Durnati, 1997; Brown & Levinson, 1987), and initiate alternative discourses grounded in fundamental human solidarity. In political contexts,

such acts can facilitate negotiation, conflict resolution, and broader processes of political transformation (Young, 2000).

Power

The notion of power is generally defined as the ability of one individual or group to control the behavior of others (Brown & Gilman, 1960, p. 255). Power is non-reciprocal, meaning that only those with power can influence less powerful individuals, not vice versa (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Key factors shaping power in interaction include social distance, relative status, and the degree of imposition involved.

Analyzing power through CDA involves examining how dominant groups use text and talk to maintain control and reproduce social hierarchies. This includes understanding how discourse shapes behavior and cognition, reflecting and reinforcing both material and ideological forms of power (van Dijk, 1996). By studying these dynamics, CDA provides insights into the mechanisms through which social influence is exercised, contested, and maintained.

Ideology

The term “ideology”, first introduced by the French philosopher Destutt de Tracy in the 18th century, refers to the collective political, social, or religious beliefs embraced by groups or movements. Examples include communism, liberalism, feminism, pacifism, racism, and others. Individuals adhering to an ideology follow a set of principles that guide their social behavior, interpret contemporary events, and shape their worldview (van Dijk, 2004).

Language plays a crucial role in ideology. It organizes social life, represents objects, assigns roles, and becomes a platform for conflicting viewpoints with ideological implications (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). While early studies in sociology, political science, and linguistics often overlooked language’s role, discourse-oriented linguistics has highlighted its importance in shaping and communicating ideologies (Wodak, 1989).

Eagleton (1991) identifies multiple interpretations of ideology, focusing on social and political hegemony, though no universally accepted definition exists. He defines ideology broadly as the process by which ideas, beliefs, and values are produced in society and more narrowly as the concepts and convictions that reflect the experiences of socially significant groups. Ideology, therefore, represents the ways society has historically functioned.

METHODOLOGY AND DATA COLLECTION (DETAILED)

Model of Analysis

The study adopts Fairclough’s three-stage CDA framework (1989)—Description, Interpretation, and Explanation—to analyze solidarity, power, and ideology in Iraqi political speeches. In the Description Stage, vocabulary, grammar, and rhetorical strategies (e.g., pronouns, repetition, humour, modalities) are analyzed to show how language constructs solidarity and authority. Grammar is examined using Halliday and Matthiessen’s transitivity system (2014), and modality is assessed via Quirk et al. (1985) to reveal expressions of obligation, possibility, and prediction.

The Interpretation Stage links textual features to socio-political contexts. Using Fairclough’s situational framework and categorizing speech acts as past-, present-, or future-oriented, the analysis shows how Iraqi politicians maintain alliances, manage tensions, and foster national cohesion. In the Explanation Stage, discourse is situated within broader ideological and power structures. Ideology legitimizes dominance, and power naturalizes it. This stage reveals how Iraqi political discourse shapes public perception, justifies authority, and advances specific worldviews, providing a coherent method to study solidarity, power, and ideology.

Description Stage

This stage focuses on selective textual analysis (Fairclough, 1989), primarily examining vocabulary and grammar to maintain the descriptive phase of CDA.

Vocabulary

Vocabulary is analyzed using Fairclough’s CDA framework, integrated with linguistic strategies from the Journal of Nusantara Studies (2020). This approach examines how language constructs and legitimizes social relations, identities, and ideologies through lexical choices carrying experiential, relational, and expressive values. Key linguistic strategies include collective expressions, personal pronouns, repetition, soft directives, modalities, humour, rhetorical questions, and literary devices. These encode power dynamics, solidarity, persuasion, and ideology. For example, collective pronouns (“we”, “our”) foster unity, while modal verbs (“must”, “should”)

express obligation and shared responsibility. Rhetorical questions and humour convey expressive values and engage audiences emotionally and ideologically.

Mapping these strategies onto Fairclough's framework allows systematic analysis of how solidarity and authority are constructed in political speeches, helping to explain collective identity formation and ideological positioning.

Fairclough's vocabulary analysis focuses on:

- Experiential values: How words, classifications, or metaphors represent the world.
- Relational values: How language positions the speaker in relation to the audience (power, solidarity).
- Expressive values: Judgments, stances, or values conveyed.
- Metaphors: Conceptualization of events or actions.

Linguistic Strategy	Fairclough's Vocabulary Element(s)	Explanation
Collective expressions	Relational & Experiential	Use of we, us, our fosters solidarity, inclusivity—positioning the speaker as "one of us" (minimizing power distance). Also constructs a social reality of "togetherness" in response to crisis.
Personal pronouns (I, He)	Expressive & Relational	"I" shows personal reflection and credibility; "He" (referring to God) invokes religious authority. These create an emotional tone and position the speaker as both relatable and spiritually grounded.
Repetitions	Expressive & Emphasis (linked to Relational)	Intensifiers that reinforce key messages or values (e.g., hope, unity), also contribute to persuasion through rhythm and emphasis.
Soft directives	Relational & Expressive	Gentle commands or suggestions that lower the sense of imposition but still guide behavior, often used to maintain authority without appearing coercive.
Literary expressions	Experiential & Expressive	Use of idioms and metaphors to dramatize or emphasize ideas (e.g., "no stone was left unturned"), shaping how events are understood emotionally.
Advice	Relational & Expressive	Positions the speaker as caring and authoritative; suggests best practices in a non-threatening tone.
Light sarcasm / Humour	Relational & Expressive	Builds rapport or distances from opposition (naysayers), a subtle way of asserting dominance or critique while appearing light-hearted.
Modalities (must, should)	Relational & Experiential	Directs behavior using modal verbs, projecting necessity and obligation (often used by authorities or leaders).
Questions (esp. rhetorical)	Expressive & Relational	Invite agreement, reflection, or solidarity—commonly used to engage the audience and promote critical thinking or emotional alignment.

Grammar

Two grammatical features, transitivity and modality, are analyzed in the texts, as emphasized by Fairclough (1992, 2003). These features focus on clause-level grammar and its role in meaning-making.

Transitivity

Transitivity, according to Fairclough (1992), relates to the ideational meaning of clauses, helping reveal political, social, cultural, and ideological aspects of discourse. It identifies "who does what to whom" (Teo, 2000), highlighting agency and how actions are attributed to participants. Fairclough's approach, informed by Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), emphasizes features such as passivization and agentivity (Baker et al., 2008).

This study follows Halliday and Matthiessen's (2014) model, which defines three experiential components of a clause:

- Participant: who is involved in the action
- Process: the action itself
- Circumstance: conditions of the action

The analysis focuses on central elements—participants and processes—especially the frequency of processes involving "man." Halliday and Matthiessen categorize processes into principal (material, mental, relational) and subsidiary (behavioural, verbal, existential), with each process type linked to specific participant roles, as summarized in the table below:

Process type	Category meaning	Participants, directly involved	Participants, obliquely involved
Material:	'doing'	Actor, Goal	Recipient, Client;
Action	'doing'		Scope; Initiator;
Event	'happening'		Attribute
Behavioural	'behaving'	Behaver	Behaviour
Mental:	'sensing'	Senser, Phenomenon	Inducer
Perception	'seeing'		
Cognition	'thinking'		
Desideration	'wanting'		
Emotion	'feeling'		
Verbal	'saying'	Sayer, Target	Receiver; Verbiage
Relational:	'being'		
Attribution	'attributing'	Carrier, Attribute	Attributor, Beneficiary
Identification	'identifying'	Identified, Identifier;	Assigner
	Token, Value		
Existential	'existing'	Existent	

The table above is followed in the transitivity analysis of both texts under study in the next chapter for identifying the processes that 'man' participates in and the roles he attends in each.

Modality

Modality, the second grammatical component in the description stage, relates to the interpersonal function of language, showing how social relationships are expressed in clauses (Fairclough, 1992). It examines how speakers indicate their stance toward other participants. For English texts, this study follows Quirk et al. (1985), defining modality as how a speaker expresses the probability or necessity of a proposition through modal verbs. They categorize meanings into:

- Social constraints: permission, obligation, volition
- Speaker judgment: possibility, necessity, prediction

For Arabic texts, Khalil (1999) is used, mapping English modal verbs to their Arabic equivalents and meanings. The analysis investigates the frequency of modal verbs to understand interpersonal and ideological aspects of the discourse.

Interpretation Stage

The interpretation stage links textual analysis to ideologies and social context (Fairclough, 1989). It integrates the text with the interpreter's members' resources (MR)—linguistic and non-linguistic knowledge shaped by social and ideological factors—to understand relations of language, power, and ideology. After analyzing vocabulary and grammar, attention shifts to the situational context and speech acts, connecting the text to its broader social setting.

Situational Context

Situational context is examined through four questions (Fairclough, 1989):

- 1 What's going on? – the topic, purpose, and activity of the situation
- 2 Who's involved? – participants in the discourse
- 3 In what relations? – power and social relations among participants
- 4 What's the role of language? – how the text functions within the situation

This framework links textual features to the social and political context, enabling analysis of power, solidarity, and ideological positioning in discourse.

Speech Acts

When dealing with speech acts (henceforth, SAs), Fairclough (1989: 9), states that the notion of uttering as acting represents a significant thing in the interpretation of a text, and is central to CDA in regard to the claim that discourse is social practice. He (*ibid.*: 155) adds that they are concerned with the sense participants assign to components of a discourse by means of their MR and with the interpretations of the situation.

Past-Oriented Acts of Solidarity

Past-oriented congratulatory acts involve expressing pleasure for events or achievements that occurred in the past (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985; Wierzbicka, 1987). These acts are often ritualized, and may be ostensible, such as political losers congratulating election winners, where the act follows social norms rather than sincere emotion (Clark, 1996; Corcoran, 1994). Categories of past-oriented acts:

- 1 Winning an election: Congratulatory messages in concession speeches to newly elected officials.
- 2 Nominations: Congratulations to newly appointed public figures in political or professional roles, often from predecessors, nominators, or subordinates.
- 3 End of ordeal: Celebrating the resolution of hardships, such as political figures being exonerated by courts.
- 4 Achievements: Recognition of impressive accomplishments by non-political actors (e.g., athletes, scientists), often framed as national pride.

Welcoming actions acknowledge the positive outcomes of others' actions or decisions, emphasizing support rather than focusing on human agents:

- 1 Agreements: Supporting negotiated settlements or pacts.
- 2 Decisions: Praising political or judicial rulings.
- 3 Statements and pronouncements: Welcoming public declarations or speeches.

Present-Oriented Acts of Solidarity

Greeting and welcoming are expressive acts showing pleasure at others' presence (Wierzbicka, 1987). Unlike past-oriented acts, they occur in the present, sometimes accompanied by future-oriented wishes. They enhance solidarity by recognizing the autonomy of others, asserting equality, and establishing trust (Duranti, 1997; Young, 2000; Papson, 1986). Categories:

- Seasonal greetings: Best wishes exchanged during national or religious holidays.
- Ceremonial greetings: Formal welcomes for high-status individuals at official events (Duranti, 1997).

Future-Oriented Acts of Solidarity

Blessing and wishing are future-oriented acts that forecast good outcomes for others.

- Blessing: A declarative act in religious contexts invoking divine favor (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985; Bruder, 1998).
- Wishing: A secular, expressive act predicting beneficial events without assuming self-fulfillment (Wierzbicka, 1987).

Both forms project solidarity by hoping for success or good fortune in areas such as elections, achievements, or positive decisions.

Religious And Secular Future-Oriented Acts

Religious blessings are offered by certified authorities, such as rabbis, to public figures during events like medical procedures, elections, or high-ranking appointments, enhancing legitimacy and support. Secular wishes often accompany past- and present-oriented acts, appearing in congratulatory messages and ceremonial or seasonal greetings, projecting goodwill and solidarity.

Explanation Stage

The Explanation Stage links discourse to its social context and effects (Fairclough, 1989). It examines how texts reflect ideology and power, either as outcomes of past struggles or as instruments shaping future social relations. Ideology and power are interrelated: ideology is a major mode of power, while power is ideologically rooted.

Ideology

Ideology represents shared worldviews that establish and maintain relations of power, domination, and exploitation, embedded within the texts.

Power

Power refers to the ability of dominant individuals or groups to instill their social and political ideologies through discourse, making them appear universal or commonsense (Fairclough, 1989). Analysis focuses on authority and source within the texts.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of the three speeches reveals both shared strategies and contextual differences in constructing identity, solidarity, and ideology. All texts employ collective pronouns (“we,” “our,” “us”) to foster unity, while limited use of “I” humanizes the speaker without undermining the collective voice. Repetition, soft directives, modal verbs (“must,” “shall”), and metaphors enhance emotional and ideological resonance: Mosul as Iraq’s “beating heart,” Gaza as a moral test, and Iraq as a “phoenix rising from the ashes.” Despite these shared linguistic tools, each speech pursues distinct aims: regional restoration (Text 1), transnational moral advocacy (Text 2), and national legitimacy and democratic identity-building (Text 3).

Transitivity analysis shows a focus on Material Processes, emphasizing agency and action. Text 1 (35.7%) frames collective reconstruction efforts, Text 2 (30%) highlights moral resistance against oppression, and Text 3 (40%) emphasizes Iraq’s proactive democratic transformation. Relational processes (28–30%) define identities, while Mental processes (20–30%) encourage emotional alignment. Verbal processes maintain engagement and ethical appeals, whereas Behavioral and Existential processes are absent, reflecting an active, forward-looking discourse strategy.

Situational and speech act analysis reveals context-specific rhetorical strategies. Text 1 centers on Mosul’s suffering, combining moral appeals and inclusive language to mobilize national solidarity. Text 2 asserts moral authority internationally, using emotionally charged language, religious references, and delegitimizing opponents to frame the Palestinian cause. Text 3 balances acknowledgment of past suffering with future-oriented optimism, constructing Iraq as a credible democratic actor in global diplomacy. Across all texts, speakers rely on soft power—emotive appeals, shared values, and strategic framing—rather than coercion. Ideological undercurrents are evident: nationalism and religious duty in Text 1, moral-religious advocacy in Text 2, and democratic renewal against extremism in Text 3.

Overall, the analysis demonstrates how linguistic choices, shaped by context and ideology, systematically construct solidarity, assert power, and guide public sentiment to support political and moral agendas.

CONCLUSIONS Based on the analysis, the following conclusions are drawn:

1 **Shared Rhetorical Strategies with Contextual Variation** All three speeches employ collective pronouns (“we,” “our,” “us”) to construct unity and shared identity. However, their functions differ: in Text 1 they promote regional restoration, in Text 2 transnational solidarity, and in Text 3 democratic nation-building.

2 **Repetition and Ideologically Charged Vocabulary** Repetition reinforces ideological meaning across the speeches. Words like “Mosul” evoke resilience, “occupation” and “massacre” highlight injustice, while “freedom” and “democracy” signal transformation—illustrating language’s strategic role in shaping ideological alignment.

3 **Transitivity as a Marker of Agency and Power** Material processes dominate all texts, emphasizing action-oriented discourse: rebuilding in Text 1, resistance in Text 2, and reform in Text 3. Relational and mental processes reveal identity formation and emotional engagement, while the limited use of behavioral and existential processes underscores a focus on purposeful, agentive expression.

4 **Metaphorical and Modal Expressions Reinforce Moral Authority** Metaphors such as “Mosul as the jewel,” “Gaza as a test,” and “Iraq as a phoenix” enrich symbolic meaning. Modal verbs like “must” and “shall” express urgency and ethical responsibility, guiding audiences toward ideological commitment without coercion.

5 **Speech Acts as Tools of Soft Power** Rather than employing coercive language, the speakers rely on emotive and ethical appeals. Acts of gratitude, solidarity, and moral exhortation mobilize public sentiment and strengthen political legitimacy.

6 **Ideological Discourses Reflect Political Objectives** Each speech reflects a distinct ideological stance: national unity and faith-based identity in Text 1, justice and resistance in Text 2, and democratic reform with global engagement in Text 3. These ideologies are linguistically constructed to align with each speaker’s political and cultural agenda.

REFERENCES

- Augoustinos, M., Hastie, B., & Wright, M. (2011). Apologies in political discourse: The case of Kevin Rudd’s apology to the Stolen Generations. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 63(1), 75–85. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-9536.2011.00010.x>
- Baker, P., Gabrielatos, C., KhosraviNik, M., Krzyżanowski, M., McEnery, T., & Wodak, R. (2008). A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press. *Discourse & Society*, 19(3), 273–306. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926508088962>
- Bayertz, K. (1999). *Solidarity*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Bloor, M., & Bloor, T. (2007). *The practice of critical discourse analysis: An introduction*. Hodder Education.
- Bloormert, M. (2005). *Power and inequality in discourse*. Routledge.
- Brown, P., & Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in language* (pp. 253–276). MIT Press.
- Brown, P., & Gilman, A. (1972). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 252–282). Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bruder, M. (1998). Speech acts of blessing: Religious discourse and performativity. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30(3), 337–357.
- Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, H. H., & Carlson, T. B. (1982). Hearers and speech acts. *Language*, 58(2), 332–373.
- Corcoran, P. (1994). Presidential concessions: The rhetoric of defeat. *Political Communication*, 11(2), 109–128.
- Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An introduction*. Verso.
- 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., Mulderrig, J., & Wodak, R. (2011). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (pp. 357–378). Sage.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (Vol. 2, pp. 258–284). Sage.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. Doubleday.
- Habermas, J. (1990). *Moral consciousness and communicative action*. MIT Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday’s introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Hart, C. (2011). *Critical discourse analysis and cognitive science: New perspectives on immigration discourse*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jaworski, A. (2009). *Sociolinguistics: A reader and coursebook*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publishing.
- Kampf, Z. (2013). Apologies in the Israeli political arena: Face-saving, face-threatening, and face-constituting acts. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 12(1), 21–42.
- Kampf, Z., & Katriel, T. (forthcoming). *Solidarity in political communication*. Oxford University Press.

- Khalil, E. (1999). *A contrastive grammar of English and Arabic*. Jordan Book Centre.
- Klenke, K. (2008). *Qualitative research in the study of leadership*. Emerald Group Publishing.
- Machin, D., & Mayr, A. (2012). *How to do critical discourse analysis: A multimodal introduction*. Sage.
- Meyer, M. (2001). Between theory, method, and politics: Positioning of the approaches to CDA. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 14–31). Sage.
- Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse analysis: An introduction*. Continuum.
- Papson, S. (1986). Ritual and political communication. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, 1(3), 335–353.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. Longman.
- Scholz, S. J. (2008). *Political solidarity*. Penn State University Press.
- Searle, J. R., & Vanderveken, D. (1985). *Foundations of illocutionary logic*. Cambridge University Press.
- Stjernø, S. (2005). *Solidarity in Europe: The history of an idea*. Cambridge University Press.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1997). *Grounded theory in practice*. Sage.
- Teo, P. (2000). Racism in the news: A critical discourse analysis of news reporting in two Australian newspapers. *Discourse & Society*, 11(1), 7–49.
- Trifunovic, D. (2012). Solidarity and social cohesion: Theoretical perspectives. *Sociological Review*, 41(3), 221–234.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1996). Discourse, power and access. In C. R. Caldas-Coulthard & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis* (pp. 84–104). Routledge.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2004). *Ideology and discourse: A multidisciplinary introduction*. Pompeu Fabra University.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2015). Critical discourse studies: A sociocognitive approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (3rd ed., pp. 63–84). Sage.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1987). *English speech act verbs: A semantic dictionary*. Academic Press.
- Wodak, R. (1989). *Language, power and ideology: Studies in political discourse*. John Benjamins.
- Wordhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. (2015). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (7th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Young, I. M. (2000). *Inclusion and democracy*. Oxford University Press.