

Received on (16-05-2022) Accepted on (18-06-2022)

<https://doi.org/10.33976/IUGJHR.30.4/2022/8>

Selected Erdogan's Speeches to the Islamic World: A Pragma-Dialectic Analysis

Prof. Khader Khader^{*1}, Mr. Moutaz Ismail^{*2}

Department of English, Islamic University of Gaza, Gaza Strip, State of Palestine^{*1,2}

*Corresponding Author: moutazmoh1988@gmail.com

Abstract:

Erdogan's role has become apparent and influential in the Middle East with great popularity from the Arab public. This is due to his professional and inspirational use of political speech with solid arguments used by Erdogan in his speeches. The arguments succeeded to convince his audience to achieve some political goals regionally and globally. Therefore, there is a need to investigate this phenomenon to learn how political speeches are built and how politicians use a lot of arguments. The arguments are structured in a way to convince the audience regardless of their objectives and intentions. The pragma-dialectic model is based on arguments and the use of rhetoric devices in the speeches. It categorizes the stages of arguments and defines the rhetoric devices into three categories managing to obtain the audience sympathy to his ideas to direct them to keep paying attention and sympathy to the issues of the Islamic world. Erdogan has a very professional use of arguments to persuade his audience built on an argumentative way.

Keywords: argumentation theory, rhetoric devices, pragma-dialectic, discourse analysis, political discourse.

خطابات أردوغان الى العالم الاسلامي: تحليل جدلي تداولي

المخلص:

أخذ دور أردوغان يأخذ شكلا واضحا وفعالا في الشرق الأوسط وبدعم كبير من الجمهور العربي وذلك نتيجة خطابه المحترفة المدعمة بجدليات قوية كان يستخدمها أردوغان في خطابه. حيث نجحت هذه الخطابات في اقناع عدد كبير من الجمهور وساعدت تركيا في بعض من اهدافها السياسية على الصعيد الاقليمي والدولي. وعليه هناك حاجة ماسة لدراسة هذه الظاهرة للتعليم منها بنية الخطابات السياسية وكيفية استخدام السياسيين للكثير من الجدليات المنظمة والمركبة بطريقة تقنع الجمهور بما هو مطلوب بغض النظر عن أهدافهم و نواياهم. و تركز الجدلية التداولية على النقاشات والادوات البلاغية في الخطابات. لذلك تصنف الدراسة مراحل النقاشات وتعرف أيضا أدوات البلاغة في ثلاث تصنيفات لتجعل الخطابات مفهومة بشكل أفضل. وقد توصل الباحث الى أن أردوغان بارع في استخدام النقاشات لاقتناع جمهوره والتي هي مبنية على طريقة جدلية. ونجحت الأدوات البلاغية في كسب تعاطف الجمهور لأفكار المتحدث من خلال ثلاثة مصطلحات مثل الأخلاقيات والتفخيم الدرامي والعقلانية. ونجح استخدام المصطلحات لمواصلة جذب انتباه الجمهور وتعاطفه لقضايا العالم الاسلامي وتسليط الضوء على الظلم الممارس على المسلمين في جميع أنحاء العالم.

كلمات مفتاحية: النظرية الجدلية، الادوات البلاغية، الجدلية التداولية، تحليل الخطاب، الخطاب السياسي.

1. Introduction

The political history of Turkey has gone through many different stages that have ups and downs of the Turks in terms of politics and economy. Turkey's historical stages until the emergence of Erdogan and the transformation accomplished by him put Turkey back into the leading countries of the world. The Republic of Turkey is a country that has great glory and a long history as it once was one of the strongest empires on the globe. This Muslim country represented an Islamic symbol for Muslims all over the world as it was previously the Islamic succession Caliphate. Therefore, Turkey is so far regarded as the greatest Islamic country that has dominated a wide area of this world for more than 400 years. After the downfall of the Islamic Caliphate, many presidents got control of Turkey. The majority of them were officials in the Turkish army. As a result, the position of the Republic of Turkey retracted largely at all levels whether at the political, economic, cultural, and social levels. Many military coups happened in Turkey as attempts to overtake control as a result of competition between the Islamists and military leaders. Such political swings have heavily affected Turkish stability and made her lose its political and economic presence internationally and regionally. However, there were many attempts for the awakening of Turkey, one of these steps was the success of democratic elections in 1992, and Najim El-din Arbakan won the position of prime minister. He took many tangible steps toward developing Turkey at all levels. Unfortunately, a military coup was called out against Arbakan and democratic life retreated from Turkey. This resulted in ending the democracy in Turkey and consequently the wheel of development did not progress at all under the military regime.

The attempts to revive democratic life in Turkey continued. One of the most successful steps toward a new rising was when Rajab Tayyeb Erdogan was the head of Istanbul municipality who achieved unprecedented accomplishments for Istanbul. Then, he established a new party which led him to win the elections in 2003 and became the prime minister of Turkey. In the same context, Rajab Tayyeb Erdogan, who is the current president of the Republic of Turkey, took office in 2014 to find a legacy of a complicated political situation between Turkey and the Islamic world. Starting from the Palestinian cause, his perspective toward Arab revolutions and spring, also his opinion about the American and European escalation against Iran. All these factors have resulted in increasing hatred or even an anti-Turkish attitude from the American administration, the Western world, and Israel.

Erdogan has become popular among the Muslim leaders all over the Islamic world as he achieved a breakthrough in many areas in Turkey such as economic, diplomatic, social, and cultural levels. Also, Erdogan strongly supported the Palestinian issues and defended the Palestinian legitimate rights. Moreover, Erdogan boldly condemned the Israeli massacres against the Palestinian people. Furthermore, he supported the Arab spring and powerfully tried to strengthen the Arab relations with Turkey at all levels. He also opposes any military coups that are happening at the moment in Libya by supporting the internationally recognized government against Khalifa Haftar, a retired military general, who dreams to ascend to the throne by force. In short, he started to engage politically in the region changing the Turkish theory of international relation, zero-enemy, into a regional player.

Similarly, El-Haj (2017) considered Erdogan as a symbol of humanity and principles in this materialistic world. He isn't only a president of Turkey, but also, he is a leader for the Arab and Islamic world. He proved that he is a humble man and he accomplished great gains for his country. Erdogan supported not only the Palestinian issue but all Muslim issues like Rohingya, Libyans and

Muslim minorities all over the world. He didn't give a blind eye to the ongoing oppression facing all poor Muslims all over the world. Moreover, his attitudes toward the various issues of the Arab and Islamic world showed his sincere belonging to his Islamic identity.

It is believed that Erdogan becomes a model not only in politics but also at economic and cultural levels. Erdogan, as a political leader, has many persuasion strategies to affect Muslims in theory and practice as he supports and still in favour of all Muslim issues especially the first issue for all Muslims that is the Palestinian issue. Erdogan is also a humanitarian leader who is in favour of Muslim minorities all over the world like in China, Myanmar through supporting them diplomatically in the international assemblies and collaborate internationally with super powers to put many efforts into ending their misery. The engagement in the regional issues like Syria and the problem of refugees, the fierce defying of the concept of Islamophobia and the clear support of Gazans is a good proof for a need for a study that reveals the facts related to the political life of Erdogan and his discourse toward the Islamic world and its issues. It is believed that this study may spotlight the rhetoric of Erdogan and the persuasion strategies included in his speeches that increase his popularity among Muslims all over the world. Erdogan made Turkey an influential country by the practical and amazing achievements in all fields of Turkish life .

Erdogan is always defending the religion of Islam and stands firmly against the West and its terms used to describe Islam by showing the true culture of Muslims to fight the stereotypes made on Islam. He was also very sure to discuss the sensitive issues related to Islam and terrorism through selecting very appropriately chosen words that allow him to maneuver from point to point smoothly without falling into semantic problems. The issues of Kashmir, the mass killing of the Rohingya minority in Myanmar, and Muslims all over the world are the main components of Erdogan's international speeches like in the United Nations assembly and Davos conference discussing them in the light of human rights and international law violations. Moreover, his last support to Palestine in general and Gaza, in particular, has indulged him in political and diplomatic differences with what-so-called Israel because of the Marmara convoy, which ended with killing some Turkish innocents and eventually led to a politically problematic situation between the two parties.

Political discourse analysis is the study of political writings and speeches and these can be written by a single person or by a group of people, but they must be about the same event or topic. In general, such study does not include real political acts committed unless the political discourse analysis is designed to correlate talk with action. The analyses' goal is to better comprehend political ideas. It is also the study of all types of written and spoken language. Indeed, political discourse analysis is a multi-disciplinary field of study that focuses on the linguistic and discursive features of political text and speaking, as well as the political nature of discursive practice.

Based on the above-mentioned conclusions, the researcher believes Erdogan is considered a skillful public speaker and exceptional orator. He was able to gain people's support and won many times as a prime minister and finally as president of Turkey. He received such support due to his rhetoric, charisma, and intelligence. All these criteria are present in all of his speeches nationally and internationally. It is known that Erdogan has a very good repertoire of language use which can be seen in all of his speeches. He is always very careful about his use of verbal and nonverbal cues.

Objectives of the Study:

- Identify Erdogan's strategies of persuasion and attitude to the Islamic world that are introduced and defended.
- Detect the most important rhetorical devices used in Erdogan's political speeches .
- Show the importance of applying pragma dialectic analysis in the political discourse.
- Investigate and interpret Erdogan's international speeches to reveal how he can establish rapport with the Muslim world.

1. Main Questions of the Study:

- a. What argumentation stages has Erdogan used to introduce and defend his discourse to the Islamic world?
- b. What are the linguistic and rhetoric devices used in the speeches?
- c. What are persuasion strategies does Erdogan use to persuade his audience of the validity of his views ?
- d. How is skillful Erdogan in addressing the Islamic nations and building rapport with the Islamic world through his discourse?

2. Importance Of the Research:

This research paper is built on a master thesis which discusses political discourse analysis. This field is crucial, it is still an undiscovered area for linguistic investigation. The current study tries this kind of investigation in terms of how argumentation achieves political goals and defended against the background of the political communicative situation of the three speeches making up the data. This analysis will be beneficial for both linguists and politicians to understand the major and minor constituents of the political speeches and strategies to achieve political goals. This study also shows the professional utilization of words in certain linguistic positions, which allow the speaker to manoeuvre linguistically so that he can avoid falling into political problems.

3. Literature Review:

Many scholars have done attempts to present a definition of discourse, originally Latin *discursus*, which means speech. Some argue that discourse is a reference to a language form for speaking that is used in a spoken event. Wodak and Ludwig (1999) think that there is an interrelation between language and society which affects both of them. Discourse, as a term, is used differently by others who go to define it as the methods in which language is used socially to convey more comprehensive historical meanings and are identified by the social conditions of its usage. Discourse is also defined as the relation between the speaker and the hearer in terms of background as Bloor and Bloor (2013) discussed that discourse analysis can encompass matters such as context, background information, or knowledge shared between a speaker and listener. Therefore, discourse is about social event and the language use to convey meaning the speaker wants to convince the hearer of. The certain use of language features is not neutral and it is in favour of the speaker's arguments and points of view .

Discourse analysis is a branch of science to investigate spoken language and its social meaning. The goal is to see the use of language in daily contexts. In fact, it examines the mechanism of using language in different social domains and used to describe the spoken and written forms of language. Taylor (2013) stated that discourse analysis is a social phenomenon that transcends the individual. Also, Paltridge (2012) argued that the distribution of language features and the manner in which they produce dialogue in the texts. It studies the production of the language and its style to reveal the message, and of course, the style has many features that can convey the meaning directly or indirectly.

In their study, Mohammed & Zefresky (2011) highlighted that building up argumentative discourse on supporting standpoints and their connections with their sub-standpoints makes the political speech easier and more understandable. They also asserted on the idea that particular arrangement of argumentative moves is important in drawing the overall analysis of the political speech. Pragma-dialect analysis suggests a good analytical framework for argumentation modelled on a critical discussion.

Van Eemeren & Grootendorst (1987) discussed that the primary distinction between pragma-dialectical rules and production rules is that the latter are defined as criteria for resolving disagreements rather than as production rules for developing logical arguments. Each pragma-

dialectical rule relates to a required condition for settling a disagreement. Only following all of the regulations is a sufficient criterion. A second distinction is that pragma-dialectical norms are concerned with the performance of speech acts in the various phases of a critical conversation aimed at resolving a difference of opinion rather than the employment of logical constants in a formal dialogue. The pragma-dialectical theory encompasses all parts of a critical dialogue, not only the logical ones. Therefore, pragma-dialectic analysis can be considered as analytical criteria for any political discourse which defends some standpoints.

Political discourse Analysis

Politics and language are interconnected since language is used to manipulate thoughts and sometimes to defend the undefended. Orwell (2021) argued in his book (Politics and the English Language) that political speech and writing are to defend things that cannot be defended. Therefore, language is an effective weapon that can be used to defend ideologies and cause to stand firmly against injustices. A well-written speech full of meanings and persuasive style could be a winning weapon in the arena of international assemblies and may change international politics in the favour of the oppressed people. It is also stressed that political action is greatly influenced by the language as P. Chilton and Schäffner (2011,1) argued that any political action is set, put together, measured and affected by language. Moreover, other verbs are used to describe the relation between political action and language, such as "guided, explained, justified, evaluated, and criticized". However, it is the goal of this linguistic coercion or control that distinguishes political speech as a distinct topic of linguistic analysis. In fact, analysing political discourse entails looking at how rhetoric is used to accomplish political aims such as spreading new policies and decisions, enacting new legislation, or reaching out to an audience for consensus.

Discourses addressed to the Islamic World

Erdogan was not the only political figure who addressed the Islamic world and discussed its issues including the Palestinian cause. Barak Obama, the ex-president of the U.S., in his visit to Egypt addressed the Islamic world by delivering a speech that discussed all Muslim world problems reviewing the significant relations between the two parties.

Moreover, many Muslim presidents address the problems of the Islamic world and highlight the issues and dilemmas that face the Muslim nation. Mahathir Mohamad, the Malaysian Prime Minister, argued that the Muslim world is living in a chaotic situation and asked for "applicable" solutions during a summit of Muslim countries. He commented on many issues calling for putting an end to such crises since the world lives in the 21st century should not commit wrong practices like genocide and mass killing. Mahathir also stressed the point that the creation of Israel and the suffering of the Palestinians considering Israel as a source of all problems in the Middle East. Israel violated all international and humanitarian laws by committing crimes against humanity in the last two wars on Gaza. Another issue he also mentioned is the atrocity against Rohingya minority in Myanmar and the blind-eye policy towards the crimes against human rights with a very negative international response towards it. Also, Imran Khan, the Pakistani prime minister, talked about the concept of Islamic terrorism and the double criteria policy used by the west towards the Islamic world. Such a policy does not support the concepts like justice, peace, and humanity to preserve the international order and maintain stability in the region. Moreover, Imran asked for reconciliation between Arab Muslim countries starting with Saudi Arabia to put an end to the current differences. Van Eemeren and Houtlosser (2005) found that the pragma-dialectical approach to argumentation's purpose is to give a comprehensive combination of both dialectics Language pragmatics - the study of language as it is used in actual communication and critical exchange studies. It is a combination of the reasonability of arguments along with a series of spoken moves that constitute the arguments. Therefore, pragma-dialects model is a mixture of dialectics and their meanings, pragmatics, in order to reach a reasonable argumentation of a certain topic. In order to achieve this in an argumentative

discourse, there are moves that have to be made so that the speaker can captivate the audience's attention. These moves are speech acts, and each one of them has a role in the social context. That is, F. H. van Eemeren and Houtlosser (2005) explained that pragma-dialectical is made to attain the combination of normative and descriptive perception.

Levinson (1983) defined pragmatics is the study of utilizing proper language in appropriate settings. That is to say, humans have a language-based communication system. Modern linguistics is the name given to the study of this language. Pragmatics is a discipline of linguistics that studies the perspectives of language users. Speakers must pick what to say in various situations in order to seem suitable from their perspective. Pragmatics also impacts the challenges encountered by language users while participating in social situations. It may also be used to investigate how the speakers' choice of language influences the addressees when they communicate.

Leech and Thomas (1989) concluded that pragmatics as A study of what linguistic utterances mean to the users of those utterances and their interpreters. Despite the fact that it deserves greater attention, pragmatics has been overshadowed by the other two words. Knowing the real world has an impact on how we use and understand words, according to pragmatics. Furthermore, it demonstrates how the construction of sentences differs based on the relationship between the speakers. It describes how people utilize and comprehend speech acts. Linguists tried to look at spontaneously occurring speeches from a pragmatic standpoint. They faced various hurdles and problems since pragmatics, as previously said, is more of a philosophical. Pragmatics, on the whole, focused on settings that aren't related to linguistics or language. It entails looking at how being aware of the real-world influences how utterances are utilized and understood. It also considers how the relationship between the speaker and the audience influences the construction of a phrase. Finally, it is concerned with how speakers employ and comprehend speech acts.

Most of the studies of argumentation in pragma-dialects concentrate on the types of strategic maneuvering used by political figures. These studies show the overall structure of political speeches and the arguments used in the speeches with special reference to the nature of political speech. Following is a survey of some of these studies :FH van Eemeren, Garssen, Krabbe, Verheij, and Wagemans (2014) conducted a study on how the pragma-dialectical model and the concept of SM can be applied to investigate rhetorical argumentation (political argumentation). Taking up the purpose of pragma-dialectics to examine interactive arguments where two arguers advance, defend, and sequentially challenge standpoints, they investigate how a political figure maneuvers strategically to achieve the goal of resolving disagreement in a reasoned persuasive fashion. The data of their research is the U.S. President Barack Obama's speech at Cairo University in June 2009. In the pragma-dialectical part of the study, the main and sub standpoints which make up the arguments for the whole speech are reconstructed. For example, in Obama's speech in Cairo "It is time for new beginnings between the U.S. and the Muslim world" is defined as the main standpoint or the main argument. The three sub-standpoints: "the current relationship between the U.S. and Muslims is not satisfactory", "a partnership based on mutual interests and mutual respect between the U.S. and Muslims will be fruitful", and "this partnership is feasible despite the challenges" come to support the main argument. Taken in this hierarchical order –as expressed in the speech– each of these arguments supports the argument preceding it. Also, each of these arguments is then advocated concerning the seven issues causing tension between the U.S. and Muslims. Zarefsky (2014) explains that Obama connects these arguments with those issues to convey to his audience the reason behind his arguments. In other words, Obama argues that a partnership based on mutual interests and respect is feasible and fruitful – despite challenges– in confronting violent extremists, addressing the Arab-Israeli conflict, addressing the rights and responsibilities of nations on nuclear weapons, realizing the promise of democracy, addressing the issue of religious freedom, achieving equality for women, and benefitting from economic development.

For the part dealing with strategic maneuvering, Zarefsky (2014) concentrates on the episode discussing the Arab-Israeli conflict of Obama's Cairo University speech. Starting from the aspect of 'audience demands' involved in strategic maneuvering, Zarefsky (2014,262) explains that the audience of the speech is heterogeneous or composite; it includes people with different aspirations, as well as different ideological backgrounds (Israelis and Palestinians). Therefore, he starts his argument about the Palestinian-Israeli conflict by announcing that "the U.S. considers legitimate the aspirations of both people in states of their own". Thus, he addresses the needs of both peoples to make the argument about peace between both sides a successful one.

Kienpointner (2013) takes up the concept of strategic maneuvering as developed within pragma-dialectics to analyse and assess Obama's political rhetoric in terms of its rationality and efficiency. He takes up many Obama's addresses and attempts a delineation of the main features of Obama's political rhetoric regarding the three dimensions of SM: topical potential, audience demands, and presentational devices. As far as the topical potential is concerned, Kienpointner (2013) also explains that Obama often maneuvers strategically with the persuasiveness of 'pragmatic arguments'. These are causal argumentation describes the positive or negative impact of political decisions, initiatives, and activities.

Concerning his strategic adaptation to audience demands, Kienpointner (2013) argued that Erdogan tries to select arguments and topics that are attractive and appealing to his audience. Finally, to use presentational devices effectively, he persuasively formulates his arguments by giving narrative passages in a clear, rhythmic, and well-structured way. Besides, he uses classical figures of speech such as alliteration, antithesis, parallelism, climax, anaphora, and metaphor. The current study contributes to the investigation of the arguments made in Erdogan's three speeches to the Islamic world by using the model of pragma-dialectics. The focus in the study is given to the function in which the speech acts making up the arguments perform to resolve the issues of tension between Turkey and the Islamic world. Also, the element of strategic maneuvering is highlighted in these speech acts to explain how the arguments are made reasonably and effectively. To maneuver strategically, a speaker has to have an argument and this argument has to go through four main stages like confrontation, opening, argumentation and conclusion .

The previous studies on argumentation as a theory and the research conducted that Erdogan's political speeches have relied on the argumentative stages to reach out his audience and establish his speech based on reasonability and logic of his standpoints. Pragma-dialects and argumentation mixture provides an explanation of the analysis showing the use of rhetoric devices and how they helped a lot in strengthening the speeches and delivering the meaning, the over and the cover one. In addition, a brief explanation is given on the nature of pragma-dialects and its relation to the study of argumentation. The important aspect of pragma-dialects, as involving practical argumentation, is used strategically to defend political decisions and actions to discuss it from a linguistic point of view and not politically. The lens of the research is to discuss the excellence of president Erdogan in utilizing language, as an effective tool to serve his political goals. He used his linguistic abilities sometimes to maneuver and other times to manipulate feelings to gain new countries on his side as he is trying to make a new coalition.

4. Materials and Methodology:

In this paper, the researcher presents the methodologies that are followed in the research and how the speeches are analyzed in a well-structured form. The form follows the theory and the devices used for analysis along with the combination of pragmatics, argumentation and dialectics. First, the research designed discusses the qualitative method of conducting research, and the most significant related literatures on the topic. Next, the pragma dialectic argumentative approach, which is a combination of three elements, are utilized to cover the hidden details of the speeches and uncover the hidden meaning of the speaker. After that, the data is collected from the official websites of

TRT channel, Davos conference official website and from United Nations Assembly official website. Finally, the research procedures draw the route to answer the research questions based on the analysis of the three speeches in the data analysis section.

5. Data Collection:

The three speeches (Davos Speech 2009, Islamic Summit 2016, and UN Assembly Speech 2019) were retrieved from the Turk-Press official website. Because the original texts of the Davos meeting in 2009 and the Islamic Summit in 2014 were unavailable, the researcher got English translations of the two documents through TRT, Turkey's official news agency. The third text, UN Assembly 2019, is downloaded from the official UN assembly website. Moreover, the researcher collected many books, academic articles from peer-reviewed journals like Springer Link, Sage, Elsevier and well-known writers who contributed a lot in this field. The reason of choosing the three speeches is to cover 10 years on Erdogan's political life from 2009 to 2019, and this is because this decade has witnessed most of Erdogan's achievements and the great shift from zero-enemy policy into full engagement into regional and world politics. These speeches also cover three main international fields like United nations, the Organization of the Islamic Cooperation and Davos conference. These fields discussed very important issues for the Islamic world and world cross-border issues like terrorism.

Argumentation theory

Van Emmeren and Grassroot (2004) stated the definition of argumentation as "Argumentation theory or reasoning is an interdisciplinary study of how conclusions can be reached through logical reasoning. That said, the claims are locally based, whether sound or not. It covers the arts and sciences of civic debate, dialogue, conversation and persuasion. Examine the rules of inference, logic, and procedures in both artificial and real environments.

Jory (2016) defined it Argumentation involves deliberations and negotiations dealing with collaborative decision-making procedures. If logic is utilized in the theory, then the focus is on reasoning, and if rhetoric and DA are used then verbal persuasion. Erdogan utilized both logic and verbal persuasion to achieve his political goals. Eemeren (2018) clarified the general goal of the discipline of controversial theory is to provide theoretical tools for analyzing, assessing, and generating controversial discourse in an appropriate manner.

The main feature of the argument is to attain an acceptance of the defended standpoint. The reason behind argumentation is to establish a dialogue that aims at not only understanding but also an interaction that seeks to achieve goals set by the defender. That is to say, F. H. Van Eemeren and Grootendorst (2010) pointed out that the central task of theory is to develop rules for rational discussion or discourse. And the value of the rules being developed is considered to be the same to the extent that these rules help achieve the goals of dispute resolution. People go to use AT due to their beliefs whether they are right or wrong, it does not matter .

For Aristotle, dialectic is the art of arguing for and against. In the Topics, he explains that an argument takes the form of a critical discourse that is dialectics, because there is a systematic interaction between pros and cons of a given issue. FH van Eemeren et al., 1996 argued that the dialectical discussions are designed to lead to generally accepted opinions. Deductive or inductive syllogism may be used in dialectical discussions. The assumptions expressed in these discussions are, generally accepted, wise, or the majority of them, as well as the most famous and respected of them. These generally accepted premises lead to generally accepted conclusions.

Rhetorical and Argumentative pragma-dialectic approaches:

In contemporary, the study of rhetoric has progressed best in the United States. From the 19th century, modern rhetorical approaches have achieved many developments. Firstly, Schwartz (1966) influential definition of rhetoric as the use of words to form attitudes or induce actions in others

comes close to the traditional definitions concentrating on persuasion. Despite this development, the argumentative sight that connects rhetoric with finding the appropriate means of persuasion is still predominant and paradigmatic in rhetoric.

In the last years of the twentieth century, the irrational image rhetoric had acquired over time has been looked over. Scholars from various countries started to argue for a reconstruction of the rhetorical approach. In the United States, (Wenzel, 1988) stressed the rational characteristics of rhetoric. France, Reboul (1990) argued at almost the same time for assigning the rhetoric its proper place alongside the dialectic in the argumentation analysis. He saw rhetoric and dialectic as diverse and sometimes overlapping disciplines. In his view, dialectic is within rhetoric utilized in public discussions, while dialectic is a part of rhetoric because it provides rhetoric with its intellectual tools. In Germany, Kopperschmidt (1989) argued that, from a historical standpoint, rhetoric is fundamental to argumentation theory. Despite the American scholar's engagement in argumentation theory, they do not have a clearly expressed shared perspective. Zarefsky (1995) defines their most obvious common feature as "the practice of justifying decisions under conditions of uncertainty". This practical view of argumentation was encouraged by the American debate tradition. Such relations with classical rhetorical theory have directed the development of a debate tradition into providing a better definition.

The manifestations of the debate tradition have had a huge effect on American argumentation studies. Other Scholars such as Rigotti (2009) and Sara (2011) promote a linguistic approach, by combining linguistic approach with dialectical and rhetoric insights to argumentation such as pragma-dialectics. Because they analysed argumentative speeches, debates, and argumentative texts, the rhetorical approaches contributed limitedly to the analytical part of the research program than the linguistic approaches. Pragma-dialectics is most closely to the rhetorical approaches in giving substance to the effectiveness of strategic manoeuvring.

In rhetoric, Aristotle defines rhetorical arguments as arguments "intended to convince a particular audience of the correctness of a standpoint" (FH van Eemeren et al., 1996, p. 32). Aristotle also defines rhetoric as "the faculty of discovering the possible means of persuasion in reference to any subject whatever" (Rhetoric, 1355b), while according to Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969, p. 4) argued that argumentation seeks to "induce or to increase the mind's adherence". He distinguishes between two types of persuasive devices. The 'extrinsic' or 'inartificial' devices and draw from pre-existing material such as laws, documents, statements by witnesses, or confessions by suspects (p. 43). The 'intrinsic' or 'artificial' persuasive devices and are devised by speakers in order "to persuade their audience of their point of view" (p. 43). For Aristotle, intrinsic rhetorical devices lie in three categories: ethos, pathos, and logos. The following table shows the categories:

Table (1.1) Rhetorical devices and their meanings

Category	Meaning
Ethos	when the speaker exhibits practical wisdom, virtue, or goodwill
Pathos	It is used to make the discourse play on the audience's emotions. It is about showing inspirations, telling a well-told story, visually demonstrating like images words, and use of vivid language.
Logos	it involves that the speaker uses arguments to reach persuasion. It appeals to the sense of logic and good reasoning by building a sound argument supported by statistics, facts and numbers.

The ethos or 'character' device is at work when the speaker exhibits practical wisdom, virtue, or goodwill. This can be shown through the speaker's background, the expertise of the topic, and

research. According to Aristotle, this is the most effective means of persuasion because when an audience trusts a speaker, "it will be more inclined to accept what the speaker says" (p. 43). The pathos or sentiment device is used to make the discourse play on the audience's emotions. It is about showing inspirations, telling a well-told story, visually demonstrating like images words, and use of vivid language. As for logos, it involves that the speaker uses arguments to reach persuasion. It appeals to the sense of logic and good reasoning by building a sound argument, essential claim, or statements, using good evidence and reasonable connections between evidence and claim. Aristotle refers to two types of arguments that are at play within logos. The first type is deductive syllogisms or 'enthymemes'. An enthymeme is a syllogism in which the premises are plausible starting points for the audience and one premise is usually left implicit ([Kraus, 2002, as cited in van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 2004, p. 44]) .

Dialectical stages in the process of resolving a difference of opinion

F. H. Van Eemeren et al. (2006) stated that the stages of argumentation – are the “confrontation” stage, the “opening” stage, the “argumentation” stage, and the “concluding” stage. In argumentative practice, the four stages are made to resolve a difference of opinion reasonably if it deals with explicitly or implicitly in a proper way. The following table shows the four stages:

Table (1.2) The four stages in an argumentation analysis

Table (1.1) Rhetorical devices and their meanings	
Stage	The definition of the stage
The confrontation stage	A difference of an opinion is raised by making a standpoint that is rejected or questioned by the other party .
The opening stage	It is a stage where both protagonists and antagonists take a place.
The argumentation stage	It is the core of the CD in which both for and against arguments are created to resolve a difference of an opinion.
The conclusion stage	It is a result of the discussion which is in favor of one of the parties.

In the confrontation stage, one standpoint (or could be more than one) that is not accepted because it is against contradiction, thereby establishing a difference of opinion. That is, there is no need for a discussion if there is no standpoint of a difference. Therefore, this stage establishes the base of the following arguments and decides the two parties of the discussion.

In the opening stage, the parties find out a common ground on which they share background knowledge to be able to decide whether they can build up a discussion. This is considered a starting point for making an argument. The parties start to make new positions for them, one as a protagonist, who defends his points and stands firmly for them and the other is an antagonist, who reacts critically to the standpoint and its defence. In this regard, the opening stage remains largely implied assuming the existence of common ground exists bearing in mind the hidden and implied standpoints.

In the argumentation stage, protagonists progress their arguments for their standpoints as an attempt to overcome the antagonist's criticism. The antagonists examine whether they consider the argumentation that is presented acceptable. If the argumentation is accepted completely or partially as convincing, they provide further reactions followed by further argumentation by the protagonist, and so on. Consequently, the structure of the argumentation is put forward in the discourse which will become very complicated.

The concluding stage is when the parties establish the outcome of their tries to resolve a difference of opinion. The difference of opinion can only be considered to be resolved if the parties agree that

the protagonist's standpoint is acceptable and the antagonist's doubt is withdrawn. In practice, one of the parties concludes the argumentation in words, but if the other party does not accept this conclusion, no resolution has been achieved. The following table shows the four stages used in argumentation analysis:

Procedures of Implementing the Analysis

The analysis uses two tables for each speech one for dialectic analysis and the second for rhetoric devices to show the speech acts types, which depict the sequences of the arguments through speech acts. Each analysis is followed by an explanation for the moves to draw the line of the arguments and how they support the main concepts and meanings that the speaker was trying to convey. The movements are represented by the speech acts made in the speeches and clarified in the tables so as to make it easy to follow them. After that, tables for logos, pathos and ethos are given in order to clarify the use of rhetorical devices in the speeches. It is also followed by detailed explanation to examine the usage of these devices. The combination of two types of analysis, dialectical and rhetoric, helps to clarify the language used by the speaker and his use of language to enforce his idea and arguments .

6. Data Analysis and Interpretation

This paper is dedicated to analyzing argumentation using the model of the pragma-dialectic. The model identifies the four discussion stages that are illustrated in the process of conflict resolution in the three speeches. The model of pragma-dialectics for the UN General Assembly 2019 speech which clarifies the discussion stages of the speech and defines the dialectical objectives of every stage. The models of pragma-dialectics for the speech in Davos 2009 and the speech in the Islamic Summit 2014 concentrates on the parts where Erdogan discusses the issues of conflict in the two speeches .

The two steps analyzed in the model of for every speech are: the dialectical analysis and the rhetorical analysis. The kinds of speech acts used in every discussion stage for the three speeches are identified. It takes the tabular form for clarity reasons. The discussion moves that are relevant to the process of resolving the conflict are recognized together with the speech acts making up each discussion move. In addition, the dialectical analysis contains the argument schemes' identification and the argument structures redirected by the discussion moves in the model of the pragma-dialectics .

One additional element is elaborated in the reconstruction process of the speeches building up the data of the study: the linear reconstruction of political argumentation as proposed by Sandvik (1997). Regarding the interactional feature of political argumentation, Sandvik proposes that while a pragma-dialectic reconstruction involves deletions of repetitions of standpoints and arguments, such repetitions are significant in the analysis of interactive discourse in general and political argumentation in particular (p. 421). To include such repetitions in the reconstruction process of political argumentation is to illustrate "how the politician falls back on the same argument" (p. 421). Moreover, when these repetitions are realized in relation to the content of previous moves, "they can represent an effort to trigger a particular wanted response" (p. 421). Therefore, in the reconstruction of the speeches of the data, such repetitions of standpoints and arguments are not deleted .

In the confrontation stage of the critical analysis of argumentation in the UN General Assembly 2019 speech, the first dialectic objective is to put to discussion the status of conflict and tension between the West and the Islamic world, which is resulted from the injustice caused by the west and how to resolve the situation. According to the pragma-dialectic framework, the status of conflict is promoted in the method of descriptive standpoints which depict the tension between the West and the Islamic world together with its causes, results, and possible solutions .

The moves of argumentation that make up these standpoints are assertive speech acts. The assertive act is used to express an attitude and places an obligation on the speaker to defend and support his assertion (Green, 2000; Pagin, 2005, as cited in Tseronis, 2009). Moreover, assertive acts imply a commitment on the part of the speaker to the truth, correctness, and acceptability of a proposition (a standpoint) (van Emmeren & Grootendorst, 1984, 2004). Therefore, such facts' expressions are taken as starting points to argue for possible resolution where the speaker or arguer is dedicated to support his standpoints and prove their acceptability to his addressees. The standpoints of Erdogan in moves convey the role of the protagonist on Erdogan making him responsible to defend these standpoints for his audience in the Islamic world. At this point, the audience is supposed to take up the role of antagonists who seek a reasonable defense of the standpoints given by Erdogan (the protagonist).

Erdogan in his first standpoint defended the concept of injustice exercised on the Islamic world by the west. The prejudice and bias along with double-criteria policies are the essential source of instability in the Muslim world. Erdogan stands in this position to confront the west and argues rationally supported by shreds of evidence, statistics, and data. The second point of his defense is the international role is decreasing and losing its international presence through the negativity and nearly no response to the crises in the world, especially the Muslim world. Many problems in the world countries were been given as examples to prove his point and ensure that such a role should be changed immediately on a fair basis. Lastly, Erdogan stressed the point of terrorism and that Turkey is heavily affected by it causing great economic and political instability in the countries and many deaths of innocents as well. He also addressed the issue of ISIS and the Turkish role in neutralizing many of its members and cutting its support. Verily, he assured that global peace can only be made through stopping the anti-Islamic rhetoric and denouncing Islamophobia that caused many terrorist attacks on many different places in the world against Muslims .

The aforementioned three standpoints are defended through many strategic moves that built up the strategy of persuasion of the audience. In the opening stage, for example, for standpoint 1, Erdogan used a directive speech act to direct the world that the Syrian case, as an already-established fact which forms a common ground, is a crisis that immediately needs to be ended. This move has saved him more time and efforts to go into discussing the Syrian situation from the very beginning and into details that might lead to a dead-end. Therefore, he established this fact to cut the way on others to maneuver and make the audience go astray from his point. He very fast supported his fact by an unforgettable picture of the Syrian drowned baby, which shocked the shore, to highlight the issue of Syrian refugees. The speech act here is directive because he wants to provoke the world and wake him up to act positively as fast as possible. Then, the next move comes to complete the idea and shed light on the international community response by accusing it as slow and ineffective that forgets shocking events recklessly. The following three moves played very successful roles in making up the opening stage for Erdogan's argument .

Cleverly, Erdogan started his argument stage with the Syrian case to connect the opening and the argument stages so that the audience is still attached to his speech. Such kind of connection assures the continuity of the audience's full attention, which is the sole purpose of every speaker. In the argument stage, the speaker divided the Syrian case into three main issues to bring a solution for the cause into reality, and this is, of course, done by using a declarative speech act. The issues are the political solution, massacre prevention, and the influx of immigration. The first and second issues, which are mentioned in moves which are directives to show that Erdogan has no authority to exercise any genuine power. Yet, what comes next is commissive in which he has control over the immigration. That is to say, as if the speaker was trying to say to the world, especially Europe, that he will open the borders to the immigration to flow to Europe and export the problem to the west. After that comes next move that discusses terrorism, particularly PKK, the speaker shows Turkey in a defensive position by protecting its borders through engaging with talks with the United States to establish a safe zone mentioned obviously. Then, the speaker reassures the Turkish defensive

position to prevent terrorism by now by using commissive speech act to announce making the peace corridor whether or not accepted by some parties.

In the case of protecting the Muslim minority in Cyprus, the speaker declares that there is an unfinished process of compromise regarding Cyprus asserting that Turkey is pledged to international treaties and willing to cooperate with anyone to resolve the situation. In addition, he also supported the idea of a cooperation horizon between the parties based on a win-win approach. However, he also declares that some interventions seek to change the chance into a conflict. In this context, the speaker built his logic on some steps to argue his point by the issues is not yet done and need more time, there is a cooperation ground between Turkey and Cyprus, there is a future economic chance, there are interventions, and yet Turkey is determined to continue the talks .

In the Libyan case, the speaker here that Turkey is seeking stability and security based on a fair process and the rest of the moves are committed to directing others to provide relief and to respect the will of Libyans .

Most importantly, the Palestinian cause, as always, takes most of Erdogan's attention since he considers it the core of the conflict in the Middle East. First, he asserted the fact that Palestine is now considered a symbol of injustice. By this move, he brings forward the point of injustice exercised on the Palestinians, which is a fact ignored or marginalized by many in the world and delineates any other points. He also backed it by many historical explanations using assertive speech acts, but he ignored any other criticisms to the Palestinian cause since the injustice was done weighs much more than criticism and actions taken by the Israeli occupation. The first critical question in the argumentation regarding the Palestinian cause is directed to the UN asking about their resolutions and whether or not are accomplished or enforced. This is considered as the first question to construct the debate to address the cause and ask for actual results.

The second critical question is the atrocities and murders done by the occupation which is a result of the international blind-eye policy given to the Palestinian cause. A good example of this is the legal status of Jerusalem and holy sites. In other words, the speaker is attempting to establish the fact that the more ignoring for the cause, the more violations will be done by the occupation. The last critical question is the acceptance of the mediation role of Turkey so that the international community supports the efforts done by Turkey. The speaker here again asserts and declares that Turkey will maintain to stand with the Palestinians despite all the opposing parties.

In the case of Kashmir and Rohingya, the first critical question for this issue is that there will be no real attention devoted to the problem. Of course, this point is closely connected to the opening stage and the first standpoint which states injustice against Muslims through using a series of assertive speech acts. Then the argument moves on to engage the UN to stand with its ethics to stop the genocide against the minority there. The second critical question is the group of initiatives proposed by turkey to play the mediation role, as always, to work on a plausible solution for this crisis. Turkey is very careful to show its role in resolving differences and assist Muslims all over the world by discussing the problem first, then asserting the international intervention and lastly the Turkish role and initiation .

Anti-Muslim rhetoric is considered a priority in Turkish foreign policy since it is an existential threat to the Muslim world and peace in general, and that is why the speaker here used a declarative speech act to double ensure its seriousness and danger. In move 33, declarative, commissive, and assertive speech acts are utilized in one move to shed light on the danger of this matter and urges the world to act quickly for this danger as it harms almost everyone. The rhetoric here is classified as bigotry to stress that this point is unquestionable and there is no way to justify it by any means. This is followed by another move to direct end this argument by making a touchable step towards ending this bigotry by raising awareness, of course. Lastly, the speaker also asks for the Muslim world to end their division as a move to be a mediator rather than being biased for one side to gain the audience's trust as a neutral player who seeks world peace free from all kinds of terrorism

The conclusion stage is meant for the outcome of the speech which is that Turkey has a significant position for any future peace and is a major international player that can play a distinct role in ushering peace. The Turkish commitment is renewed to mankind as a step to say that Turkey serves the whole world without any discrimination and that Turkey is affected by the surrounding issues. A couple of moves are a couple of assertions used to conclude the speaker's remarks and the three standpoints mentioned above.

Rhetoric is mainly discussed in three major terms ethos, pathos, and logos to analyse a text. The speaker in this speech used ethos in quote 1 to show his knowledge of the problems and issues of the globe to achieve the audience's trust and to follow his speech with belief and confidence. In quote 2 the speaker introduces two major concepts justice and humanitarian intervention connecting it with Turkish generosity in terms of humanitarian aid and assistance to attract the audience. To keep the smooth attraction of the audience, the speaker moved to the category, which is pathos, starting with an image of very small countries are trying to agitate the world. A metaphor for a very tiny number of countries, referring to the countries of veto power, should not be the only ones who determine the destinies of world nations. Before this image gets lost, another move draws a picture of Turkey as a normal country, just like other countries, which are putting a lot of effort to achieve and maintain justice. These moves certainly manipulate the audience's feelings and make them, at least, build trust with the speaker. Again, in order to maintain the feelings captured, he shocked the audience with the picture of a lifeless body of a kid who tragically died, with his family, trying to immigrate to Europe, and this picture, of course, is manipulative and make the audience shows sympathy immediately. In the next move, he utilizes the previous images into the Syrian cause to pass the idea of the safe zone. This, for sure, includes showing the suffering of the Syrians by using "a bleeding wound in our hearts" to keep the emotional sympathy condition of the audience .

In logos, the speaker is cautious to bring in statistics and data to prove logically the size of Muslim world miseries. Yet, to more inclusive, he started with general data resulted from the world problems. Next, the following statements are dedicated to the numbers of terrorist militants of ISIS, but then is for asylum seekers to refer to the efforts made by the Turkish governments. The size of the Turkish donations, the indirect European donations, are and manifested with stressing on the indirect help from Europe. Also, the speaker mentioned the number of Syrian immigrants along with other nationalities as an introduction for the next stage, which is a proposal for the solution. Therefore, he addressed three main issues for Syria territorial integrity, massacre prevention, and the elimination of terrorism there. The intelligent use of logical steps to reach his goals is depicted in this speech by which he put the world before his proposal. Then it comes a practical step to impose his proposal on the audience so that it accepts it as a de facto solution. As it can be seen, the usage of pathos and logos are more than the usage of ethos. This is because the speaker was sure to present himself as the one who is trying to provide the truth with numbers and the same time, he manipulates feelings to gain more sympathy. The numbers are a very good strategy to convince the audience with logic and the manipulative pictures are very effective too in achieving sympathy and consequently the speaker's goals.

The confrontation stage is started with the point of justice and peace as it is the main focus of the speaker and the core argument that build up the whole idea of the speech. These concepts are to be critically discussed till they reach the acceptance level of the audience that Muslims are oppressed and have nothing to defend such kind of a systematic injustice practiced against Muslims. This is to support and solidify the two concepts but make them a reality through strengthening the relations with the Islamic world. This world has a distorted image because of the terrorist attacks and the media that played a role in showing only the bad side of it. This has been clearly stated in move 4 through the use of the word 'racism' to show the structured attack against Muslims either by direct attack or by biased streaming. Here comes to stress the point that the religion of Islam is exploited by terrorism which is attached to Islam through every attack happens in the world. The following

comes as another stress on the fact that Islam is a religion of peace and it will always be. The systemic attack or any attempt to distort Muslims is originally political and has no root in the culture of Muslims.

The opening stage is meant for finding a common ground with the protagonist and the antagonist who originally have many differences of opinions. In this regard, Muslim countries have major differences of opinions 'Sunnis and Shias' along with differences between the Sunnis themselves and Shias as well. The speaker here used to previous moves to overcome this issue and states clearly that he is only Muslims so that he can avoid these differences and save efforts and time getting into such an endless discussion. This maneuvering strategy is supported stating that Muslims only follow one prophet and are all brothers and sisters. This strategy has avoided purposeless discussion which might lead to a dead-end way. This is utilized to transfer the audience from the previous point to the focus of the speaker, which is the pains of the Islamic world. The attacks on Muslims that take a place in the world helps in drawing bad stereotypes that Muslims are terrorists and trouble makers. Such a negative concept may lead to a general negative conclusion, with the help of biased media, to form a kind of agnostic or even aggressive feelings against Muslim minorities all over the world. That is why the speaker goes back again on stress that Islam preaches justice and cooperation to state that the prophet always preached such concepts. Moreover, the speaker refers back to a common problem made by Muslims which is the antagonist's feelings for each other considering it the main reason for the current division and weakness. That is to say, the problem is within Muslims themselves and not the religion, and this can be overcome only by unity and alliance as one integral nation to face the external threats. The next move formulates the future strategy that should be followed by all Muslims to gain back their position; they need to work hard to gain the trust of more world countries to become a good friend (increase friends) and this leads to a decrease in the number of foes. Cooperation, unity, and alliance make the Islamic world stronger and economically efficient and consequently takes an important position in the world, which will allow it to make good friends. Institutionalization of cooperation is the only key to maintain the alliance among the Islamic countries which, in turn, will be able to fight terrorism based on structured cooperation and a unified unity against it. Turkey wants to enhance this idea by offering Istanbul as a centre so that to facilitate such cooperation and to systematically fight against all terrorism. The speaker here enhances the fact that Muslims already have institutions but they just need to be activated. This move is meant to show the seriousness of Turkey and its willingness to fight against terrorism by any means and at any cost. Not only this, but the speaker also asks all Muslims countries to become an effective tool against terrorism since they all suffer from the same issue. Finally, the speaker goes back again to shed light on the essential role of the Islamic organization of Islamic Cooperation since it is the future of the Islamic nation and a launching pad for the future youth to put an end to the terrorism crisis .

The argumentation stage is the centre of the CD in which reasons both pro and against are generated to overcome a gap of opinion. The speaker shows both the views and replies to them logically and provides examples to convince the audience and all who are concerned. He shifts from a point to another intelligently and effectively to serve his arguments but in a convincing method. The first example, which is Al Qaeda, is mentioned as the reason for killing a lot of innocents and it should be fought as the origin of the evil and death in the Islamic world. This point is sensitive because it hides the main creator of Al-Qaeda, which is the west here. The hidden meaning is the one wanted by the speaker as if he would say that terrorism is originally made by external parties who are responsible for those deaths. He mentioned other examples of terrorist puppets who laid waste in the Middle East and all have the same intention and thought, which is destruction and bloodshed. The previous three moves are to eliminate the idea of terrorism is made by Muslims but assures that it originally came from outside. Terrorism is called by the speaker as business attacks to point out that terrorism in the Middle East is for business for the sake of other parties, not Muslims who do

not benefit from these attacks. The attacks and their executives are considered terrorism and common enemies for Muslims and humanity to make it a general for all world countries and not only Muslims. Moreover, not only the external interference but also the double standard policy to fight terrorism is the main actor in strengthening terrorism since the slow reaction against it can make it stronger or at least make survives for more time. This double standard is manifested in the Paris attack and the neglect of attacks in Istanbul and Lahore (Muslim countries) is proof presented by the speaker to such a policy is responsible to disappoint all efforts in fighting terrorism. These moves bring to the audience that the double standard policy is a cause in slowing the process of fighting terrorism and could be a factor in weakening the alliance to fight it. Therefore, the speaker asks to put an end to any external intervention, since it is not supporting the fight against terrorism, and focus on making a unity of the Islamic countries to help themselves alone. In the next move, the idea of double standards is stressed again to draw more attention to it and pave the way for the next concept to be introduced, which is a phobia in the west. It spread widely recently through many attacks on Muslims in the West who are left defenseless without any protection. This comes as a result of the representation of Muslims in the United Nations Security Council and the absence of Muslims in the decision-making in the five world-ruling countries. Muslims are minorities in the globe although they have a great number of the world population, which is 1/4 of the globe. This injustice of representation is clearly stated " the world is larger than the five" the world order resulted from the world war must be changed based on justice and equity not on power and domination. The refusal of the current representation is an excellent tool to show the injustice against Muslims and are not counted in the world population since there is no actual presence in the world. Consequently, there will be no genuine peace in the world because the international world order is a complete injustice and is distributed among all nations fairly to present them all geographically, religiously, and fairly. The speaker assures on the point that if such a fair representation does not happen, those who are oppressed and not heard by the world will turn to be fuel to world terrorism as victims. This strategy makes Muslims are the victims and not responsible for falling into terrorism because they are the who are oppressed and have nothing to do but being exploited by terrorists.

The speaker's main arguments are defended in the conclusion point, which is used to reassert the principles stated in the main arguments. This statement starts with the idea of unity to end the diversity in the Muslim community, which is riven with profound divides and disparities. The speaker then goes on to say that the Islamic world's political institutions should be restructured to replace them with more functional ones. The new entities will provide decent living standards and shift the general derogatory stereotypes towards Muslims. This is accompanied by a realistic move called "the Islamic Development Bank," which is a practical expression of cooperation rather than cooperation. To gain the audience's confidence and demonstrate seriousness and practicality in creating a new Islamic cooperative alliance to defend and protect the Islamic world's profile, the speaker presents an action plan with a deadline. The meaning of the alliance is altered by demonstrating the question of immigrants to Europe and how Europe treats them in a discriminatory manner.

Any orator will use a variety of techniques, including rhetorical devices, to attract the audience's attention. In this sense, he begins with an ethos device, saying that he and his nation are following our prophet's orders. Such a statement has the potential to force listeners to pay attention to the sentence at the very least. This transition is rational enough to allow the orator to lead the listener along a sequence of steps before he has covered all of his argumentative points. Starting with a religious statement or its context is appealing to a religious audience and is an important way to emotionally connect them to the speech.

Since it manipulates thoughts and desires, the second process, pathos, is key in every expression. The speaker can't influence the Islamic world without first addressing Prophet Muhammad. He

nicknamed him the "ambassador to fairness" in the expectation that everyone in the crowd will follow in his footsteps and work tirelessly to fulfil the speaker's objective of justice. He then went on to tell what the prophet ordered and forbade, particularly injustice. That is, the speaker spiritually promoted justice, claiming that it is a divine obligation ordered by God and his messenger, not just the speaker's thoughts. To put it another way, any critique of the speaker's claims would be religiously and socially inappropriate. Furthermore, the use of the phrase "this is what I ask from God" indicates that the speaker is religious and that he is close to people's values. Since he uses an idiom, this will help the listener more at ease and persuade them to trust the speaker. The word 'thanks' is then used to illustrate how respectful the speaker is, and he communicates with the crowd naturally to demonstrate that there is no barrier between him and the audience. On top of that, he thanked Saudi Arabia, the most important and prominent nation in the Islamic world.

Furthermore, phrases such as "feel safe," "lose faith," "victims," and "terrorists" are used to paint an emotional image of innocent civilians who are losing their lives as a result of injustice, which would inevitably cause them to become terrorists. This emotional picture of causing innocent people to become murderers will also assist in gaining sympathy to help those people from becoming killers and terrorists. Furthermore, the pronoun 'we' is used to illustrate that the speaker and the audience as a whole are concerned with the same problem. The word 'Ommah' means harmony and teamwork, and it is everyone's responsibility to make this collaboration a huge success. As a result, the completion of this collaboration becomes an emotional and religious obligation that must be fulfilled effectively.

The confrontation stage of the Davos 2009 Forum is explained by three key points of view assertively considering them as a top priority and a backbone of this discussion. The first is to clarify the current situation in Gaza and Syria (as samples from the Islamic world) and to evaluate it for intervention. It is considered to become the first dialectical standpoint and brings it as a point of difference to be resolved at a subsequent time. The second standpoint is the question of humanitarian intervention in Palestine, as there is a significant hardship for the Palestinians at all stages. The third and final standpoint is the intermediary role that Turkey plays in finding stability and peace in the region based on justice for all concerned within the context of previous peace agreements and agreements. Erdogan's position in the three standpoints 1, 2, and 3 conveys the role of Erdogan as a protagonist, making him responsible for defending those positions to his audience on behalf of the Islamic world. At this point, the audience is expected to step into the role of antagonists demanding a fair defence of the position of Erdogan (the protagonist).

The opening stage is represented by a clear statement that is used to shock the audience with a disturbing image of the killing of innocent people, including women and children, and to bring them in front of the absolute horror that the Palestinians are being brutalized. There seem to be no red lines in this attack and every facility is within the scope. This ruthless war is intended for the purpose of annihilation of the nation, and this brutality's picture is cleverly utilized in the opening stage to build up a solid ground for the speaker's defence. The Palestinians are powerless without the capacity to restore what was devastated by the occupation. This change is required to support the Palestinians and to invite the entire world to see how much damage has been done and how much excessive use of force has been used in the Gaza war. Another point at the opening stage is the humanitarian intervention position of Turkey, which is committed to standing with Muslims, who also have the right to live as other nations of this world. The next move is aimed at clarifying the intermediary position if Turkey is to create a structured indirect channel between the two parties in the presence of officials who have never collaborated before. The key argument to support this position is the effort to release the captured soldier into a suitable settlement for both sides and to be fair enough to extend the truce there .

The argumentation stage starts which questions the time of ending the blockade on Gaza and how will people survive under those conditions. This is a combination of assertions and directives are

utilized to demand a world response if they are concerned with a peaceful solution for the region. This move aims at starting the argument with the world by asking them logically that how besieged people can give peace if they do not live with a good living standard as the other parties do. This rational way of asking questions will lead to plausible reasonableness and consequently to an unbiased position.

In addition, the speaker also addressed the question of the smuggling of arms from Egyptian borders in order to draw a kind of equilibrium between the two opposing parties and to point out that Turkey is neutral and not in support of either one, but that it has conditioned the termination of smuggling by accepting Palestine as a state. Time and time again, the speaker does leave a chance until he asserts the role of Turkey, as a helper and facilitator, who asks the whole world to stand before its human responsibilities. This should be helped by a great deal of foreign assistance to ensure that the Palestinians have their position. Here, the speaker tied the peace process to the reconstruction of the Palestinian nations, leaving the other side with no alternative but to recognize it as the starting point for the dialogue. In addition, with a view to neutrality, the speaker clearly reiterates, by the use of an indirect instruction, that the Palestinians should They should complete their unification and bring an end to their division in order to confront their destiny. The speaker articulated his desire, in a directive way, for the Obama administration to pursue a solution because it is a global force that can apply tremendous leverage to progress the peace process .

The conclusion stage is used to outline and describe the root cause of the issue that democracy has not been upheld, even though the West is still talking about supporting it. The speaker believes that the West is responsible for the mess in Palestine, and they are still in favour of Israel, and against the Palestinians, since Hamas was voted by the people. Yet, amid all this, Turkey still has an interest in settling the situation and establishing a fair and comprehensive peace, yet on one condition that no matter what democracy produces, it must be upheld whether it is Hamas or every other group .

As far as the ethos is concerned, the speaker began this stage by showing off his fantastic study and analysis skills and how much expertise he has in this matter. Such a move gives the listener a sense of trust and belief that the speaker here is a credible person who talks based on empirical evidence that is broken down into steps. The next step is to obtain appreciation and support from the audience because of his respect for Shamon Perez because of his age, and because he is older than the speaker himself. The speaker also reveals, though, that Shamon Perez considers this respect as an asset in passing his thoughts and that the speaker has a lower voice so he does not want to violate the respect. In this case, the audience would undoubtedly stand with the speaker, because of his great courtesy and decent conduct and, subsequently, because of his claims.

Regarding pathos, the speaker uses both powerful phrases and visuals to disclose his arguments to the crowd and make them feel sympathized with, and stand for, the marginalized people. Move 4 used the illustration of a locked jail to depict the siege imposed on Gaza and the deadly effects of that siege. Isolation is the explanation for the region's chaos, and it destroys all hope for the Palestinians. It has left the mind of the viewer in a dark and wild place where many constraints humiliate human dignity. An example of this doomed life also in the key product for average citizens and a position that needs approval for every step of the way. The speaker set a vision of the situation in Gaza that would stick to their minds for good. To make it more meaningful, the speaker explains a true story that happened when he was visiting Palestine, where he and his wife had to wait a bit. He followed it with more stories and told Perez about the conversations that had taken place in order to make more publicity and use them as evidence of his sincerity and integrity. In fact, the speaker added more imagery such as assistance that should flow, which means that the Palestinians should receive a great deal of help and support to be used for restoration. Democracy is often affirmed by the use of the term "root" to mean that the world should create a truly democratic political climate for new elections in Palestine and fully recognize the outcomes.

Finally, the term "yield" was used to suggest that the peace process should be a good tree with the green colour corresponding to peace, which should have been planted a long time earlier and put a great deal of work into it in order to achieve good output. All of these points have been used to persuade the audience through manipulating their feelings and emotions. Lastly for logs, in order to present arguments and make them more persuading, the speaker used logical reasoning supported with dates and statistics to reveal that the situation is factually based on scientific numbers and block the way for any other counterclaims.

The research questions raised in Chapter 1, and the outcomes of the analysis of the three speeches were investigated. The researcher dealt with each speech separately, and presented a complete overview of the sources for the speeches to draw an overall outcome and conclusion for the arguments and their methods of presenting. The persuasion strategies utilized in the speeches are to make them a benchmark for the Palestinian politicians and those who are interested in the topic. Lastly, the researcher addressed the effectiveness of Erdogan's discourse addressed to the Islamic world and professional use of language and persuasion strategies.

Research Implications

Erdogan's arrangement of his speeches and the method used in his arguments contributed a lot in achieving his political goals through the use of words. The concepts utilized in his argumentation, injustice, the international role and fighting terrorism is not only issues for Muslims (his claim) but also universal concepts that no audience would refuse to agree with him. Maintaining focusing on these concepts along with using a lot of prime examples, statistics (logos) and images (pathos) from the real world helped a lot in delivering his standpoints. Giving examples from the innocent Muslims and the ill representation of Muslims in the UN play a major role that injustice still exists because it is built on discrimination and inequality of the strongest five countries, who refuse to change the international order (inductive reasoning). After that, Erdogan provided many examples like the situation in Gaza to stress on the point that the world still fails in converting justice into a universally recognized concept so that peace can prevail. All other situations like Syria, Cyprus, and terrorism attacks are supporting examples for his arguments. Erdogan here also took advantage of using rhetorical devices to elevate his style and draw the attention of the world as much as possible. Ethos, pathos and logos are the main constituents of his speech which successfully manipulate the feelings of his audience and attract attention to his argument, injustice. First, ethos is used to build up a solid ground with the audience that the speaker is authentic with a goodwill to all humanity, who believes that all should be equal. After that, Turkey shows its humanitarian role in helping people in general and tries to end the world's miseries .

Finally, Erdogan was sure that show respect to Perez, though he is considered against him, to tell the whole world that Muslims respect and appreciate older people who are from different opinions, religions and thoughts. Second, pathos has its share in the speeches to manipulate feelings and to get sympathy of the world to Muslims who suffer and die on daily basis. The image of dying Muslims in many occasions and the image of the Syrian baby let the whole world recognize that there is injustice exerted there and there must be a change towards this misery. Moreover, the Muslims world is engaged by using the words of God and his messenger, and that God promotes cooperation so that they can carry the burden of the Islamic nation. This burden is the responsibility and the duty of all Muslims who believes in God and his messenger. This way of manipulation leaves no choices for the Islamic countries expect to follow the speaker's speech. Third, logos is another major element in any speech to make it factual based on scientific realities for those who are not convinced by emotions and wisdom. Therefore, statistics and facts are shown for credibility of the speaker and his attention toward a real change in the world. Syrian refugees, number of millions for aid and factual events happened in many parts of the Islamic world are fair enough to prove the injustice and sufferings. Erdogan used many persuasion strategies like cause and effect,

proposing a solution and reasoning, deductive and inductive, to convince the audience with his beliefs and concepts to change the image of Muslims globally and regionally. All of previously mentioned points succeeded in making a rapport with the Islamic world and resulted in strengthening the Turkish relations with them. Now, Turkey is stronger and has a crystal-clear role in the Middle East like in Libya and Syria. Its role cannot be neglected internationally nor locally. The methodology shows the standpoints of the speaker's argument and they are manifested in the argument stages. The use of pragma-dialectic with rhetoric devices shows how the speaker used both arguments and rhetoric to achieve his goals. The clarification of argument stages and rhetoric show the levels of deep meaning and the hidden messages of Erdogan to the Islamic world and the world in general. The tables here show every single move made by the speaker and how it contributes to the ultimate argument and also help to speaker to maneuver politically and linguistically.

Conclusion:

This paper discusses the results and summarizes the findings achieved in this study. It also provides recommendations for further studies for analysts for political speeches linguistically. The study also helps researchers utilize the argumentation theory in analyzing speeches used by politicians in addressing and achieving their goals. The careful choice of words can play a major role in maximizing of achieving political goals and are sometimes forceful enough to make the listener complies with the speaker's demand without the need of using force. To show how far argumentation methods are used in study, this research presented various argumentation strategies and techniques for studying oral discourse. The researcher follows Van Eemeren model of analysis based on four main stages in any arguments the confrontation, the opening, the argumentation, and the conclusion. These stages have sequential speech acts that constitute an influential structure which affect and manipulate the audience .

References:

- Bloor, M., & Bloor, T. (2007). *The practice of critical discourse analysis: An introduction*. London. Routledge.
- Bloor, M., & Bloor, T. (2013). *The practice of critical discourse analysis: An introduction*. London. Routledge.
- Chilton, P., & Schäffner, C. (2011). *Discourse and politics. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, 303-330. London. SAGE Publications Ltd. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446289068.n15>
- Die vier grundlegenden Arbeitsschritte: Von Der pro-kontra-Liste bis zur logischen Detailrekonstruktion. (2020). *Argumentationsanalyse*, 1-50. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-476-05124-0_1
- Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1984). *Speech acts in argumentative discussions: A theoretical model for the analysis of discussions directed towards solving conflicts of opinion*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (2003). *A systematic theory of argumentation*. Cambridge. Cambridge. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511616389>

- Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., Johnson, R. H., Plantin, C., & Willard, C. A. (2013). *Fundamentals of argumentation theory: A handbook of historical backgrounds and contemporary developments*. London. Routledge.
- El-Haj, S. (2017). *Erdogan is a poineer of Modern Turkey*. Istanbul. Istanbul Univerity Press.
- Findlay, I. M. (2003). *Discourses of domination: Racial bias in the Canadian English-language press*. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 28 (1). Canada. University of Toronto. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.22230/cjc.2003v28n1a1349>
- G. Leech, G., & Jenny A. Thomas. (1989). *Language, meaning and context: Pragmatics. An Encyclopedia of Language*. London. Routledge. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203403617-11>
- Grootendorst, R. (2004). *A systematic theory of argumentation: The pragma-dialectical approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ihnen Jory, C. (2014). *Negotiation and deliberation: Grasping the difference*. *Argumentation*, 30(2), 145-165. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10503-014-9343-1>
- Kienpointner, M. (2013). *Strategic maneuvering in the political rhetoric of Barack Obama*. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 12(3), 357-377. Amsterdam. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.12.3.03kie>
- Kopperschmidt, J. (1989). *Methodik Der Argumentationsanalyse*. Stuttgart. Frommann-Holzboog.
- Levinson, S. C., Levinson, S. C., & S., L. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Orwell, G. (2021). *Politics and the English language*. London. Renard Press.
- Mohammed, D & Zarefsky, D. (2011). *Pragma-dialectical analysis of rhetorical texts*. Retrieved from https://run.unl.pt/bitstream/10362/82341/1/IFILNOVA_Pragma_dialectical_analysis_of_rhetorical_texts_Dima_Mohammed.pdf
- Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse analysis: An introduction*. New York. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Reboul, O. (1990). *Rhetorique et dialectique chez Aristote*. *Argumentation*, 4(1). Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00186297>
- Rigotti, E. (2009). *Pondering on Problems of Argumentation*. The Netherlands. University of Amsterdam. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9165-0_12
- Taylor, S. (2013). *What is discourse analysis?* New York. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Van Eemeren, F. H., Garssen, B., Krabbe, E. C., Snoeck Henkemans, A. F., Verheij, B., & Wagemans, J. H. (2014). *Handbook of argumentation theory*. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9473-5>
- Van Eemeren, F.H., Grootendorst, R. (1987). *Fallacies in pragma-dialectical perspective*. *Argumentation I*. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00136779>
- van Eemeren, F. H., & Houtlosser, P. (2006). *The case of pragma-dialectics. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 1-28. The Netherlands. University of Amsterdam. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/11794578_1
- Wenzel, J. W. (1979). *Jurgen Habermas and the dialectical perspective on argumentation*. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 16(2), 83-94. London. Routledge. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/00028533.1979.11951161>

- Whaley, B. B., & Samter, W. (2006). *Explaining communication: Contemporary theories and exemplars*. London. Routledge.
- Zarefsky, D. (2014). *Political argumentation in the United States Argumentation in Context*. The Netherlands. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1075/aic.7>