CEJISS

President Bush's Address to the Nation on U.S. Policy in Iraq: A Critical Discourse Analysis Approach[1]

Ibrahim A. El-Hussari[2]

Introduction

Political language is basically used as a powerful tool in winning the support, as well as the consent, of both the public and national lawmakers, but more especially at moments of crisis over which a nation may clearly divide. Whether in office or in opposition, political leaders who deliver public speeches within a national context often tend to manipulate language to best-suit the rhetorical mode or genre they choose to pass a message through in an effort to gain political advantage, maintain power, or shirk responsibility. Unable, and perhaps unwilling, to coerce, political leaders in the so-called democratic polities often need to 'manufacture consent' in order to undertake their agendas. Such a practice occurs through discourse and verbal representation. To this end, discourse can be seen as a cultural tradition that comprises linguistic self-consciousness, as well as the skills and methodologies brought into play to shape the convictions of a particular audience and sustain a positive image of the public speaker. Critical discourse analysis (CDA), on the other hand, takes another path to send a different message. It is a tool that helps the discourse analyst to illustrate how unmasking the written/spoken word (with overt and covert meaning) can bring about a different perspective and a deeper understanding of whose interest is being served. In short, CDA tries to illuminate ways in which the dominant forces in a society construct versions of reality that favor their often hidden agendas. As an effective tool used by scholars to decipher a text, CDA compels us to make a move from seeing words in the abstract to seeing them as loaded with meanings in a particular context. Politically speaking, no public speech is ever neutral.

---

[1] This paper was first presented at the Political Linguistics Conference (PL2007) at Warsaw University, Warsaw, Poland, 13–15 September, 2007.

[2] Ibrahim A. El-Hussari is an Associate Professor at the American Lebanese University. He may be reached at: ihousari@lau.edu.lb.

This paper uses CDA as a tool to study President George W. Bush's speech, "Address to the Nation on U.S. Policy in Iraq", which was delivered on January 10, 2007.[3] The speech was transcribed and published by *The New York Times* on January 11, 2007. I recorded this speech, and then compared it with the newspaper transcript to verify its authenticity. The speech, as text, is framed within a particular yet uneasy political context in which several segments of the speech analyzed are problems mediated by hidden ideological assumptions and power relationships.

The paper examines chunks of public discourse that intensify 'political correctness' through the overuse and repetition of key words, such as combating terror/terrorism/Al-Qaeda for the purpose of maintaining troop security, home safety, and world peace, as well as expediting the global war on terror. This paper analyses such repetition for frequency, duration, intensity, and effects. It also studies the effect of the association technique, whether explicit or implicit, whose use triggers intense emotions shaping the future not only of the U.S., but also that of the world at large. The confessional and apologetic tone of the speech, admitting 'unidentified' failings of previous strategies and outlining a new and 'more effective' strategy for Iraq through sending more troops to secure Baghdad, is analyzed on the levels of discursive practices that include rhetorical composition of words and phrases, omissions, diversion, and confusion, to mention only a few. By showing this, the speech becomes more than just words in the text; it discloses how those words were used in that particular political context.

In my analysis of President Bush's speech, I drew on critical approaches deriving from the literature in various disciplinary fields, such as critical linguistics and pragmatics, from which CDA uses analytic tools to address persistent questions about power relationships and ideology.

The paper concludes by identifying unresolved issues and challenges underlying the speech, for the speech brought to the fore nothing more than an adjustment of the initial mission assigned to the American armed forces on the eve of invading Iraq, but was hastily described by the President, soon after the fall of Baghdad, as "Mission Accomplished". Ironically, much of the substance that the speech contained was previously transmitted through earlier speeches delivered by President Bush in the U.S. Congress and elsewhere.

Rationale for Studying the Text

The reasons for selecting this political speech are simple. Firstly, it was delivered in the wake of the latest U.S. Senate Elections, the result of which gave the Democrats a slim majority in Congress for the first time since the Presidential Election of 2000. Secondly, the over-all situation in Iraq had been deteriorating drastically since the Fall of Baghdad in April 2003. Besides trillions

[3] Speech available at: http://whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2007/01/20070110–7.html.

of dollars budgeted to spend on the invasion and meet the aftermath obligations, the invasion had claimed by then heavy losses in life and property, not only on the part of the Iraqi civilians and military personnel, but also on the part of the Coalition Forces, especially the American troops. Thirdly, the speech was delivered in the wake of the issuance of the Iraq Study Group Report, prepared over a significant span of time by a bipartisan panel led by former Secretary of State, James Baker, and former Congressman, Lee Hamilton, to advise the American Administration on a solution. And lastly, perhaps, the speech came to redress the rift increasingly widening between the U.S. Administration and its allies in the Coalition Forces due to the public pressures exerted on quite a number of governments that participated in the invasion of Iraq – some of which opted for a military withdrawal from Iraq, for there was no time-line drawn for a pullout of forces as the mandate thereof is open-ended.

An Overview of the Speech as Text

This written text is transcribed from the televised public speech in which President Bush addressed the American people on U.S. policy in Iraq over the past four years of the invasion. The timing of the speech is significant as it occurs in the wake of the Republicans losing their majority in the new Senate and Congress as a whole, thus campaigning to keep the President's agendas and maintain power relations with Congress and beyond. The speech is also a response to the Baker-Hamilton Report, produced by the bipartisan panel making up the Iraq Study Group. Further, the speech is a text in conflict-resolution strategy planned by the President and his advisers. The language-based process of constructing a version of reality most suitable to the Bush Administration is remarkably subtle and comprehensive. Discourse carries the ideological assumptions under which the issues alluded to are known and ordered in the context it is used. This means that the content of the political language used in the speech contains the very rationale by which it is to be framed, defined, understood and acted upon. In common parlance, this is likely to bring about the consent of the audience targeted. Looking at the text as a whole, Henry and Tator (2002) recommend analyzing what sort of perspective is being presented – what angle or point of view.

The thirty one blocs making the structure of the speech vary in length but are tightly framed by the particular modes of linear rational thought, empiricism, and objectivity that often characterize formal public speeches. The political language thus used conveys both the linguistic meaning of what is said and the corpus, or a part of it, of the political beliefs underpinning almost each and every statement (cf. Geis 1987). The corpus of the text boils down to one point: the President is endorsing a new strategy to change the American course in Iraq. This is stated in paragraph 1 of the speech: "The new strategy I outline tonight will change America's course in Iraq, and help us succeed in the fight against terror". The

rest of the speech presents a contentious justification of the failings of earlier strategies, a sanguine defense of the new strategy endorsed, and an admonitory message about "unacceptable" consequences if the new strategy fails.

What Critical Discourse Analysis Says about the Text

The principal unit of analysis for CDA is the text. Texts, whether spoken or written, are often taken to be acted upon as their form and structure are not arbitrary. As such, they remain affiliated with particular conventionalized discourses. The formal public speech under study features discourses of power relations, conflicting ideologies, domestic and foreign policies, and broad national strategies. As a conventional form, then, it constrains and enables meanings on many levels between the speaker as encoder and the receiver as decoder. Although the term discourse is slippery, elusive, and difficult to define (Henry & Tator 2002), the analyst's attempt, using CDA, to 'debunk' the words of those in power (McGregor 2003) cannot simply go unnoticed. A linguistic analysis of various lexical and grammatical devices used in the text is an essential part of CDA, for "texts are meaningful only because they actualize the meaning potential of the linguistic system" (Halliday 2004, p.658). CDA, as a tool to explore and further understand the text as a set of discourses, seeks to link the text (micro level) with the underlying power structures in society (macro level) through the discursive practices upon which the text is built (Thompson 2002). I drew on a variety of techniques deriving from various disciplinary fields, as CDA does not have a unitary theoretical framework or methodology because it is best viewed as a shared perspective encompassing a range of approaches instead of one school (cf. van Dijk 2000). Discourse, then, can be interpreted differently by people whose backgrounds, knowledge and power positions are different. Therefore, the "right interpretation does not exist whereas a more or less plausible or adequate interpretation is likely" (Fairclough 2002; Wodak & Ludwig 1999). Whilst CDA can also focus on body language, utterances, and visual images as a means of discourse (Fairclough 2000), this paper will, however, be limited to analyzing written language.

President Bush's speech/text as discourse is effective in practical terms and evidenced by its ability to organize and regulate relations of power. Such a discourse might be called a "regime of truth" (Foucault 1980). It is this regime that takes hold of a political system that constrains and enables analysts engaged in CDA to do a revealing job as they study what is included in and what is excluded from the text.

The text is a formal public speech: the President of the United States addressing the nation. The text frames the message of changing the current American policy in Iraq, and so does the concept of topicalization at the sentence level. In choosing what to put in the topic position, the speaker/writer creates a perspective or slant that influences the perception of the audience.

The new strategy I outline tonight will change America's course in Iraq, and help us succeed in the fight against terror. (para.1)

This will require increasing American force levels. So I have committed more than 20,000 additional American troops to Iraq (para.10).

Thus, from the outset of the speech, the President sets a problem-solution model, presumed to be culturally ingrained. This pattern is reinforced by the sequence of the textual segments comprising the entirety of the text. The sequence (situation – problem – solution) is conditioned by words signposting the text. This is subtly done through drawing attention to the difficult situation in which "the Armed Forces of the United States are engaged in a struggle that will determine the direction of the global war on terror and our safety here at home" (para.1). This is done by addressing and choosing the degree of formality in accordance with the normal conventions of the Western mode of writing.

Grammatical and Lexical Features of Cohesion

The linguistic choices, both lexical and grammatical, seem to sustain the speaker's intention for a change of course, which later in the text becomes a change of mission to be accomplished by sending more troops to Iraq. Key-words, such as "terror", "failure", "success", "danger" and "safety", for instance, being a vital part of the contextual framework through frequency, illuminate and serve the topical key-word "change," which explicitly appears six times as a vocabulary item but is supported by the modal auxiliary "will" which is followed by an action-word sixty-three times for the purpose of conveying a degree of certainty and authority that a change of course is a serious issue. Thanks to the discourse relations of cohesion and coherence (for example the variation of discourse conjunctive markers), the constituent parts of the text hang together as a unity. Although linguistic features are not the most salient characteristics of political discourse, no text could ever have a material existence without them (Halliday 2004).

The discursive practices used to tidy up the President's address to the nation render the text dynamic. Various labels to identify the meaning relations between chunks of the text take the forms of stating the problem, marketing the solution, justifying previous failure and possible success of the new strategy, and showing a power position from which the tone of concession felt is rather clothed in an air of motivation and challenge. The problem stated implicitly throughout the text places the speaker in a Hamlet-like situation, as the struggle the U.S is engaged in "will determine the direction of the global war on terror and home safety" (para.1), "… the situation is unacceptable to the American people and it is unacceptable to me" (para.4). The solution proposed to this problem is the *new strategy* whose degree of explicit frequency (six times) is significant as a clue to understanding the gravity of the problem. "It is clear that we need to *change*

our strategy in Iraq" (para.5), and "So my national security team, military commanders and diplomats conducted a comprehensive review … We consulted members of Congress from both parties, our allies abroad and distinguished outside experts. We benefited from the thoughtful recommendations of the Iraq Study Group … In our discussions, we *all* [emphasis mine] agreed that there is no magic formula of success in Iraq. And one message came through loud and clear: failure in Iraq would be a disaster for the United States" (para.5). All this implies that the whole nation should be involved in reaching a solution to their problem. This is followed by a series of reasons and evidence justifying failure of earlier strategies and manipulating language through a concessionary attitude that invites sharing in finding a way out. The conjunctive discourse markers (additive, adversative, temporal and causal), together with nominal and gerund phrases mark this swerve in register: "But in 2006, the opposite happened … And the result was a vicious cycle of violence that continues today" (para.3); "The consequences of failure are clear" (para.6); "The challenge playing out across the broader Middle East …" (para.22); "Succeeding in Iraq also requires defending its territorial integrity and stabilizing the region in the face of extremist challenge" (para.19); and "Victory will not look like the ones our fathers and grandfathers achieved. There will be no surrender ceremony on the deck of a battleship" (para.25). It should be noted here that the phrase "no surrender ceremony on the deck of a battleship" is copied, with a slight change, from the President's speech addressing the nation on 30 November 2005, in the sentence "There will be no singing ceremony on the deck of a battleship".[4]

The President's discourse therefore works from within a system of language in use, where linguistic features of the text seem to be in keeping with the context of situation within the framework of the communicative function of language. This explains the polite but firm attitude of the speaker addressing a grave national issue to his people, and more emphatically his political opponents on the receiving end whose expected response to the speech is crucial. To this effect, discourse includes representations of how things are and have been as well as representations of how things might, should, or could be (Fairclough 2002). The question that a CDA analyst should raise concerning President Bush's asking the Congress members to get directly involved in the Iraqi issue and come up with improvements on his new strategy may read as follows: Are the Congress members really part of the solution, or as Brown (1993) so uncomfortably alleged, part of the problem? The power relations and the position of power from which the President is speaking are clear enough in the following paragraph.

> *In the days ahead, my national security team will fully brief Congress on our new strategy. If – if members have improvements that can be made, we will make them. If circumstances change, we will adjust. Honorable people*

[4] Speech available at: http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/11/2005 1130–2.html.

> *have different views and they will voice their criticisms. It is fair to hold our views up to scrutiny. And all involved have a responsibility to explain how the path they propose would be more likely to succeed* (para.27). [Emphasis added.]

Note the three "if"s in the construction of the President's proposition, much more than in the lexical and grammatical linguistic features where conditional clauses are evident, their frequency being eight for explicit "If" clauses, three of which are in one paragraph (para.27) and fifteen for embedded conditional clauses with "would" and "infinitive" phrases as part of the omitted "If" clause, examples being "as" (para.17), and "as a result" (para.18). These conditional relations imply that the degree of certainty to whether the President asks for real involvement of the Congress in the solution to the problem is weakened by the power relations he is in control of as President of the United States. The challenge underlying the proposition in paragraph 27 (see emphasis) is that the Iraq "legacy" will be handed down to the new Administration succeeding Mr. Bush's in 2008.

Unmasking other grammatical features of the discourse, more specifically the conjunctive discourse markers, furthers the effect of the lexical relations carrying the President's message to the nation. This is quite clear when we examine the causal and temporal conjunctive discourse relations expressed by the most frequent words. The causal relations, 12 in frequency, appear in such expressions as "the result was" (para.3), "the consequences of failure" (para.6), "for the safety of" (para.6), "for it [the plan] to succeed" (para.10), "so" (para.10, 14, 18), "why" (para.11), "in the long run" (para.22), "come after" (para.26, 26), "and we concluded that" (para.26), and so forth. The temporal relations, 26 in frequency, range from simple to conclusive and summary, as in the following: "tonight" (para.1, 11, 24), "when" (para2, 13), "in 2006" (para.3), "on Sept. 11, 2001" (para.6), "our past efforts" (para.8), "now" (para.9, 12, 30), "earlier" twice (para.11), "this time" twice (para.11), "last week" (para.12), "over time" (para.13), "by November" (para.15), "benchmarks" (para.16), "soon" (para.16), "recently" (para.20), "on Friday" (para.21), "in the days ahead" (para.27), "in these dangerous times" (para.29, "the year ahead" (para.30), "throughout our history" (para.30), and "these trying hours" (para.31). In association with the conjunctive discourse markers are lexical discourse relations that tilt at serving the overall purpose of the text.

At the level of lexical cohesion used throughout the text, the linguistic choices made signpost the ideological assumption underlying it. Dale (1989) uses the term 'sense legitimation' to describe a strategy for manufacturing consent in a particular group, and thereby achieving the hegemony of a discourse. The words and word phrases used by President Bush here to intensify the enormity of the situation that needs to be urgently redressed seem to serve the hegemony of the discourse strategy encompassing the speech. This strategy

involves couching unpopular policy changes in words whose meanings are subtly elusive. In CDA, it is clear that particular wordings are clues to discursive relationships in the text. Arguably, the more frequently a particular wording is used in a text, the more likely it is that a particular discourse is enlarging the base of its subscribers. In the speech under study, the subscribers are not only the people directly addressed (the American nation, the Congress) but also a larger number of people across the globe, including partner countries in the coalition forces and the moderate countries in the Middle East. In this context, CDA illuminates this side of the speech: how the speaker wants to be seen, not so much as a speculator of forthcoming events, but as an outspoken truth-teller who calls a spade a spade. The following lexical discourse features used in the text most frequently could not have been a matter of arbitrariness.

The thematic level of meaning underlying the lexical discourse features is intensified through word and phrase repetitions, contrasting images, metaphors, and untraditional, newly-coined collocations. For example, addressing the current situation in Iraq as "unacceptable" (para.4), "challenging" (para.22), and "dangerous" (para.29), the President employs repeatedly negative images of the enemy, such as "Al-Qaeda terrorists", "Sunni insurgents", "Shia death squads", "radical Islamic extremists", "enemies", "sectarian violence", "killers", "suicide bombings", "assassinations", "improvised explosive device attacks', "images of death and suffering", "murderers", "foreign fighters", "infiltrate and seize control", "building radical Islamic empire", "launching new attacks at home and abroad", and the like. Yet the negative image of the enemy is explicitly painted by the most frequently used synonymous words and expressions, such as "terror/terrorists" (12 times), "sectarian violence" (10 times), "extremists" (5 times), and "Al-Qaeda" (10 times) – in all, 37 times throughout the text.

On the other hand, the positive image of the American forces operating in Iraq is presented as "brave, selfless young men and women in uniform" who understand that "our cause in Iraq is noble and necessary and that the advance of freedom is the calling of our time" (para.29) ... "They serve far from their families, who make the quiet sacrifices of lonely holidays and empty chairs at the dinner table …" (para.29). They are there to "kill, destroy, capture, strike, blow a deal, fight, struggle, clear" and so forth. The new strategy, however, assigns to them "a well-defined mission: to help Iraqis clear and secure neighborhoods, to help them protect the local population and to help ensure that the Iraqi forces left behind are capable of providing the security that Baghdad needs" (para.10). Note the omission of the other parts of vast Iraq.

The assertive tone of the speech is evidenced by rather short and clear-cut sentences that show resolve, determination and commitment. Even when using the passive and the negative forms of the action verb, the speech sends a message that everything in Iraq is under control. The following sentences carry this message: "We will not allow them …" (para.18); "Where mistakes have been made, the responsibility rests with me" (para.4); "This is a strong

commitment" (para.10); "Now is time to act" (para.12); "For the safety of our people, America must succeed in Iraq" (para.6); "We can and we will prevail" (para.30); and "We go forward with trust" (para.31). As a matter of fact, the wording of the President's firm stand is also framed within an explicitly worded ideological struggle that goes beyond Iraq and American interests there, as in: "It is the decisive ideological struggle of our time" (para.22); "… the hateful ideology of the enemy" (para.22); and "Now America is engaged in a new struggle that will set the course for a new century" (para.30). However, there is confusion when it comes to spelling out the real reasons behind the vicious cycle of violence in Iraq. Time-lines, benchmarks, and promises to be met by the Iraqi government (which the speech advises and warns at the same time to enact necessary reforms across the socio-economic and socio-political structures of Iraq) betray the uncertainty of the situation the speech claims it is under control. The following conclusive statements rehashed in the text send a doubtful message about the prospects of a peaceful settlement in Iraq:

Only Iraqis can end the sectarian violence and secure their people. (para.7)

I have made it clear to the Prime Minister and Iraq's other leaders that America's commitment is not open-ended…(para.12)

So America will hold the Iraqi government to the benchmarks it has announced. (para.14)

A democratic Iraq will not be perfect. (para.25)

And the speech closes with a preaching tone "that the Author of Liberty will guide us through these trying hours" (para.31), reaffirming the ideological conflict underlying the situation in Iraq and beyond: "On one side are those who believe in freedom and moderation. On the other side are the extremists who kill the innocent and have declared their intention to destroy our way of life" (para.22). The ideology materialized in the speech consists of a "systematic network of beliefs which needs discourse as its medium of expression" (Hodge & Kress 1991, p. 6).

What is Excluded from the Text?

Excluded from the text are points related to the real reasons behind the invasion of Iraq, and the intensity of the dark situation in the process of rebuilding the torn country. The reasons which were worded in a highly elaborate, rhetorical manner on the eve of the invasion have now totally disappeared from the text. Saddam Hussein's "Weapons of Mass Destruction" (WMD), which on the eve of the invasion were the focal point behind the Bush Administration rallying support and mobilizing coalition forces, contrary to the UN Inspectors' reports about WMD, are totally absented from the speech. Another reason

for the deterioration of the Iraqi situation, but is also excluded from the text, is related to the preservation of Iraqi unity and its territorial integrity, both of which are threatened in the absence of the strong Iraqi army and police force which were dismantled after formal surrender, to be replaced by a new army and police force made up mostly of sectarian militia men. Thanks to the chaos created after the army was dissolved, the Kurds in northern Iraq have established their own autonomous state (Kurdistan), Shia groups are on the way to building their own state in southern Iraq, and the Sunni groups are building their own militia force. Besides these reasons, and definitely much more saddening, is the corruption across the public sectors of the state as well as the money spent on thousands of security contractors, which the speech does not even allude to.

Absent also from the speech is the rising number of casualties claimed, whether on the part of the Iraqi population (not to mention millions of the displaced Iraqis within and without the country) or the Coalition Forces. A news report released by CNN (August 17, 2007) on the Iraq situation shows that the suicide rate among American military personnel rose to 25% in the year 2006. Further exclusions, in form of omissions, are the democratization process of the broader Middle East, to be replaced by full cooperation with the non-democratic "moderate" Gulf countries and with the Iraqi tribal and sectarian forces. The Iraqi "young democracy" being the example set for the Middle East seems to have gone down the drain.

Still other exclusions behind the tragic situation in Iraq include the indefinite mandate of the coalition forces in Iraq; some of these forces have already left and some others are about to leave. Further exclusions from the text are the unidentified mistakes made in Iraq, and the job being accomplished by the troops. We do not know exactly what mistakes have been made in Iraq and who has made them (agent omitted), and why the President claims responsibility for that, as in "Where mistakes have been made, the responsibility rests with me" (para.4), or in "They [troops] have done everything we have asked them to do" (para.4), which sounds vague and is subject to further enquiry, as in the case of Abu-Ghraib prison torture images which were denounced world-wide. Another important omission, perhaps, is concerned with the unidentified "benefits" from the Baker-Hamilton ISG Report. The President says he will form another bi-partisan committee for Iraq in order to redress the differences between the Republicans and the Democrats, but the mission assigned to this new ISG is left vague and unknown. Omission from the text, whether done consciously or unconsciously, is a key-guide to inform CDA.

Conclusion

CDA, used in this paper as an approach to political discourse, can be an effective tool that enables us to view reality as textually mediated through

language systems, and the text as a site of power struggle used for both the "inculcation and the contestation of discourses" (Locke 2004, p.2). It also views analysis and interpretation of the text as potentially revealing of ways in which discourses summon power to manipulate public opinions through covert calls (Janks 1997). This paper has illustrated the ways CDA debunks the hidden ideological meanings behind President Bush's speech of January 10, 2007, by peeling away the layers of the text, both lexical and grammatical, to expose the invisible power of the written/spoken word within the field, and to examine what language in use reflects about such a field. This does not mean that CDA provides an answer to the political problem situated in a specific context; rather, it enables the analyst and the critical reader to understand the conditions behind that problem or, as Palmquist (1999) put it, "the deep ideological roots of the issue". This paper has also illustrated how CDA can be effective in unmasking textual discursive practices by paying attention to what, as van Dijk (1999) argues, "politicians say and do". In short, CDA can be used as an effective tool that uncovers the hidden meaning of the text so that we discover the relationship between power, position, and language in use.

Bibliography

Brown, M. (1993). *Philosophical studies of Home Economics in the United State basic ideas by which home economists understand themselves*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1993.

Dale, R. *The State and Education Policy*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press,1989.

Fairclough, N. *Language and Power*. 2nd ed. New York: Longman, 2000.

Fairclough, N. "The dialectics of discourse", 22 May, 2002 <http://www.geogr.ku.dk/courses/phd/glob-loc/papers/phdfairclough2.pdf

Foucault, M. *Power/Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon, 1980.

Geis, M. *The Language of Politics*. New York: Spring-Verlag, 1987.

Halliday, M.A.K. An Introduction to Functional Grammar. 3rd ed. London: Arnold, 2004.

Henry, F., & Tator, C. *Discourses of Domination*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.

Hodge, R. & Kress, G. *Language as Ideology*. London: Routledge, 1991.

Janks, H."Critical Discourse Analysis as a Research Tool", *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 18 (3), 1997, 329–42.

Locke, T. *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London and New York: Continuum, 2004.

McGregor, C.*Critical Science Approach – a primer*, 18 June 2003<http://www.kon.org/cfp/critical_science_primer.pdf

Palmquist, R. *Discourse Analysis*.26 Nvember, 1999<http://www.gslis.utexas.edu/-palmquist/courses/discourse.htm

Thompson, M. *ICT, Power, and Development Discourse: a critical analysis.12 April, 2002*< http://www.jims.cam.ac.uk/research/seminar/thompson_ab.pdf

van Dijk, T.A. "*Critical Discourse Analysis and Conversation Analysis*". *Discourse and Society*, 10 (4), 1999, 450–459.

van Dijk, T.A. *Critical Discourse Analysis*. 24 June, 2000<http://www.discourse-in-society.org/oldArticles.pdf

Wodak, R., & Ludwig, C. (Eds.) *Challenges in a Changing World: Issues in critical discourse analysis*. Vienna: Passagenverlag, 1999.