

## **A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF VLADIMIR PUTIN'S SPEECH ANNOUNCING 'SPECIAL MILITARY OPERATION' IN UKRAINE**

**Enas Naji KADIM**<sup>1</sup>

Researcher, Wasit University, Iraq

### **Abstract:**

In the last years, politics become globally the main activity in life of human beings in order to discuss and negotiate different crises such as the relations between countries, health crisis, the crisis of the water sources, the diplomatic relations, war announcements and so on by manipulating language which has different types and aims. There many studies which are focused on the political speeches of different presidents and politicians and these studies adopt different theories and models in order to show their ideologies, power, plans and different characteristics. So this study tries to analyse the speech of president Vladimir Putin concerning the crises of Ukraine. It tries to analyse his speech by adopting Van Dijk (1999, 1995, 2004, 2006) discursive strategies. This study aims to find how Putin manipulated and used these strategies in his speech concerning the crisis in Ukraine. Vladimir Putin is a president of Russia and his country has tense relations with Ukraine from United States of America (USA) and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) been strategically planning to extend their territories along the borders between Ukraine and Russia. He tried to state the facts and tell the international community, the citizens of Russia and Ukraine, UAS, and NATO' countries about the lies of the United States. The current study is concerned with the political discourse of President Vladimir Putin concerning the crises of the war with Ukraine. It investigates the structures and the discursive strategies that reveal some aspects of Putin's political attitudes and ideologies. This study is done in three categories which are as follows: the category of meaning, the category of argumentation and the category of rhetoric.

**Key words:** Political Discourse, Ideology, Power, Discursive Strategies, United Nations, and North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

---

 <http://dx.doi.org/10.47832/2757-5403.18.23>

<sup>1</sup>  [enaskadim1985@gmail.com](mailto:enaskadim1985@gmail.com)

## Introduction:

In this study, the researcher applies Van Dijk' CDA model which consists of 25 discursive strategies. This model helps to analyse and interpret the political dimensions of the ideology of the Russian Federation, Vladimir Putin of the speeches 's, during the crisis of the Ukraine. From a general view, language, whether it is spoken or written has messages that the speaker or writer intends to convey to his audiences which can be explicit or implicit and one of these messages is political ones. The CDA has been thoroughly investigated by many linguists and social scientists. Fairclough and Wodak (1993) among others define" discourse as any form of language that the society uses to convey information at the contextual level. Technically, it refers to utterances or linguistic sentences between the writer – speaker on the one hand, and the reader- hearer, on the other. Therefore, analysing sentences and words can help understanding the speaker's ideological background and how he uses language techniques to persuade and manipulate peoples' minds. Since this study is concerned with analysing Putin's speech during the crisis of the Ukraine. Van Dijk (1998) argued that the CDA is a kind of discourse analytical research that studies the way dominance, inequality and social power abuse are resisted, reproduced and enacted by the talk and text in the political and social context. From the abovementioned, we can say that CDA focuses on revealing the hidden meaning of the text. It also shows how the speaker, or the writer applies the power in his discourse in order to control the minds and actions of the dominant groups and persuade them with his beliefs and thoughts.. The main purpose of the CDA is then to find how the spoken or written texts are organized, and it investigates the hidden ideological features and power relations by analysing the characteristics of language and structures in the text.

## 1.Ideology

There are many scholars and philosophers who defined the concept " ideology "and they dealt with it from different views , for instance the French philosopher Destutt de Tracy described the concept "ideology" as the 'science of ideas' (Yahiaoui, 2005,p 2). Later on , the notion " ideology" has evolved and acquired different meanings and implications, the most important ones of them are the political and cultural ones. The concept "ideology" is one of key terms showing culture. It refers to a group of dominant ideas and beliefs which affect every sphere of human social interaction and organization, which are political, economic, scientific, educational, and cultural. Ideology is seen as a systematic scheme of concepts, specifically in relation to human life and culture. Hence, ideology consists of the way of thinking, or sets of ideas held by an individual, group, or culture and it constitutes the underlying foundation of the belief systems or social perceptions of particular groups Scholars indicate that language is the medium of expressing the ideologies , it plays a role in legitimating the relations of organized power. In other words a language can have its own ideology which may be either a correct conceptualization of language or dissented from the facts. These ideologies form or social representations of specific groups the basis of the belief

systems (Van Dijk, 2001 ) The historical origins of the word " ideology" can be traced back to eighteenth-century French philosophical thought. The term idéologie "ideology" which was coined by the French philosopher Destutt de Tracy (1795) coined idéologie "ideology", to refer ideas which are used in clarifying, stating and improving public debat. Actually the term is a combination of two words which are Greek 'idea' (form) and 'logos' (knowledge). The term ideology has many meanings and interpretations, ranging from a set of ideas, beliefs or values which justify the system, systematic doctrines, cultural beliefs that legitimize particular social and political system, to hegemony, or and this dominant ideology used by the state to justify the use of power, control and domination.

## **2. Language and Political discourse**

Language is essential to all modes of communication, it is the most important tool for human communication. Orally or in writing, language is vital for conveying our thoughts, ideas, messages and facts. Yule (1996) argued that through the use of language, humans are capable of producing statements with accompanying actions. Aristotle's (1991) famous definition - 'Man is by nature a political animal' provides evidence that the study of politics has a long tradition. Post (2009) and Rudyk (2007) referred that language is the fundamental medium and weapon of ideology and power. However, the political actions and events are carried out through language (Bello, 2013). Language is not only a tool, but also a product of specific ideologies and political systems, so the relationship between ideology and power on the one hand, and language on the other, is reciprocal. (Ghazani, 2016; Van Dijk, 2005). Van Dijk (1998) viewed political discourse as a class of genres defined by the domain of politics, but not a genre by itself. Therefore, political speeches, parliamentary deliberations, electoral debates, political programs and government discussions are some genres which are related to politics. Politicians who have responsibilities in the society using a type of language which is termed as a political language in order to convince and persuade the audiences and people. Politicians' speeches have direct influences in different fields of life, such as economic, social, cultural, military and even education. In other words their speeches sometimes have the decisions of war, peace, stability or conflict. Political discourse is very important because it plans and leads the future of the nation. Schaffner (1996) stated that political discourse is one of the types of discourse in general and can be depended on two criteria: functional and thematic. Since politics has different activities and events. So political discourse is used to express them and is it determined according to the cultural and historical views. Therefore, it is functional since it fulfils different functions due to different political activities and events and is thematic because its subjects and topics are primarily related to politics such as political activities, political ideas and political relations. Liebes & Ribak (1991) stated that political discourse can be defined as a communicative act by which participants try to give specific meanings to facts and influence or persuade others to affect the attitudes and opinions of a certain audience to shape people's thoughts and attitudes. Political discourse is different from other types of discourse because it is directed to a certain group. In other

terms, political discourse can be defined as a manipulative linguistic strategy which serves concrete ideological aims. Political discourse may involve both the formal debates, speeches, and hearings and the informal talk on politics among family members.. For these reasons, the researchers have tried to analyse these speeches in order to uncover what they mean in reality (Sheveleva, 2012).

### 3. Method

This section is concerned with the selection and description of the study data which indicates and describes the data and the tools of analysis which adopted in this study.

#### 3.1.Data Description

The data of the study are selected extracts taken from the Russian President Vladimir Putin's speech which announces 'special military operation' in Ukraine. The speech has been taken from the website of the journal "The Print ". Vladimir Putin, (born Oct. 7, 1952, Leningrad, U.S.S.R.), Russian president (1999–2008; 2012–) and prime minister (1999; 2008–12). Putin served 15 years with the Комитет государственной безопасности Knowledge Generation Bureau KGB, including six years in Dresden, E.Ger. In 1990 he retired from active KGB service and returned to Russia to become prorector of Leningrad State University, and by 1994 he had risen to the post of first deputy mayor of the city. In 1996 he moved to Moscow, where he joined the presidential staff as deputy to Pavel Borodin, the Kremlin's chief administrator. In July 1998 President Boris Yeltsin appointes Putin director of the Federal Security Service. In 1999 Yeltsin appointed Putin prime minister, and on December 31 of that year Yeltsin stepped down as president in Putin's favour. <https://www.britannica.com/summary/Vladimir-Putin> The Russian leader's initial aim was to overrun Ukraine and depose its government, ending for good its desire to join the Western defensive alliance NATO. After a month of failures, he abandoned his bid to capture the capital Kyiv and turned his ambitions to Ukraine's east and south. Launching the invasion on 24 February he told the Russian people his goal was to "demilitarise and de-Nazify Ukraine". His declared aim was to protect people subjected to what he called eight years of bullying and genocide by Ukraine's government. Another objective was soon added: ensuring Ukraine's neutral status .<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-56720589>.The speech of the president is divided into parts as extracts and they are numbered in order to be analyzed and discussed.

### **3.2. Tools of analysis**

This study is qualitative and the adopted model of this study was based on critical analysis of discourse (ADC) particularly the ideological discursive devices of Van Dijk. According to Van Dijk (2005, p.735). These devices are important for speech production and recognition processes of ideological analysis of political speech. The researcher tries to analyze the political speeches from the micro-level according to the ideological devices which will be classified into three categories as follows : meaning , rhetoric and argumentation (Van Dijk, 2003, 354).The category of meaning consists of: actor description , demonization, disclaimer ,display of power, implication , lexicalization ,negative other-presentation , positive self-presentation ,polarization ,situation description and threat, vagueness and victimization, the category of rhetoric consists of: metaphor national self-glorification and rhetorical question and the category of argumentation consists of :authority, evidentiality, and example or illustration ( p.735-36).This study also highlights and marks the strategies that may be used by the Russian President Vladimir Putin's speech in his speeches to persuade his audiences with his ideas and thoughts and earn support to achieve his goals and plans in the near future.

#### **1.The category of meaning**

This category which consists of the following devices as follows :

##### **1.1. Actor description**

It is one of the semantic devices by which the discourse is about people and actions involving various types of actor description. So , actors may be described as members of groups or as individuals, referring to them by first or family name, function, role or group name, as specific or unspecific, by their actions or attributes, by their position or relation to other people, and so on.. Besides this characterization of THEM, in group –out group polarization will typically reverse that role for in group members when conservative speakers describe "our own" people as victims (Van Dijk, 2005, p.735).

##### **1.2.Demonization**

It is the term that has been expanded to refer to any characterization of individuals, groups, or political bodies as evil.

### 1.3. Disclaimer

It is a semantic device which is again a mix between positive self –presentation and negative –self presentation for describing good characteristics of In -group members , such as a person , group or item and then describing a denial of these characteristics by using specific terms like "but. These disclaimers quickly save face by mentioning OUR excellent, but then focus almost entirely on THEIR bad attributes " (Van Diik ,2005, p.736). All these disclaimers combine a positive aspect of our own group, with negative ones of the Others, and thus directly instantiates the contradictions in ideological based attitudes.

### 1.4. Display of power

Power is the ability of an individual or groups who try to control on a specific environment or lives and those will control on others. So power is linked to speeches because speeches are ways of representing and constructing reality, so that power relations are constructed, maintained and contested via discourses. One can be powerful in one context and powerless in another which it depends on different factors, Fairclough (1995, p, 1) defined "power not only as asymmetries that exist between individuals participating in the same discursive event but also in terms of how people have different capacities to control how texts and thus discourses are produced, distributed and consumed". Van Dijk (1996,p. 85) noted that 'social power and dominance are often organized and institutionalized, so as to allow more effective control and to enable routine forms of power reproduction'.

### 1.5. Implication

The implication is a semantic device which is used by speakers in general and especially politicians. They usually resort to use in order to avoid mentioning explicit information when it is not correct or the information is negative for them. In other words, negative information for US and positive information for THEM remains implicit and the positive information for US is explicit and negative information for THEM remain explicit. The implication is something which the speaker suggests or implies with an utterance, even though it is not literally expressed.

### 1.6. Lexicalization

Lexicalization is a semantic device which is used to depict someone or something positively or negatively. Van Diik (2005, p.735) explained that the choice of lexical items by speakers is based on the speakers' posting , role , goals , point of view or opinion that is as a consequence of context elements.

### **1.7. Negative other-presentation**

It is the categorization of people into in-groups and out-groups, and even the division between 'good' and 'bad' out groups, is not value-free, but imbued with ideologically based applications of norms and values.

### **1.8. Positive self-presentation**

Positive self-presentation is one of the semantic devices which is used either individually in the form of face keeping or impression management or collectively form in which the speaker indicates the positive characteristics of the own group. This device is also an essential ideological device, because it is based on the positive self-schema that defines the ideology of a group (Van Dijk, 2004 p.67).

### **1.9. Polarization**

It is one of the semantic devices that categorizes people into in-group (US) and out-group (THEM) members and then builds mental positive and negative representations of the in-group and out-group respectively. At the same time, polarization divides out group (THEM) again into two negative and positive members or groups. We can conclude their attitudes or ideologies from their speeches, talks and texts. In other words, there is either white or black areas no gray one. (Rashidi&Souzandehfar,2010;Van Dijk,2005,p.738). Gamble & Gamble (2013, p. 86) indicated that polarization is the use of "either-or language" that causes us to perceive and speak about the world in extremes".

### **1.10. Situation description**

It is the description of the actions, experiences and situations which they need to be described.

### **1.11. Threat**

Threat is an ideological device which implicitly refers to this fact that THEY are dangerous and enhances the terror of THEM and the need to contain such danger.

### **1.12. Vagueness**

Vagueness is one of the semantic devices which is used by speakers to avoid sensitive and problematic issues. So, they sometimes use vague expressions such as, quantifiers like "some, certain, few, a few" and "a lot" (Van Dijk, 2005, p. 739), adverbs ('very'), nouns ('thing') and adjectives ('low', 'high'). vagueness may imply mitigation, euphemism and indirectly also a denial.

### **1.13. Victimization**

Victimization is one of the semantic devices which portrayed "In-group members" as victim of unfair treatment of "Out-group members". The relations are organized by the binary US-THEM pair of in-groups and out-groups.. This means that when the Others tend to be represented in negative terms, and especially when they are

associated with threats, then the in-group needs to be represented as a victim of such a threat( Van Dijk ,2005, p.739).

## **2.The category of argumentation**

This category which consists of the following devices : authority , evidentially and example / illustration

### **2.1. Authority**

It is one of the argumentative devices by which a political speaker resorts to use this device in his speech which is deductive reasoning ( logic) in order to persuade the listeners ,Van Dijk ( 2000, p. ) mentioned that these authorities are often organizations for instance UNITED NATIONS or moral leaders , well- acknowledged persons.

### **2.2. Evidentiality**

It is one of the devices by which speakers present facts or proofs to support their thoughts ,or believes (Van Dijk ,2005,p.736).

### **2.3.Example / illustration**

It is again one of the argumentative devices by which a speaker uses either real or imaginary examples in his or her speech in order to persuade their audiences and listeners and at the same time to support his or her point of views often in the form of stories which state about Our good deeds and Their bad behavior(Van Dijk ,2005, p.737).

## **3.The category of Rhetoric**

This category which consists of the following ones : metaphor, national self-glorification and, rhetorical question

### **3.1. Metaphor**

It is one of the rhetorical devices which is based on the implicit comparison between two categories with meaning extension. However, most political metaphors are negative, and “thus fall under the overall ideological strategy of negative other-description” (Van Dijk, 2006,p, 78).

### **3.2. National self-glorification**

It is one of the rhetorical devices by which the speaker praise for his own country, its principles, history and traditions. thus such ideologies may be combined with nationalist ideologies( Van Dijk ,2005, p,738).

### **3.3.Rhetorical Question**

Rhetorical question is one of the devices which is found in political speeches (Orwell 1946). Rhetorical Question has been defined by several scholars such as Beekman & Callow

(1976), Cuddon (1979), Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech & Svartvik (1985), as that question which is structurally the same as any other question but which, usually, is not designed or is not expected to elicit an answer. The main difference, however, is that the rhetorical question is semantically and functionally a statement or claim because the writer is ready to tell his readers the answer, the answer is already known, or nobody, not even the writer, knows the answer. This means that getting an answer to such a question is the desire of every reader/listener.

#### **4. Quantitative Data Analysis and Discussion**

This section is limited to analyse and discuss the whole speech of the president Putin about the military operation in Ukraine, according to the strategies of the model as indicated previously.

##### **Extract (1)**

*"I consider it necessary today to speak again about the tragic events in Donbass and the key aspects of ensuring the security of Russia".*

The president Putin started his speech by manipulating many strategies at the same time and these strategies as follows : Firstly, the strategy of situation description when he mentioned that it is necessary to return to the history of the tragic events which are occurred in Donbass. He described these events as tragic and hard for Donbass. He linked the events of the past with the present ones. Secondly, he stated both of the strategies of victimization and implication. He implicitly referred that Donbass was a victim to these events. Thirdly , the strategy of threat, again he referred to the security of Russia faces dangerous movements.

##### **Extract (2)**

*" I will begin with what I said in my address on February 21, 2022. I spoke about our biggest concerns and worries, and about the fundamental threats which irresponsible Western politicians created for Russia consistently, rudely and unceremoniously from year to year. I am referring to the eastward expansion of NATO, which is moving its military infrastructure ever closer to the Russian border".*

Putin linked his speech with a previous one on February 21, 2022. So, he manipulated the strategy of negative self-representation of the other-group when he told his citizens about the threats of the western politicians. He described their actions and behaviors as not stable and ruder ones. Secondly, he used the strategy of actor description of the expansion of the NATO' countries and the moving of their military infrastructures towards Russian border. Thirdly, the strategy of threat he mentioned directly that threats of western countries.

**Extract (3)**

*"It is a fact that over the past 30 years we have been patiently trying to come to an agreement with the leading NATO countries regarding the principles of equal and indivisible security in Europe. In response to our proposals, we invariably faced either cynical deception and lies or attempts at pressure and blackmail, while the North Atlantic alliance continued to expand despite our protests and concerns. Its military machine is moving and, as I said, is approaching our very border".*

Putin used again many strategies in this text such as authority, negative self-representation and repetition. Firstly, he manipulated the strategy of authority when he mentioned the roles of NATO ' countries and their plans in the region. NATO's countries continued with their plans in spite of the proposals of the Russian federated. Secondly, he showed the negative behaviors of NATO ' s countries in the region, which named them as" cynical deception and lies or attempts at pressure and blackmail ". Thirdly, he manipulated the strategy of repetition when he repeated the movement of their military infrastructure towards the Russian border.

**Extract(4)**

*"why is this happening? Where did this insolent manner of talking down from the height of their exceptionalism, infallibility and all-permissiveness come from? What is the explanation for this contemptuous and disdainful attitude to our interests and absolutely legitimate demands?"*

Putin used the strategies of rhetorical question and lexicalisation in this text. Firstly, the strategy of rhetorical question when he asked many questions to the citizens of his country and to the international community. He implied, and gave the facts and the answers in the same questions. So, he pictured the situation to his citizens and to the international society and inserted the lexical words such as their exceptionalism, infallible and all-permissiveness this contemptuous and disdainful attitude.

**Extract (5)**

*"Everything is clear and obvious. In the late 1980s, the Soviet Union grew weaker and subsequently broke apart. That experience should serve as a good lesson for us, because it has shown us that the paralysis of power and will is the first step towards complete degradation and oblivion. We lost confidence for only one moment, but it was enough to disrupt the balance of forces in the world. As a result, the old treaties and agreements are no longer effective. Entreaties and requests do not help. Anything that does not suit the dominant state, the powers that be, is denounced as archaic, obsolete and useless. At the same time, everything it regards as useful is presented as the ultimate truth and forced on others regardless of the cost,*

*abusively and by any means available. Those who refuse to comply are subjected to strong-arm tactics".*

Putin used the strategies of actor description and evidentially in these lines. He answered the previous questions and described what has happened to the Soviet Union between the past and present. He described the political events and activities concerning the Soviet Union. He tried to persuade his citizens that this lesson must not be reoccurred again, then he supported his speech by mentioning different evidences such as the old treaties and agreements, entreaties and requests which are no longer working. He indicated that these treaties and agreements are useless.

### **Extract (6)**

*"What I am saying now does not concerns only Russia, and Russia is not the only country that is worried about this. This has to do with the entire system of international relations, and sometimes even US allies. The collapse of the Soviet Union led to a redivision of the world, and the norms of international law that developed by that time – and the most important of them, the fundamental norms that were adopted following WWII and largely formalised its outcome – came in the way of those who declared themselves the winners of the Cold War."*

The president Putin used the strategy of polarization in this extract since he gave a clear view about the situation of the world not only Russia. Referring that the collapse of the Soviet Union led the USA allies to draw the map of the world according to their aims and targets. They created their own laws and announced that these are the international laws but actually their own. Here Putin tried again to tell the international community that the world is divided into two groups. One of them who declared themselves as the winners of the cold war and they imposed their policies on the rest of the countries.

### **Extract (7)**

*"There are many examples of this. First a bloody military operation was waged against Belgrade, without the UN Security Council's sanction but with combat aircraft and missiles used in the heart of Europe. The bombing of peaceful cities and vital infrastructure went on for several weeks. I have to recall these facts, because some Western colleagues prefer to forget them, and when we mentioned the event, they prefer to avoid speaking about international law, instead emphasising the circumstances which they interpret as they think necessary."*

Putin used many strategies. Firstly, he used the strategy of actor description by referring that the UN Security Council did not impose sanctions on the military operations which were waged against Belgrade. Secondly, he stated the strategy of evidentially by mentioning the facts and evidences of their hostile bloody operations, which continued for weeks and destroyed the civil cities. Thirdly, he used the strategy of implication, indicating that western countries avoided the international law, and they created their own interpretations according to their

benefits and their circumstances , which means they hide the facts of their bloody actions against Belgrade.

### **Extract (8)**

*"The illegal use of military power against Libya and the distortion of all the UN Security Council decisions on Libya ruined the state, created a huge seat of international terrorism, and pushed the country towards a humanitarian catastrophe, into the vortex of a civil war, which has continued there for years. The tragedy, which was created for hundreds of thousands and even millions of people not only in Libya but in the whole region, has led to a large-scale exodus from the Middle East and North Africa to Europe."*

Firstly the strategy of evidentially was manipulated by the president Putin, showing that terrorism and civil war appeared in Libya as a result of the military power operations which were waged by western countries bloc and the USA. Then he continued that hundreds of thousands and even millions of people not only in Libya but in the whole region immigrated from the Middle East and North Africa to Europe. Secondly, the strategy of negative-representation was stated by referring to their illegal military operations which made the people of Libya suffering from civil war and immigration.

### **Extract (9)**

*"A similar fate was also prepared for Syria. The combat operations conducted by the Western coalition in that country without the Syrian government's approval or UN Security Council's sanction can only be defined as aggression and intervention."*

In this text, Putin used the strategy of illustration. So, he supported his speech by mentioning another example of Syria by stating that the same scenario occurred against Syria without the approval of the Syrian government or UN Security Council.

### **Extract (10)**

*"But the example that stands apart from the above events is, of course, the invasion of Iraq without any legal grounds. They used the pretext of allegedly reliable information available in the United States about the presence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. To prove that allegation, the US Secretary of State held up a vial with white powder, publicly, for the whole world to see, assuring the international community that it was a chemical warfare agent created in Iraq. It later turned out that all of that was a fake and a sham, and that Iraq did not have any chemical weapons. Incredible and shocking but true. We witnessed lies made at the highest state level and voiced from the high UN rostrum. As a result we see a at the highest state level and voiced from the high UN rostrum".*

Here, Putin manipulated the following strategies. Firstly, the strategy of example or illustration when he referred to the invasion of Iraq as different from the previous ones. He

stated that this invasion was illegal one because there were no legal grounds which allow them to do that. Secondly, the strategy of actor description since he continued his speech that the United States told the international community that Iraq has weapons of mass destruction. He indicated that the US Secretary of State assured to the international community that Iraq has chemical weapons, but later on, it was just lying from the highest state level and voiced from the high UN rostrum. Thirdly, the strategy of authority, referring that UN, which is considered the highest state level used its authority and voiced with USA depending on lies. He tried to tell the international community that even the decisions of the United Nations were illegal and they participated in this crime against Iraq.

**Extract (11)**

*"Overall, it appears that nearly everywhere, in many regions of the world where the United States brought its law and order, this created bloody, non-healing wounds and the curse of international terrorism and extremism. I have only mentioned the most glaring but far from only examples of disregard for international law."*

Putin used the strategy of negative self-representation. He addressed his citizens and the international community that the glaring plans of the west became known for everyone and in different regions which were feeding the international terrorism and extremism. He referred that the western countries ignored the international law and did not care for the international treaties.

**Extract (12)**

"Incidentally, US politicians, political scientists and journalists write and say that a veritable "empire of lies" has been created inside the United States in recent years. It is hard to disagree with this – it is really so. But one should not be modest about it: the United States is still a great country and a system-forming power. All its satellites not only humbly and obediently say yes to and parrot it at the slightest pretext but also imitate its behavior and enthusiastically accept the rules it is offering them. Therefore, one can say with good reason and confidence that the whole so-called Western bloc formed by the United States in its own image and likeness is, in its entirety, the very same "empire of lies."

In this text the president Putin used the strategies of metaphor and display of power. Firstly, he compared the policy of the United States to the emperor of lies. He tries to state that United States when planning for certain targets, it declares lies and implements these targets. Then, the strategy of display of power when he stated that the United States is a great country which forms the power system of the world and all the countries of the western bloc follow them in their policy.

**Extract (13)**

*"As for our country, after the disintegration of the USSR, given the entire unprecedented openness of the new, modern Russia, its readiness to work honestly with the United States and other Western partners, and its practically unilateral disarmament, they immediately tried to put the final squeeze on us, finish us off, and utterly destroy us. This is how it was in the 1990s and the early 2000s, when the so-called collective West was actively supporting separatism and gangs of mercenaries in southern Russia. What victims, what losses we had to sustain and what trials we had to go through at that time before we broke the back of international terrorism in the Caucasus! We remember this and will never forget."*

Putin used the strategies of categorization when he showed and compared between the positive political actions of his government towards the United States and other western partners and the negative political behaviors of these countries towards Russia. He stated that these countries supporting separatism and gangs of mercenaries in southern Russia. Secondly, he used the strategy of victimization by stating that they were the victims of their bad deeds especially when Russia disarmed, but the United States and their collective West did the opposite by destroying the USSR. Finally, he used the strategy of demonization by informing the international community about the aggressive operations of the United States and their allies.

**Extract (14)**

*"Despite all that, in December 2021, we made yet another attempt to reach agreement with the United States and its allies on the principles of European security and NATO's non-expansion. Our efforts were in vain. The United States has not changed its position. It does not believe it necessary to agree with Russia on a matter that is critical for us. The United States is pursuing its own objectives, while neglecting our interests."*

He used the strategy of categorization. He tried to indicate the differences between the positive behaviors of Russia and the negative behaviors of USA especially the expansion of NATO towards the borders of Russia. They looked for their aims and neglected the interest of the nation of Russia. the strategy of Situation description

**Extract (15)**

*"Of course, this situation begs a question: what next, what are we to expect? If history is any guide, we know that in 1940 and early 1941 the Soviet Union went to great lengths to prevent war or at least delay its outbreak. To this end, the USSR sought not to provoke the potential aggressor until the very end by refraining or postponing the most urgent and obvious preparations it had to make to defend itself from an imminent attack. When it finally acted, it was too late." As a result, the country was not prepared to counter the invasion by Nazi*

*Germany, which attacked our Motherland on June 22, 1941, without declaring war. The country stopped the enemy and went on to defeat it, but this came at a tremendous cost. The attempt to appease the aggressor ahead of the Great Patriotic War proved to be a mistake which came at a high cost for our people. In the first months after the hostilities broke out, we lost vast territories of strategic importance, as well as millions of lives. We will not make this mistake the second time. We have no right to do so".*

Putin manipulated many strategies which are the following ones : Firstly , the strategy of actor description of the situation. So, he described the role of the Soviet Union, which tried to prevent or delay war. Secondly ,the strategy of self-representation, he showed the positive self-representation of the Soviet Union.The Soviet union refused the aggression of the invasion.At the same time , he showed the negative self-representation of the attack of the invasion of Nazi Germany on the soviet union. Thirdly, the strategy of victimization, he stated that our motherland lost vast territories of strategic importance, as well as millions of people.

**Extract (16)**

*"those who aspire to global dominance have publicly designated Russia as their enemy. They did so with impunity. Make no mistake, they had no reason to act this way. It is true that they have considerable financial, scientific, technological, and military capabilities. We are aware of this and have an objective view of the economic threats we have been hearing, just as our ability to counter this brash and never-ending blackmail. Let me reiterate that we have no illusions in this regard and are extremely realistic in our assessments."*

Putin used the strategy of actor description and implication simultaneously. He did not utter their names and referred to them by the word " those "who have ambition to control the world. At the same time, he used the strategy of threat, stating the continues threatening of these countries which have modern capabilities against Russia since they were no penalties for these authoritarian countries.

**Extract(17)**

*"As I said in my previous address, you cannot look without compassion at what is happening there. It became impossible to tolerate it. We had to stop that atrocity, that genocide of the millions of people who live there and who pinned their hopes on Russia, on all of us. It is their aspirations, the feelings and pain of these people that were the main motivating force behind our decision to recognise the independence of the Donbass people's republics."*

Putin used the following strategies :Firstly, the strategy of lexicalization ,such as the expressions " *atrocity, genocide of the millions of people* " and secondly the strategy of victimization , he indicated that the people of the republic of Donbass suffered from the

dominance of the hostile deeds of the western countries and they pinned their hopes and aspirations on Russia to freedom them.

### **Extract (18)**

*"I would like to additionally emphasise the following. Focused on their own goals, the leading NATO countries are supporting the far-right nationalists and neo-Nazis in Ukraine, those who will never forgive the people of Crimea and Sevastopol for freely making a choice to reunite with Russia. They will undoubtedly try to bring war to Crimea just as they have done in Donbass, to kill innocent people just as members of the punitive units of Ukrainian nationalists and Hitler's accomplices did during the Great Patriotic War. They have also openly laid claim to several other Russian regions. If we look at the sequence of events and the incoming reports, the showdown between Russia and these forces cannot be avoided. It is only a matter of time. They are getting ready and waiting for the right moment. Moreover, they went as far as aspire to acquire nuclear weapons. We will not let this happen."*

Putin used the following strategies: Firstly, the description of actor when he described the behaviors and the aims of the leading NATO countries, the far-right nationalists and neo-Nazis in Ukraine towards the people of Crimea and Sevastopol. Secondly, the negative self-representation when he pictured the situation of the far-right nationalists and neo-Nazis in Ukraine and their horrible deeds in the past. He emphasized that the same actors who helped Hitler to kill people, they would do that again with the regions of Crimea and Sevastopol. Thirdly, the strategy of threat when he mentioned these countries are waiting for the right moment to attack Russia as well as they develop nuclear weapons to threaten the region.

### **Extract (19)**

*"I have already said that Russia accepted the new geopolitical reality after the dissolution of the USSR. We have been treating all new post-Soviet states with respect and will continue to act this way. We respect and will respect their sovereignty, as proven by the assistance we provided to Kazakhstan when it faced tragic events and a challenge in terms of its statehood and integrity. However, Russia cannot feel safe, develop, and exist while facing a permanent threat from the territory of today's Ukraine."*

Putin used the following strategies: Firstly, he indicated the positive self-representation of Russia towards the neighbor countries of the region. Russia respect the neighbor countries and accept the new geopolitical changes after the dissolution of the USSR. He gave an example about Russian ' situation towards to Kazakhstans when Russian government helped them in order to keep their statehood and integrity. Secondly, the strategy of threat, he pointed to the threat of Ukraine's today's which threatens the safe and development of Russia.

**Extract (20)**

*"In this context, in accordance with Article 51 (Chapter VII) of the UN Charter, with permission of Russia's Federation Council, and in execution of the treaties of friendship and mutual assistance with the Donetsk People's Republic and the Lugansk People's Republic, ratified by the Federal Assembly on February 22, I made a decision to carry out a special military operation."*

Putin used the following strategies: Firstly, the strategy of eventuality when he referred to the context of the article of the UN charter, the acceptance of Russia's Federation Council and the treaties with the Donetsk People's Republic and the Lugansk People's Republic. Secondly, the strategy of power when he declared the announcement of military operation to save and liberate these republics from the tyranny of these countries.

**Extract (21)**

*"in this context I would like to address the citizens of Ukraine. In 2014, Russia was obliged to protect the people of Crimea and Sevastopol from those who you yourself call "nats." The people of Crimea and Sevastopol made their choice in favour of being with their historical homeland, Russia, and we supported their choice. As I said, we could not act otherwise."*

Putin used the strategy of evidentially, by addressing and remembering the citizens of Ukraine with the historical event in 2014 when Russia protected Crimea and Sevstopol from the ones as you themselves called them as "nats". So the history will be repeated and occurred again.

**Extract(22)**

*"I would also like to address the military personnel of the Ukrainian Armed Forces. Comrade officers, Your fathers, grandfathers and great-grandfathers did not fight the Nazi occupiers and did not defend our common Motherland to allow today's neo-Nazis to seize power in Ukraine. You swore the oath of allegiance to the Ukrainian people and not to the junta, the people's adversary which is plundering Ukraine and humiliating the Ukrainian people. I urge you to refuse to carry out their criminal orders. I urge you to immediately lay down arms and go home. I will explain what this means: the military personnel of the Ukrainian army who do this will be able to freely leave the zone of hostilities and return to their families. I want to emphasise again that all responsibility for the possible bloodshed will lie fully and wholly with the ruling Ukrainian regime".*

Finally, the president Putin used the strategy of national self-glorification when addressing the officers of Ukrainian Armed Forces that you have to remember the history of your fathers, grandfathers and great-grandfathers who did not fight the Nazi occupiers and

did not defend our common Motherland to allow today's neo-Nazis to seize power in Ukraine. He tried to remember them with their great history

## Conclusions

The announcement of the president Vladimir Putin about the military operation in Ukraine was a historic speech in the world. From the beginning to the end of Putin's speech which was rational since it consists of many facts and evidences about the events which were occurred in many countries in front of the eyes of the international community, nearly there was no such a speech from a political prominent person or political leader with such an elite important position uttering the facts. The researcher concludes the following points:

1-Putin tried to indicate to the international community, the citizens of Russia and Ukraine that there are historical relations between these countries.

2-He demonstrated to the world the negative actions of the bloc of Western countries, formed by the United States towards his country in previous years. In the past, they did the same events towards his country and today they are trying to do the same operations. The United States follow certain approaches to arrive to their goals and targets and blackmailing the feelings of the citizens of Ukraine.

3- He has shown the misdeeds of the United States and the ambitions of NATO expansions to Russia and Ukraine. They support the Ukrainian people, but in fact they have done it for their military infrastructure to control the area. In the same time to reach the frontiers of Russia. Nevertheless, they have become a source of danger to the future of Russia.

4- They have destroyed the Soviet Union in the past through their Nazi and they will try to do it again through the new Nazi. Consequently, he manipulated some strategies in his speech to persuade and convince his public.

5-He then described the main actors in the world, especially the UN and NATO behaviours. He said that there is a hidden agreement between the United States and NATO countries towards Russia in general and the countries that remain particularly in front of them.

6-He manipulated the evidentially strategy when he mentioned the crises in Belgrade, Libya, Syria and ultimately Iraq. These countries were victims of hostile western countries and he announced directly that there was an agreement between the United States and its allies.

7- By adopting certain strategies, he showed the silence and blessing of the UN, which did not impose any sanctions on western countries. On the contrary, these organizations were with them in their goals and plans.

8- The researcher found the following points in the speech of President Putin concerning Iraq's issue.

a- First, Putin focused on the situation in Iraq that was the victim of the hostile and bloody actions of the united states and gave it a different focus.

b- Second, he referred to the fact that the United States lied to the whole world and to the UN. The question is why the countries of the UN and the world did not take decisions concerning the United States deeds and movements towards Iraq and why they did not check the information of the United States. The countries of the UN believed their lies that Iraq has chemical weapons. As a result of that, Iraq suffered and thousands of people in Iraq were killed and their infrastructures were destroyed because of their lies.

c- Finally, Putin gave the affairs of Iraq an especial case in comparison to other countries, and he named the United States by the phrase "the emperor of lies".

9- Putin showed negative behaviours during the past years, whether towards Russia or the countries of the world such as Belgrade, Libya, and Syria. However, he also indicated the positive behaviours of the government of Russia.

**References:**

- A Abioye-Omojuwa, T. (2004). The Contribution of Rhetorical Questions to Message Effectiveness in Newspaper Editorials and Features in Zaria, Nigeria. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria.
- Aristotle (1991). *On Rhetoric: a Theory of Civil Discourse* (trans. G. Kennedy). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bello, U.(2013).“If I could make it ,you too can make it! "Personal pronouncing political discourse: A CDA of President Jonathan’s presidential declaration speech. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 3(6), 84-96. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v3n6p84>
- Chilton, P. A.and C.Schaffner.(1997).Discourse and politics in T ,van Dijk (ed.).Discourse as social international,London,Sage:206
- Chilton, P.A.(2006). *Analyzing political discourse: theory and practice*. Abingdon. New York: Cuddon , J. (1979). *A Dictionary of Literary Terms*. London: Andre Deutsch Ltd.
- Destutt, de Tracy (1801). *Éléments d'idéologie* (published in 1970). J. Vrin: Paris.
- Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An Introduction*. Verso: London.
- Ghazani, A.Z.(2016). *A Study of persuasive strategies in selected American presidential speeches*. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*,3(2),631-647.
- Liebes, T. and Ribak, R. (1991). A mother's battle against TV news: a case study of political socialisation. *Discourse and Society*, 2, 2, p. 202-222.
- Orwell, G. (1986). “Politics and the English Language.” Retrieved 20 May 2008 from <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/orwelk46.htm>.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. New York: Longman Group.
- Schaffner, C. (1996) ,Editorial: political speeches and discourse analysis“, *Current Issues in Language & Society*, 3, (3), pp.201-204
- Gamble, T. & Gamble, M. (2013). *Communication Works* (11th ed.) New York: McGraw Hill.
- Van Dijk ,T.A.(1995).*Discourse analysis as ideology analysis*.
- Van Dijk,T.A.(2005).*Politics, Ideology and Discourse*. In R.Wodak(Ed.).In *Encyclopedia of Language &Linguistics*. Volume on Politics and Language (pp.728-740).Elsevier Ltd.

Van Dijk ,T.A.(2008). *Discourse and Power*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2016). *Critical Discourse Studies: A socio-cognitive approach*. In R.Wodak, &M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies*(3rded).Sage

Yule.G. (1996 ).*The Study of Language* (2 ed ).Cambridge University press.

<https://www.britannica.com/summary/Vladimir-Putin>

<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-56720589>