



The Discourse-Historical Approach and Ideologies in the Speeches of Turkish Presidents

Research Article

Correspondence:

Károly Nagy
<karoly.nagy201@gmail.com>PhD Scholar, Eötvös Loránd University,
Language Pedagogy and English Applied
Linguistics Ph.D. Programme, Hungary.

Publication Details

Received: April 12, 2023**Accepted:** May 28, 2023**Published:** June 30, 2023

Abstract

This study investigates the intricate relationship between discourse, power, and political ideologies. This study adopts the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), a well-established approach in linguistics, to explore the dynamics of power within discourse. Departing from previous research, this study takes a nuanced approach by focusing on the discursive and argumentative strategies employed by prominent Turkish leaders. In particular, the study conducts a comparative analysis of the language use of two influential Turkish presidents, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and Recep Tayyip Erdoğan. The aim is to shed light on the ideological distinctions in their discourse, employing the Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA) for a comprehensive analysis. Employing the DHA, this study unveils the use of specific rhetorical strategies, including the Shift of Blame, Legitimation, and Discontinuation, employed by these leaders. The findings underscore the persistent presence of ideology and power, discernible at various linguistic and structural levels within the political speeches of these leaders. The implications of this research extend to the understanding of the intricate interplay of language, power, and ideology within the political discourse. Future research can further explore the application of DHA in the analysis of political discourse, allowing for deeper insights into the communicative strategies employed by political leaders.

Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis, Discourse Historical Approach, representation, power, ideology



1. Introduction

Effective communication, whether through speeches or statements, is intricately tied to the speaker's rhetoric and perspective. It hinges on how these expressions are crafted, organized, and how they construct perceptions of reality. Such language use not only reflects the intention of the speaker but also embodies a complex interplay of verbal and non-verbal elements (McCarthy et al., 2010). Within the realm of political discourse, speeches stand as a significant conduit for conveying these intentions, influencing audiences, and molding public opinion.

In the case of Turkey, a nation with a rich history of political and societal transformation, political discourse takes on a pivotal role. The modern Turkish state, shaped after the fall of the Ottoman Empire, emerged under the visionary leadership of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. Atatürk introduced a secular government and an innovative political system, leaving an indelible imprint on the nation's history. This legacy is commemorated through various national holidays and events, such as the celebrated Republic Day of Turkey. However, the political, social, and educational landscape has undergone a discernible shift with the ascendancy of Recep Tayyip Erdoğan as the current president of Turkey (Ahmad, 2014). These two influential figures, each representing distinct political agendas, have significantly impacted Turkish society, ushering in an era of transformation and debate.

Hence, the central aim of this study is to delve into the perspectives, ideas, and intentions encapsulated in the speeches of these two pivotal figures. To achieve this, this study employs the rigorous methods of CDA, with a particular focus on DHA. Through this approach, this study seeks to unveil the intricate relationship between power, manipulation, and discourse, exploring repeated argumentative topics (*topoi*) and the specific discursive strategies employed. This rigorous analysis is a conduit for revealing the ideological underpinnings and the linguistic mechanisms by which they are conveyed.

DHA emerges as the apt theoretical framework for this investigation. It bridges the micro-level analysis of communication strategies (discourse and language use) with the macro-level features, including power, dominance, and inequality, as proposed by van Dijk (2015). DHA provides the methodological underpinning to unravel the nuanced interplay between these levels within discourse, offering a holistic perspective.

The corpus for this study encompasses the political speeches of Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, the present-day president of Turkey, and Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the nation's founding president. This extensive analysis aims to reveal nationalistic elements in these speeches, with a particular focus on argumentative topics and the linguistic strategies employed to advance ideologies. Through this research, this study contributes not only to the understanding of political discourse but also to the comprehension of how influential political leaders wield discourse to mold ideologies and, subsequently, to influence societal norms and policies. This study also invites future research endeavors to delve deeper into the communicative strategies employed by political leaders in diverse contexts, further harnessing DHA.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Language and Discourse

Language is a multifaceted tool for communication, serving not only to transmit information but also as a reflection of individual characteristics, beliefs, and societal practices (Amberg & Vause, 2009, p. 1). Language, when organized into texts, constitutes what the author terms "discourse" (McCarthy et al., 2010, p. 88). Discourse not only conveys meaning but also embodies customs, practices, beliefs, and values, making it a mirror of the society from which it emerges. In the realm of political discourse, the significance of language becomes even more pronounced, as political speeches are carefully constructed to achieve influence.

While examining discourse, it is imperative to consider the complex interplay between linguistic structure and content. Beyond mere linguistic analysis, understanding the underlying motives and intentions behind language choices is equally essential. Discourse analysis delves into the multifaceted aspects of language use in various contexts (McCarthy et al., 2010). To comprehend any discourse fully, questions should relate to the relationship between the speakers, the goals of communication, the management of topics, and the development of interaction (McCarthy & Walsh, 2003).

Human memory is structured around familiar knowledge, termed "schemata." Schemata encompass an individual's accumulated knowledge about certain phenomena or events (Zhang, 2010, p. 457; Widdowson, 2007, p. 28). Politicians strategically leverage this schematic knowledge, aligning their language choices with the socio-cultural background of their audience. This aligns with their goals of influencing and persuading through discourse.

2.2 Power, Ideology, Politics and Critical Discourse Analysis

Power is a multifaceted concept, embodying the ability to act, control, or influence others (Marger & Olsen, 2019, p. 1; Dahl, 1957, p. 202). Language serves as a potent tool for exercising power, influencing behaviors, and controlling the actions of others (Dahl, 1957, p. 202). The ideas individuals hold have the power to shape the thoughts of others, giving rise to what the author terms "ideology." Ideology not only encompasses the worldviews of individuals but is also heavily influenced by the ideas of the dominant ruling class. The articulation of ideologies is most clearly manifested through language (Kress, 1985, p. 29).

Ideologies can produce both positive and negative outcomes based on the social activities they support (van Dijk, 2001a). Ideologies have the power to uphold domination or organize resistance and opposition, exerting influence over socially shared beliefs and practices (van Dijk, 2006b). The definition of ideology is complex, but one of the closest interpretations is provided by Fairclough and Fairclough (2012), who underscore that ideologies pertain to how the interests and beliefs of specific social groups become general beliefs and influence social life.

Politics, fundamentally a struggle for power, revolves around the objective of achieving, effecting, and convincing the audience of the righteousness of actions or agendas (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012). Understanding the argumentative essence of political speeches is pivotal in evaluating the political strategies they represent (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012). CDA explores the

interconnectedness of discourse and power, aiming to understand how discourse is wielded as a means of exercising power illegitimately or unjustly (Fairclough, 2015, p. 49). CDA's main focus lies in exploring the interplay of language, power, ideology, and sociocultural structures.

Nationalism, closely tied to ideology, power, and manipulation, underscores the idea of a shared cultural identity among groups (Smith, 1979). Nationalism thrives on pre-existing mass sentiment, where the concept of a "nation" is rooted in shared historic territory, common myths, and historical memories (Smith, 1991, p. 14). The notion of a nation is intrinsically linked to the sociocultural context in which individuals are raised, contributing to the construct of national identity, which is conveyed through discourse (Wodak et al., 2009, p. 22).

National identity and nationalism are constructed and conveyed through discourse, especially in narratives of national culture. Discourse shapes national identity, and the national identity in turn molds the discourse. National identity is fundamentally rooted in discourse, as it is language that gives form and expression to the concept of a nation (Wodak et al., 2009, p. 22).

2.3 The Discourse-Historical Approach

DHA, pioneered by Austrian scholars like Martin Reisigl and linguist Ruth Wodak, has risen to prominence as one of the leading critical approaches for studying discourse (Reisigl, 2017, p. 44). DHA sets itself apart through its comprehensive approach, combining contextual information with extensive analysis. It offers a meticulous interpretation of the layers within a text and gives significant attention to argumentation and the identification of "topoi" or argumentative themes (Wodak, 2011).

DHA adopts a multi-dimensional approach. First, it identifies the specific contents or topics of a discourse. Second, it investigates discursive strategies. Third, it analyzes linguistic means and the specific, context-dependent linguistic realizations. This triangulation approach allows for a more holistic analysis that considers historical, political, sociological, and psychological dimensions (Wodak, 2006, p. 134).

2.4 Turkey's Past and Present Political Scene

Turkey's political landscape has undergone significant transformations. The Ottoman Empire, which spanned nearly seven centuries, was characterized by diverse nationalities and ethnic groups under its rule. The ideology of Ottomanism emphasized equality among peoples and territorial integrity (Ortaylı, 2019). However, the empire's decline and the impending division of its territories brought forth the emergence of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, a military leader who united the people and galvanized them to resist imperial rule.

After the war of independence, Atatürk assumed the role of the first president of modern-day Turkey, which was established in 1923 following the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. During his fifteen-year presidency, Atatürk initiated sweeping reforms, focusing on education, language, and ideologies. The ideology of Turkism, emphasizing the shared Turkish experience, gained traction during Atatürk's leadership (Jensen, 2017, p. 22). His presidency marked a shift toward a secular way of governance.

Recep Tayyip Erdogan, leader of the AKP (Justice and Development Party), has been a prominent figure in Turkish politics since 2002, winning numerous nationwide polls and becoming one of the most influential leaders in Turkish history (Çağaptay, 2020). Erdogan reintroduced political Islam, connecting religion to politics, marking a shift away from secular governance (Çağaptay, 2020). His leadership has brought significant changes to Turkey's economic, political, domestic, foreign, and socio-cultural landscape (Seufert, 2014). Since Ataturk and Erdogan represent divergent political agendas, their ideologies are reflected in the argumentative topics of their speeches regarding the Turkish nation.

2.5 Research Questions

In this study, the primary goal is to detect the presence of nationalistic elements in political speeches, focusing on argumentative topics. The following research questions guide this investigation:

1. What discursive strategies are employed in the selected political speeches to frame Turkish national identity?
2. What are the key similarities and differences in the framing of Turkish national identity concerning the applied discursive strategies?

2.6 The Texts Selected for Analysis

CDA aims to investigate specific features within texts, including linguistic, semiotic, and interdiscursive elements (Fairclough, 2012, p. 453). These features can be observed in larger bodies of text or even single texts used for purposes of comparison or contrastive analysis. In this study, the primary focus is on identifying instances of power, ideology, and nationalism in the selected texts.

The chosen texts for analysis consist of representative speeches delivered by Turkish presidents Mustafa Kemal Ataturk and Recep Tayyip Erdogan. Ataturk's speech was delivered in Ankara on October 29, 1933, commemorating the 10th anniversary of the secular Republic of Turkey. Erdogan's balcony speech, marking the conclusion and results of the 2014 local elections, was also delivered in Ankara on March 30 and 31. While one speech is commemorative and the other is post-election, both can be categorized as victory speeches, as Ataturk commemorates the success of the Republic of Turkey, and Erdogan's party emerged victorious in the local elections.

The choice of these specific speeches is motivated by a dual objective. Firstly, both speeches aim to rally the nation's pride and commemorate long-held traditions for the common good (Rohler & Cook, 1998, p. 243). Secondly, the speeches are selected to enable a comparative analysis of the argumentative and discursive strategies employed by the first secular president and the current non-secular president of the Republic of Turkey. The two speeches can be found in the Appendix for reference.

This section provides a clear overview of the chosen texts for analysis, highlighting their significance and the rationale behind their selection. It sets the stage for the subsequent analysis of power, ideology, and nationalism in these speeches.

3. Methodology

This section outlines the methodology employed in this study, following a structured approach to the analysis of the selected texts.

Step 1: Choosing Appropriate Texts

The initial step in the analysis process involved selecting suitable texts for examination. The two chosen speeches, one delivered by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk in 1933 and the other by Recep Tayyip Erdoğan in 2014, were carefully selected due to their commemorative and post-election nature. Both speeches exhibit elements of power, ideology, and nationalism, aligning with the study's primary focus (Vadai, 2017, p. 103).

Step 2: Identifying Appropriate Parts

Within the chosen texts, specific sections were identified for analysis. These sections were selected based on their relevance to the study's research questions and objectives.

Step 3: Developing Content Categories

Content categories were developed to guide the analysis process. These categories were designed to capture the key elements of power, ideology, and nationalism present in the selected texts (Frey & Kreps, 2000).

Step 4: Classifying Units under Developed Categories

The identified sections from the speeches were classified under the content categories. This categorization allowed for a systematic examination of how Turks were addressed, how the politicians referred to the country, and the methods used to enhance the sense of Turkish identity.

Political discourse, as a complex form of communication, was analyzed at three interconnected levels: the micro-level (focusing on lexico-grammatical features), the meso-level (involving pragmatic analysis), and the macro-level (considering explicit or implicit appeals) (Sowińska, 2013).

DHA was employed to integrate these levels and identify discursive strategies related to nationalism. The steps involved in the application of DHA are as follows:

1. Activation and Consultation of Preceding Theoretical Knowledge: This step included reviewing prior research and theoretical knowledge relevant to the study.

2. Systematic Collection of Data and Context Information: Various discourses, discursive events, social fields, actors, semiotic media, genres, and texts were the focus of data collection, depending on the research question.

3. Selection and Preparation of Data: Data was selected and prepared according to relevant criteria, involving activities like transcription of tape recordings.

4. Specification of Research Question and Formulation of Assumptions: Research questions and assumptions were formulated based on a literature review and an initial skimming of the data.

5. Qualitative Pilot Analysis: This phase allowed for the testing of categories, initial assumptions, and further specification of assumptions.

6. Detailed Case Studies: A comprehensive analysis was conducted on a range of data, primarily qualitative but partly quantitative.

7. Formulation of Critique: Results were interpreted while considering the relevant context and applying critique to the three dimensions of critique.

8. Application of Analytical Results: If applicable, the results were suggested for practical application or application proposals (Reisigl & Wodak, 2016, p. 96).

The identified strategies, including comparison, singularity, and exclusion, were presented in appendices. These tables contained numerous strategies and means of realization established over the last decade in discourse-historical research (Wodak et al., 2009, p. 35).

For the analysis, excerpts from the speeches of the politicians were utilized, with ideological elements and salient lexical items highlighted in bold. The subsequent section presents the analysis of prominent themes and rhetorical strategies, supported by excerpts from the speeches and using the analytical tools of DHA, the ideological square model, and qualitative content analysis.

4. Results and Discussion

In this section, this study investigates the results and discussions based on the application of DHA. DHA serves as a comprehensive framework for analyzing discursive strategies and topics addressed in the selected speeches. Its distinctive feature lies in its systematic integration of background information into the analysis, allowing for a multi-layered examination of the text (Wodak, 2011, p. 359).

DHA provides a means to conduct an in-depth analysis of the implicit discursive strategies employed by the speech performers. The primary focus of DHA encompasses the following discursive strategies:

1. Referential Strategy or Strategy of Nomination: This strategy involves linguistic devices such as membership categorization, metaphors, metonymies, and synecdoches. These devices are essential for understanding how individuals or groups are referenced and categorized (Sacks, 1992; Bakker, 1997).

2. Strategies of Predication: These strategies manifest in stereotypical, evaluative attributions of positive or negative traits. They encompass both implicit and explicit predicates used to convey judgments and evaluations.

3. Strategies of Argumentation: Argumentation strategies are reflected in specific topoi used to justify political inclusion or exclusion. These topoi serve as justifications for the positions and policies

advocated in the discourse.

4. Strategies of Perspectivation, Framing, or Discourse Representation: This category involves the use of means such as reporting, description, narration, or quotation of events and utterances. These techniques shape how events and statements are presented and framed within the discourse.

5. Strategies of Intensification and Mitigation: These strategies aim to intensify or mitigate the illocutionary force of utterances. They influence the degree of emphasis and persuasion conveyed through language (Ng & Bradac, 1993).

In the subsequent sections, the results of the analysis will be presented, highlighting how these discursive strategies were employed in the selected speeches by Mustafa Kemal Ataturk and Recep Tayyip Erdogan. The discussion will focus on the implications of these strategies in framing Turkish national identity, showcasing both commonalities and differences in their discourse. This analysis will offer insights into the nuanced ways in which power, ideology, and nationalism are conveyed through political discourse.

4.1 Results from the Analysis of Ataturk's Speech

The analysis of Mustafa Kemal Ataturk's speech reveals the presence of discursive strategies that can be divided into two main categories: constructive strategies and perpetuation strategies. Constructive strategies aim to build and promote national identity through identification, unification, and differentiation, while perpetuation strategies focus on sustaining and reviving national identity (Wodak et al., 2009).

The constructive strategies in Ataturk's speech can be further divided into seven sub-groups: Nomination, Predication, Assimilation, Inclusion and Continuation, Singularisation, Unification and Cohesivation, Positive Self-Presentation, and Continuation.

1. Nomination: Ataturk nominates the people of Turkey as heroes, aiming to evoke a sense of pride and a positive effect on the Turkish audience.

2. Predication: The use of the statement "How happy it is to say that I am a Turk" attributes emotional effects to the origins of ethnicity, emphasizing the ethnic identity of the Turkish nation.

3. Assimilation, Inclusion, and Continuation: These strategies highlight the desired characteristics for the nation, unifying the people and setting an example for future endeavors.

4. Singularisation: Ataturk employs this strategy extensively through the use of inclusive terms like "we" to create a sense of national unity and development.

5. Unification and Cohesivation: The shared values of the nation are emphasized, focusing on positive characteristics such as intelligence, devotion to science, love for fine arts, and a sense of national unity.

6. Positive Self-Presentation: The leader, Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, presents himself positively, emphasizing that he has never made false promises and is irreplaceable for the nation.

7. Continuation: Ataturk not only reflects on the historical successes of the Turkish nation but also looks to the future, encouraging the audience to remember, follow, and commemorate his ideas.

4.2 Results from the Analysis of Erdogan's Speech Compared with Ataturk's

In Recep Tayyip Erdogan's speech, four main categories of discursive strategies are identified: constructive strategies, perpetuation strategies, demontage (dismantling) and destruction strategies, and justification and relativisation strategies. Unlike Ataturk's speech, two additional strategies—justification and relativisation—are used in Erdogan's discourse.

1. Shift of Blame and Responsibility: Erdogan employs this strategy to shift blame and responsibility onto the opposition, creating a negative out-group within the nation.

2. Downplaying/Trivialisation Discontinuation: This strategy is used to downplay the negative features of both the opposition and the Turkish people, emphasizing the leadership's good intentions and character.

3. Nomination and Predication: These strategies are used to highlight the heroic deeds and positive traits of the Turkish people, while also negatively nominating the opposition as "pawns."

4. Assimilation, Inclusion, and Continuation: Similar to Ataturk's speech, Erdogan emphasizes the national responsibility and the preservation of Turkish identity. However, he introduces the concept of a "New Turkey," calling for future action and change.

5. Singularisation: Erdogan employs the singularization strategy through the use of inclusive terms like "we," highlighting the national control of property and the invincibility of the Turkish state.

6. Unification and Cohesivation: In both speeches, the unification and cohesivation strategies are employed to emphasize shared values and the exceptional attributes of the Turkish nation.

7. Positive Self-Presentation: Erdogan focuses on presenting his government positively, highlighting the strengthening of politics and emphasizing the opposition's disloyalty.

8. Discrediting Opponents/Negative Presentation of Others: Erdogan uses this strategy to discredit the opposition by labeling them as liars, promoting negative views about them, and painting them as agents of sedition and intrigue.

9. Justification and Relativisation: Erdogan employs these strategies to justify the state of affairs by emphasizing past deeds and protecting the national self-perception. He presents his leadership as a gift from God, legitimizing his right to rule.

10. Demontage (Dismantling) and Destruction: The purpose of these strategies is to dissolve previously constructed views and beliefs. Erdogan uses them to dismantle views held by the opposition.

This comparative analysis demonstrates the presence of similar discursive strategies in both speeches, although with different entailments. While Ataturk's speech mainly focuses on the positive

construction of national identity based on ethnicity and unity, Erdogan's speech introduces new concepts like the "New Turkey" and uses additional strategies such as justification, relativization, and the dismantling of opposing views.

These strategies play a crucial role in shaping the discourse and framing the national identity in each speech, reflecting the different historical and political contexts in which they were delivered. Ataturk's speech emphasizes the historical achievements of the Turkish nation, while Erdogan's speech focuses on his government's success and portrays the opposition in a negative light.

5. Conclusion

This study employed the analytical tool of CDA on different levels, including argumentative topic structure and discursive strategies, to analyze two significant political speeches delivered by Turkish presidents, Mustafa Kemal Ataturk and Recep Tayyip Erdogan. The study's primary objective was to identify the presence of nationalistic elements in these speeches and to discern how and where these elements were constructed. It aimed to explore the distinct discursive and argumentative strategies employed by these two politicians in shaping an ideology of Turkish nationalism and to identify any ideological similarities or differences between their speeches.

The application of DHA and the examination of discursive constructs of national identity revealed the ideological appeals made by both politicians and their role in fostering social cohesion (see Appendices). The study delved into various forms of discursive practices concerning the Turkish nation, emphasizing national uniqueness and intra-national uniformity, while often neglecting intra-national differences (the discourse of sameness) (Wodak et al., 2009, p. 186).

The study's findings underscore the presence of elements related to nationalism, ideology, and power on distinct linguistic and structural levels of these political speeches. However, it's essential to acknowledge the study's limitations. Firstly, the analysis was restricted to a specific number of speeches and did not consider other political speeches deserving academic scrutiny. Although the speeches of Recep Tayyip Erdogan and Mustafa Kemal Ataturk provided rich material for analysis, only a limited number of extracts were chosen and categorized, leaving room for further potential categories to emerge in future research.

Additionally, the array of analytical tools employed can be expanded in subsequent studies. CDA and political discourse analysis encompass complex aspects and can be explored and investigated through various approaches and methods, such as Chilton and Schäffner's Bottom-up method (1997), van Dijk's Socio-cognitive approach (2013), Fairclough's 3D model (1992), or Vadai's Power, Ideology, and Manipulation Identification instrument (2017). Exploring these distinctive approaches may yield additional cultural, social, and historical insights.

It's important to note that this research primarily focuses on linguistic analysis rather than making political claims. Given the extent of data and analysis involved in the study, it remains limited, and making broad generalizations would be inappropriate. Further research is warranted to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the topics discussed.

Funding: This study was not funded in any shape or form by any party.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Bio-note:

Károly Nagy is a dedicated PhD Scholar pursuing his doctoral studies at Eötvös Loránd University, Hungary, as part of the esteemed Language Pedagogy and English Applied Linguistics Ph.D. Programme. With a profound passion for the intricacies of language and communication, Károly's research is focused on various facets of linguistics, encompassing discourse analysis, historical-discourse analysis, and applied linguistics.

References

Ahmad, F. (2014). *Turkey: The quest for identity*. London: Oneworld.

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (Rev. ed.). London: Verso.

Amberg, J. S., & Vause, D. J. (2009). *American English: history, structure, and usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Arango, T., & Yeginsu, C. (2014, March 28). *In Local Election, a Referendum on Turkey's Leader*. The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/03/29/world/europe/turkeys-looming-local-elections.html>

Ataturk's speech at the 10th anniversary of the Turkish Republic. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.ataturksociety.org/about-ataturk/ataturks-speech-at-the-10th-anniversary-of-the-turkish-republic/>

Bakker, C. (1997). Membership categorization and interview accounting, in D. Silverman (ed.), *Qualitative Research. Theory, Method and Practice*. London: Sage, pp. 130-43.

Bricki, N., & Green, J. (2007). *A Guide to Using Qualitative Research Methodology*. Retrieved from <http://fieldresearch.msf.org/msf/handle/10144/84230>

Bryman, Alan (2004). *Social research methods* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Chilton, P., & Schäffner, C. (1997). Discourse and politics. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction – Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction. Vol. 2* (pp.206-230). London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Çağaptay, S. (2020). *Erdogan's empire: Turkey and the politics of the Middle East*. London: I.B. Tauris.

Daghigh, A. J., Sanatifar, M. S., & Awang, R. (2018). Modeling van Dijk's Ideological Square in Translation Studies: Investigating Manipulation in Political Discourse Translation. In *TRALinea: Online Translation Journal*, 20. Accessed 11 March 2021. <http://www.intralinea.org/archive/article/2290>

- Dahl, R. A. (1957). The concept of power. *Behavioral science*, 2(3), 201-215. Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (eds.), *Discourse as social interaction – Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*. Vol. 2 (pp.259-283). London, UK: SAGE Publications.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, I., & Fairclough, N. (2012). *Political discourse analysis: A method for advanced students*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2015). *Language and power*. London: Routledge.
- Farlex Dictionary of Idioms*. (2015). Retrieved January 18 2021 from <https://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/walk+into+the+lion%27s+den>
- Foucault, M. (2003) *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France 1975 1976*. Ed. Mauro Bertani and Alessandro Fontana. Trans. David Macey. New York: Picador.
- Frey, L. R., Botan, C. H., & Kreps, G. L. (2000). *Investigating communication: an introduction to research methods*. Allyn and Bacon.
- “FULL TEXT: Turkish PM Erdoğan's Post-Election 'Balcony Speech' - Turkey News.” *Hürriyet Daily News*, 31 Mar. 2014, www.hurriyetdailynews.com/full-text-turkish-pm-erdogans-post-election-balcony-speech-64341.
- Gökay, B., & Aybak, T. (2016) Identity, race and nationalism in Turkey—Introduction to the special issue, *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, 18(2), 107-110, DOI: 10.1080/19448953.2016.1141575
- Hall, S. (1996). ‘The Question of Cultural Identity’. In Hall, Stuart, Held, David, Hubert, Don and Thompson, Kenneth (eds). *Modernity: An Introduction to Modern Societies*. Cambridge, Mass. and Oxford, pp. 595–634.
- Jensen, A. L. (2017). *The sociolinguistic role of Ottoman Turkish and Arabic in Turkish nationalism* (Doctoral dissertation, Sabanci University, Istanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from <http://risc01.sabanciuniv.edu/record=b1669265> (Table of Contents)
- Jick, T. D. (1979). Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation in action. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24(December), 602-611.
- Johanson, L. (2020, August 11). *Turkic languages*. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Turkic-languages>
- Kress, G. (1985). Ideological structures in discourse. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis: Discourse analysis in society* (pp. 27–43). Academic Press.
- Marger, M. N., & Olsen, M. E. (2019). *Power in modern societies*. Routledge.

- Ng, S. H., & Bradac, J. J. (1993) *Power in Language. Verbal Communication and Social Influence.* Newbury Park: Sage.
- McCarthy, M., & Walsh, S. (2003). Discourse. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Practical English language teaching* (pp. 173–196). McGraw-Hill.
- McCarthy, M., O’Keeffe, A., & Walsh, S. (2010). *Vocabulary matrix: Understanding, learning, teaching.* Andover: Heinle Cengage.
- Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Power. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved February 23, 2021, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/power>
- Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Ideology. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved February 24, 2021, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ideology>
- Meyer, M. (2001). Between theory, method, and politics: positioning of the approaches to CDA. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 14–31.
- Nunan, D. (2015). *Teaching English to speakers of other languages: An introduction.* New York & Oxon: Routledge.
- Ortaylı, I. (2019). *Ottoman studies* (5th ed.). Istanbul: Kronik.
- Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2016). The discourse-historical approach (DHA). *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies*, 3, 23-61.
- Reisigl, M. (2017). The Discourse-Historical Approach. In J. Flowerdew, & J. E. Richardson (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies* (pp.44-59). Routledge. Access on January 21st, 2021 <http://www.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9781315739342.ch3>
- Renan, E. (1892). What is a Nation? text of a conference delivered at the Sorbonne on March 11th, 1882 (translated by Ethan Rundell). In *Qu’est-ce qu’une nation?* Paris: Presses-Pocket. Retrieved from http://ucparis.fr/files/9313/6549/9943/What_is_a_Nation.pdf
- Rohler, L. E., & Cook, R. (1998). *Great Speeches for Criticism and Analysis.* Alistair Press.
- Sacks, H. (1992) *Lectures on Conversation, Vols I and II*, edited by G. Jefferson. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Seufert, G. (2014). *Erdoğan’s “New Turkey” Restoring the Authoritarian State in the Name of Democracy.* Berlin: German Institute for International and Security Affairs. SWP Comments.
- Shojaei, A., Youssefi, K., & Hosseini, H. S. (2013). A CDA Approach to the Biased Interpretation and Representation of Ideologically Conflicting Ideas in Western Printed Media. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, 4(4).

- Sly, L., & Sly, L. (2014, March 31). *In Turkey, prime minister's party comes out on top in municipal elections*. Washington Post. https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/middle_east/in-turkey-prime-ministers-party-comes-out-on-top-in-municipal-elections/2014/03/30/6e08c986-b85a-11e3-9a05-c739f29ccb08_story.html?itid=lk_inline_manual_2
- Smith, A. D. (1979). *Nationalism in the twentieth century*. Oxford: Martin Smith, A. (1991). *National Identity*. London: Penguin Press.
- Sowińska, A. (2013). A critical discourse approach to the analysis of values in political discourse: The example of freedom in President Bush's State of the Union addresses (2001–2008). *Discourse & Society*, 24(6), 792-809. DOI:10.1177/0957926513486214.
- Taylor, A. (2014, March 31). *How Erdogan's jubilant victory speech targeted his two biggest enemies*. Washington Post. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2014/03/31/how-erdogans-jubilant-victory-speech-targeted-his-two-biggest-enemies/>
- Vadai, K. (2017). Critical discourse analysis for language education: Unveiling power, ideology and manipulation in political discourse. *Working Papers in Language Pedagogy*, 11, 96-138.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2001a). Multidisciplinary CDA: A plea for diversity. *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, 1, 95-120.
- van Dijk, T. (2001b). Discourse, ideology and context. *Folia Linguistica*, 35(1-2), 11–40.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of political ideologies*, 11(2), 115-140.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17(3), 359-383.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2011) Discourse and Ideology. In: van Dijk TA (Eds.) *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. London: SAGE, pp. 379–407.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2013). Ideology and discourse. In M. Freeden, M. Stears, & L. T. Sargent (Eds.), *The oxford handbook of political ideologies* (pp. 175–196). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2015). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton & D. Schrifin (Eds.) *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 466–485). Wiley Blackwell.
- Widdowson, H. G. (2007). *Discourse analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Wodak, Ruth & Meyer, Michael. (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: SAGE.

- Wodak, Ruth. (2001). "The Discourse-Historical Approach", in R. Wodak and M. Meyer(eds) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, pp. 63–94. London: SAGE.
- Wodak, R. (2006). History in the making/The making of history: The 'German Wehrmacht' in collective and individual memories in Austria. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 5(1), 125–154.
- Wodak, R, De Cillia, R. & Reisigl, M. (2009). *The discursive construction of national identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Wodak, R. (2011). *Suppression of the Nazi past, coded languages, and discourses of silence: Applying the discourse-historical approach to post-war anti-semitism in Austria* (pp. 351-379). Oxford University Press.
- Zhang, C. (2010). The teaching of reading comprehension under the psychology schemata theory. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(4).

Appendix A

Ataturk's Speech

Ataturk's speech at the 10th anniversary of the Turkish Republic

"The Turkish Nation! We are in the fifteenth year of the start of our war of liberation. This is the greatest day marking the tenth year of our Republic. May it be celebrated.

At this moment as a member of the great Turkish nation, I feel the deepest joy and excitement for having achieved this happy day.

My citizens, We have accomplished many and great tasks in a short time. The greatest of these is the Turkish Republic, the basis of which is the Turkish heroism and the great Turkish culture. We owe this success to the cooperative progress of the Turkish nation and its valuable army.

However we can never consider what we have achieved to be sufficient, because we must, and are determined to accomplish even more and greater tasks. We shall raise our country to the level of the most prosperous and civilized nations of the world. We shall endow our nation with the broadest means and sources of welfare. We shall raise our national culture above the contemporary level of civilization.

Therefore, we should judge the measure of time not according to the lax mentality of past centuries, but in terms of the concepts of speed and movement of our century. Compared to the past, we shall work harder. We shall perform greater tasks in a shorter time. I have no doubt that we shall succeed in this, because the Turkish nation is of excellent character. The Turkish nation is intelligent, because the Turkish nation is capable of overcoming difficulties of national unity, and because it holds the torch of positive sciences. I must make it clear with due emphasis, that a historical quality of the Turkish nation, which is an exalted human community, is its love for fine arts and progress in them. This is why our national ideal is to constantly foster and promote, with all means and measures, our nation's excellent character, its tireless industriousness, intelligence, devotion to science, love for fine

arts and sense of national unity. This ideal, which very well suits the Turkish nation, will enable it to succeed in performing the civilized task falling on it in securing true peace for all mankind.

The Great Turkish Nation! You have heard me speak on many occasions over the last fifteen years promising success in the tasks we undertook. I am happy that none of my promises have been false ones which could have shaken my nation’s confidence in me.

Today, I repeat with the same faith and determination that it will soon be acknowledged once again by the entire civilized world that the Turkish nation, who has been progressing towards the national ideal in exact unison, is a great nation. Never have doubted that the great, but forgotten, civilized characteristic and the great civilized talents of the Turkish nation, will, in its progress henceforth, rise like a new sun from the high horizon of civilization for the future.

The Turkish nation, I express my heartfelt wish that you will celebrate, after each decade elapsing into eternity, this great national day, in greater honor, happiness, peace and prosperity.

How happy it is to say that I am a Turk!”

M. Kemal Ataturk, October 29, 1933

Ataturk's speech at the 10th anniversary of the Turkish Republic. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.ataturksociety.org/about-ataturk/ataturks-speech-at-the-10th-anniversary-of-the-turkish-republic/>

Appendix B

Table 1. The 10 th Anniversary Speech of Turkish Republic (text, macrostructure topics and argumentation)		
	Macro-and mesostructure: discourse topics (T)	Argumentation, claims, topoi,
Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, 29 October 1933 “The Turkish Nation! We are in the fifteenth year of the start of <u>our war of liberation</u> . This is the greatest day marking the tenth year of our Republic. May it be celebrated. At this moment as a member of the great Turkish nation, I feel the deepest joy and excitement for having <u>achieved</u> this happy day.	Date Commemorative Speech (sub) genre T: achievement, commemoration. Reference to the Turkish War of Independence (1918-1923).	<i>End of the war. Topos of victory.</i>
My citizens, We have <u>accomplished</u> many and great tasks in a short time. The greatest of these is the <u>Turkish Republic</u> , the basis of which is the <u>Turkish heroism</u>	T: The success regarding the establishment of the Turkish Republic. Praising the nation, culture and the	Claim: Turks are the heroes. <i>Topos of achievement.</i>

<p>and the great Turkish culture. We owe this success to the cooperative progress of the Turkish nation and its valuable army.</p>	<p>military.</p>	
<p>However we can never consider what we have achieved <u>to be sufficient</u>, because we must, and are determined to <u>accomplish even more</u> and greater tasks. We shall <u>raise our country</u> to the level of the most prosperous and civilized nations of the world. We shall endow our nation with the broadest means and sources of welfare. We shall raise our national culture <u>above the contemporary level of civilization</u>.</p>	<p>T: Further accomplishments for future. Goal-setting.</p>	<p><i>Topos of comparison</i> <i>Topos of superordinate aim.</i> <i>Topos of comparison</i></p>
<p>[...] Compared to the past, we shall <u>work harder</u>. We shall perform greater tasks in a shorter time. I have no doubt that we shall succeed in this, because the <u>Turkish nation is of excellent character</u>. The <u>Turkish nation is intelligent</u>, because the Turkish nation is <u>capable of overcoming</u> difficulties of national unity, and because it <u>holds the torch of positive sciences</u>.</p>	<p>T: the importance of the pace of future achievements. T: characteristics and tasks of Turks. Stating the national character as well as values. Promotion of national values.</p>	<p><i>Topos of superordinate aim.</i> <i>Topos of illustrative example.</i> <i>Topos of definition.</i> <i>Topos of lovely idyllic pace.</i></p>
<p>I must make it clear with due emphasis, that a historical quality of the Turkish nation, which is <u>an exalted human community</u>, is its <u>love for fine arts</u> and progress in them. This is why our national ideal is to constantly <u>foster and promote</u>, with all means and measures, <u>our nation's excellent character</u>, its <u>tireless industriousness</u>, <u>intelligence</u>, <u>devotion to science</u>, <u>love for fine arts</u> and <u>sense of national unity</u>.</p>	<p>T: Describing the positive qualities of the Turkish nation. Goal and future tasks. Prediction in terms of the future. Fulfilment of previously made promises. Stating the national character as well as values.</p>	<p><i>Topos of the superordinate aim.</i> <i>Topos of responsibility.</i> <i>Topos of praise.</i></p>
<p>This ideal, which very well suits the Turkish nation, will enable it to succeed in performing the civilized task falling on it in <u>securing true peace for all mankind</u>. The <u>Great Turkish Nation!</u>[...] I am happy that <u>none of my promises have been false ones which could have shaken my nation's confidence in me</u>.</p>	<p>T: expressing strong belief regarding the nation's future endeavours. Fulfilment of past promises. Successfully maintaining the confidence of the nation.</p>	<p><i>Topos of determination.</i> <i>Topos of presupposition.</i> <i>Topos of self-justification</i></p>

Today, I repeat with the same faith and determination that it will soon be <u>acknowledged</u> once again by the entire civilized world that the <u>Turkish nation</u> , who has been progressing towards the national ideal in exact unison, <u>is a great nation</u> .	T: Future promises regarding the position of the Turkish nation in the eyes of other countries all over the world.	<i>Topos of determination. Topos of presupposition. Topos of praise.</i>
Never have doubted that the <u>great, but forgotten</u> , civilized characteristic and the great civilized <u>talents of the Turkish nation</u> , will, in its progress henceforth, rise like a new sun from the high horizon of civilization for the future.	T: Stating a firm confidence regarding the future progress of Turkey.	<i>Topos of hope. Topos of determination. Topos of presupposition.</i>
The Turkish nation, I express my heartfelt wish that you will <u>celebrate</u> , after each decade elapsing into eternity, this great <u>national day</u> , in greater honor, <u>happiness, peace and prosperity</u> . <u>How happy it is to say that I am a Turk!</u> "	T: Expressing wishes about the continuation of celebrating the commemoration of the republic. Presupposition of the emotional factors concerning nationality.	<i>Topos of continuation. Topos of self-representation. Topos of praise. Topos of presupposition.</i>

Appendix C

Table 3. The identification of nationalistic discursive strategies of Ataturk in the 10 th Anniversary Speech of Turkish Republic		
Strategies (Constructive, Perpetuation, Transformation)	Devices (Categorization, Stereotyping, Comparison)	Purpose
Constructive		
Nomination	Tropes such as metaphors Verbs and nouns used to denote processes and actions ("Turkish heroism")	To present the people belonging to the Turkish nation as an ideal.
Predication	Stereotypical, evaluative attributions of positive traits, explicit comparisons, similes metaphors, presuppositions/implications ("How happy it is to say that I am a Turk")	Introducing the national character in terms of trait as if it originated from nationality.
Assimilation, Inclusion and Continuation	Comparison, harmonisation ("our national ideal is to constantly foster and promote")	Turkey needs to provide and serve as a beacon for everyone.

Singularisation	Presupposition of national uniqueness (“because the Turkish nation is of excellent character”)	Uniting people under the umbrella of Turkish greatness, as an entity.
Unification and Cohesivation	Emphasis on unifying common/shared features Emphasis on national model character (“intelligence, devotion to science, love for fine arts and sense of national unity”)	The identification of particular features as national values, promoting a sense of uniqueness.
<i>Perpetuation</i>		
Positive Self-Presentation	Referential assimilation, positive attributions (“I am happy that none of my promises have been false ones”)	Conveying that the speaker belongs and he is the defender of the nation
Continuation	Comparison, emphasis on continuity (“we shall work harder” “marking the tenth year of our Republic. May it be celebrated”)	Turkey must become more successful; the uniqueness must be protected.

Appendix D

Erdogan’s Speech

Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan’s speech in Ankara, starting late March 30 and ending early March 31, on the results of the local elections. I wholeheartedly greet our 81 provinces as well as sister and friendly capitals and cities of the world from Ankara, from the AK Party headquarters. I’ve just addressed via teleconference thousands of people who gathered in Skopje Square. They were sharing the joy you have here in freezing weather. I first want to express my absolute gratitude to my God for such a victory and a meaningful result. I thank my friends and brothers all over the world who prayed for our victory. I thank my brothers in Palestine who saw our victory as their victory. I thank my brothers in Egypt who are struggling for democracy and who understand our struggle very well. I thank my brothers in the Balkans, in Bosnia, in Macedonia, in Kosovo and in all cities in Europe who celebrate our victory with the same joy we have here. I thank my suffering brothers in Syria who pray for our victory although in a great pain, facing starvation and under bombs and bullets. I express the gratitude of my people to all our brothers and friends who gave a support to Turkey’s independence struggle just like before the Independence War of Turkey. Of course, this precious people deserve the greatest appreciation. My brothers; I thank you very much because you have protected the new Turkey’s struggle for independence. I thank each of you because you have protected the ideal of a great Turkey and the targets of a great Turkey. You have supported your prime minister, your party, the politics, your own future with your own will. Well, today is March 30. What did they say? They said “Chaos after March 25.” Correct. We saw the chaos. What was

this chaos? This country found the opportunity to see the traitors who eavesdropped on the Foreign Ministry and committed treachery by interfering in the national security of this state and people. That was their chaos plan. I've been saying for months that "We'll walk into their dens." Now, from time to time, journalists ask me whether I will make a balcony speech this year. Ok, first, what are you expecting out of a balcony speech? Second, why don't you ask the same to the leaders of the opposition parties? But they [opposition leaders] have no such target. They will keep silent but will claim their win. Regardless of whether he receives 26, 27 or 28 percent, the general directorate [CHP leader] will say he won the elections. The other [MHP] will claim his win although he gets 13, 14 or 15 percent. Why? Because they have spent their lives this way. But what did your brother say? "I'll quit party leadership if we cannot be the first party." Politics requires honor. Politics requires nobility. If you cannot enrich your positions, quit. This general directorate [CHP leader] once said he would quit politics if he remains below 40 percent. He got 26, did he go? No. He won't go this time either. The other one has occupied this seat for the last 16 or 17 years. Will he go? No. The message our precious people gave is very clear. The people gave a clear message to Turkey and to the world: What did they say? They said "We are here." They said, "The Turkish people are impassable." "We are the owners of this country. the people will not bow and Turkey is invincible." Those who managed could flee. More can flee tomorrow. I have filed criminal complaints about some of them; I said they can also flee. As I have said, from now on, we'll walk into their dens. They will pay for this. How can you threaten our national security? Syria is in a state of war with us. They are harassing our planes. They have martyred our 74 brothers and the Süleyman Şah Tomb is our lands. An attack against there is an attack against 780,000 square kilometers. Can we remain silent about such a thing? But these traitors wiretapped this meeting and leaked it to the world. They are worse than Assassins [of the Middle Ages]. They are beyond them. My brothers; there is a very important message conveyed by our people through the polls. Our people have made their objection and their stance against attempts to change the direction of Turkey through non-political ways. Election results show who lost, more than they show who won. Please listen to these words carefully: Today, unethical politics has lost. Tape politics, montage politics, slander and denigration politics has lost. Politics without building something, politics without plans and projects, without goals, has lost. O, General Manager [referring to the main opposition CHP leader Kemal Kılıçdaroğlu], o, so-called party chair! What would you speak of during your election campaign if you didn't have those tapes? We spoke of plans, projects. They spoke of lies, dissimulation, slander, sedition and intrigue. The status quo has taken a huge blow today. Dirty relations and unnamed alliances have lost today. Every kind of tutelage and to all kinds of tutelage-dictating centers has been hit with a full Ottoman slap by the nation. Arrogance has lost today. Pride has lost today. The arrogance that looks down on its nation, belittling it and making light of its choices has lost in the ballot box one again. You know those people who used that blood-dripping, anger-inducing, hate-mongering headlines... Today, they have lost heavily again. O, Pennsylvania [referring to U.S.-based Islamic cleric Fethullah Gülen], o, the media who support them from here, o, the capital that supported them... Weren't you positioned against democracy? Democracy has won at the ballot box today. The will has won at the ballot box. What happened to the messages that you gave with an expectation of a coup in Turkey in 2014 in the 21st century? Look at this, the nation is here. The people are here. Those who'd love to plot a route for Turkey through extra-political interventions have lost today at the ballot box. Where are you now? The politics of lies, slander, blackmail and montage has been destroyed today. The solution method of all problems in Turkey is politics and democracy unquestionably. Whatever problem one has, politics should be used for the solution. Whatever problem one has, it should be solved at the ballot box. As the AK Party, we will analyze the election results, as we have done in all other

elections. [Analyzing the reasons] why we got 46-47-48 [percent of votes all over Turkey] and we could not increase this [rate] to 55 or 60 [percent]. We will sit and discuss this now. And after discussing these and coming up with results we will continue on our path after working on our flaws. But is the opposition occupied with such an issue? No. They have always caught unprepared in the elections. We will wholeheartedly evaluate the feelings of people who have voted for us and my citizens who have not voted for us. The opposition should read the message people have given in the ballot in the correct way. The opposition should do healthy self-criticism. Do you know what made me hurt? I put aside what has been done against me after what has been done at the Foreign Ministry. Have you heard of any statement from this opposition? Did you hear them saying “This is treason, this is espionage, we are taking sides with the government against this.” Can those who take sides with Pennsylvania say these? This was what they said when they said there will be chaos after [March] 25. They said the economy would collapse; did it? We will get stronger in the economy, in politics and in democracy. Come on, let’s turn over a new page. O, the opposition, o, the people who have given their hearts to the opposition. Turkey’s interests must be over everything else. We said we are ready to lose if Turkey would win. The mentality that the AK Party should lose regardless of what consequences it will have for Turkey must be a thing of the past. The principles, values must be the fundamentals of the politics. Let’s raise Turkey together. Those who are used by Turkey’s enemies as pawns were disappointed today. These pawns once again saw how glorious, how noble, how heroic these people are. We have come [to power] to serve the people, not to be a master over them. We are only the porters of a big stone on the path. We were not here yesterday, but this path will continue. As long as the world stands, God willing, our flag will continue to wave in the highest bastions forever. For this, what have we said? We have said one nation with Turks, Kurds, Laz, Caucasians, Abkhazians, Bosniaks and Roma people. I do not love a Turk for being a Turk, a Kurd for being a Kurd, or a Laz for being a Laz. I love them because Allah who has created me has created the 77 million people. We do not discriminate. One group is making political Kurdishness, one group is making political Turkishness. The CHP says ‘I am a party of the coasts.’ One nation, one country, one flag, one state. They have entered our institutions over in 35-40 years. They infiltrated wherever. We became the victim of our good intentions. Now it is time to comb them out, within the law. Why? Because from now on, neither the nation nor we will show tolerance to such networks. Look, thank God, we have been granted the proud and honor of being at the forefront of this path. Maybe tomorrow we will not be in these posts. We have tried to glorify whatever task my God has given us. After now, as long as this body has this life, God willing, we will try to loyally adopt whatever tasks are bestowed onto us. If God pleases, we will put in an effort to laud our flag and our land as the servants of this country and nation until our last breath. We are highly relieved. We feel the pride of carrying the great Turkish flag, which we took over from our predecessors, to high bastions.

We are at joy to have strengthened politics. We have no doubt that the great AK Party family will behave with this consciousness. Today, nobody should be sad or sorry. The 77 million people should know that Turkey won today. Every single individual in the 77 million people should know that the new Turkey won today. This is the wedding day of the new Turkey.

Today, the targets of 2023 won, the resolution process won, the process of national unity and fraternity won. Not even one person among the 77 million lost, because a cadre that is ready to serve them without any discrimination is in office. They may think differently; they may have voted for different political parties; they may have cursed us. They may have insulted us. We have stomached most of them; we have taken many of them to court. The worthless opposition, the status quo, coup

attempts and tutelage have lost. Immoral and indecent politics have lost. I am thanking once more my nation. I am thanking those grandmothers who have prayed non-stop for months, even children. I am thanking young people, my sisters and the gentlemen.

I am thanking my brothers who have trusted us and who have believed in us. I am thanking those who have prayed for Turkey, for Turkey’s stability everywhere in the world. I am thanking my organization, from my headquarters to provincial organizations, district organizations, small town organizations and polling-station observers. I am thanking one by one our women’s branches, our youth branches, all of them one by one. I wish all the success to the elected mayors, city council members, metropolitan council members, village and neighborhood heads. I wish from God that these elections bring goodness to Turkey. May God protect my country, my nation. The nation is invincible. I say happy victory; let our victory be blessed. I salute all of you from my heart and I am asking, “Are we ready?” We walked together on these roads. We got wet together under the pouring rain. In all the songs I am listening to now, everything reminds me of you. Everything reminds me of Turkey.

“FULL TEXT: Turkish PM Erdoğan’s Post-Election ‘Balcony Speech’ – Turkey News.” Hürriyet Daily News, 31 Mar. 2014, www.hurriyetdailynews.com/full-text-turkish-pm-erdogans-post-election-balcony-speech-64341.

Appendix E

Table 4. Recep Tayyip Erdoğan’s speech in Ankara, starting late March 30 and ending early March 31, on the results of the local elections (<i>text, macrostructure topics and argumentation</i>)		
	Macro-and mesostructure: discourse topics (T)	Argumentation, claims, topoi,
Recep Tayyip Erdoğan 31 March 2014 I wholeheartedly greet our 81 provinces as well as sister and friendly capitals and <u>cities of the world</u> from Ankara, from the AK Party headquarters. [...] I first want to express my <u>absolute gratitude to my God</u> for such a <u>victory</u> and a meaningful result.	Date Commemorative Speech (sub)genre T: Addressing voters inside and outside of Turkey. Showing thankfulness to a higher authority.	<i>Topos of gratitude, achievement.</i>
<u>I express the gratitude of my people to all our brothers and friends who gave a support to Turkey’s independence struggle just like before the Independence War of Turkey.</u> Of course, <u>this precious people</u> deserve the greatest appreciation.	T: Expressing gratefulness for voters and supporters all over the world. Allusion between the Turkish War of Independence (1919-1923) and the local elections of 2014.	<i>Topos of freedom. Topos of gratitude. Topos of comparison. Topos of struggle. Topos of history</i>

<p>My brothers; I thank you very much because <u>you have protected the new Turkey's struggle for independence</u>. I thank each of you because you have <u>protected the ideal of a great Turkey</u> and the targets of a great Turkey. You have supported your prime minister, your party, the politics, your own future with your own will.</p>	<p>T: Expressing gratitude for the protection and the defence of Turkey, in terms of politics. Expressing thankfulness for maintaining the ideal Turkey by casting the votes on the party of the prime minister.</p>	<p><i>Topos of freedom.</i> <i>Topos of gratitude.</i> <i>Topos of comparison.</i> <i>Topos of struggle.</i></p>
<p>[...] This country found the opportunity to see the <u>traitors who eavesdropped on the Foreign Ministry and committed treachery</u> by interfering in the national security of this state and people. That was their chaos plan. I've been saying for months that "<u>We'll walk into their dens.</u>"</p>	<p>T: defeating the traitors, preventing chaos. Warning against external threats. Reference to the wiretap scandals of 2011 and 2014.</p>	<p><i>Topos of victory and defeat</i> <i>Topos of chaos</i> <i>Topos of threat</i> <i>Topos of self-justification</i></p>
<p>But what did your brother say? "<u>I'll quit party leadership if we cannot be the first party.</u>" Politics requires honor. Politics requires nobility. [...] The people gave a clear message to Turkey and to the world: What did they say? They said "We are here." They said, "<u>The Turkish people are impassable.</u>" "<u>We are the owners of this country. the people will not bow and Turkey is invincible.</u>"</p>	<p>T: Definition of the national ideal character. Referring to himself as the brother of the nation. Stating the required qualities for politics. Reference to the past promises of the leaders of the opposition. Expressing ownership and the indestructibility of Turkey.</p>	<p><i>Topos of external force</i> <i>Explicit topos of comparison</i> <i>Topos of consequence.</i></p>
<p>Those who managed could flee. More can flee tomorrow.</p>	<p>T: Expressing threat and anger towards the those who fled the country. Reference to the wiretap</p>	<p><i>Topos of external force</i> <i>Explicit topos of comparison</i> <i>Topos of action</i></p>
<p>[...] Syria is in a state of war with us. They are harassing our planes. <u>They have martyred our 74 brothers and the Süleyman Şah Tomb is our lands.</u> [...] <u>Can we remain silent about such a thing?</u> But these traitors wiretapped this meeting and leaked it to the world.</p>	<p>scandals of 2011 and 2014. Calling for a retaliative action.</p>	<p><i>Topos of consequence.</i></p>
<p>They are worse than Assassins [of the Middle Ages]. They are beyond them. [...] <u>Our people have made their objection and their stance against attempts to change the direction of Turkey through non-political ways.</u></p>	<p>T: Applying pejorative comparison for those who fled the country as well as the ones who allegedly wiretapped the meeting of the Foreign Ministry and the</p>	<p><i>Topos of explicit comparison</i> <i>Topos of achievement</i> <i>Topos of blame</i></p>

	<p>president of Turkey, the Gullenist movement.</p>	
<p>[...] <u>Today, unethical politics has lost.</u> Tape politics, montage politics, slander and denigration politics has lost. [...] O, General Manager [referring to the main opposition CHP leader Kemal Kılıçdaroglu], o, so-called party chair! <u>What would you speak of during your election campaign if you didn't have those tapes?</u> We spoke of plans, projects. <u>They spoke of lies, dissimulation, slander, sedition and intrigue.</u></p>	<p>T: Stating the message of the election. Emphasising victory in terms of political ameliorated qualities. Referring to the wiretap scandals of 2014. Defining the core qualities of politics. Accusing the leaders of the opposition.</p>	<p><i>Topos of achievement</i> <i>Topos of blame</i> <i>Topos of explicit comparison</i> <i>Topos of self-justification</i></p>
<p>You know those people who used that blood-dripping, anger-inducing, hate-mongering headlines... Today, they have lost heavily again. O, Pennsylvania [referring to U.S.-based Islamic cleric Fethullah Gülen], o, the media who support them from here [...] <u>Weren't you positioned against democracy?</u> <u>Democracy has won at the ballot box today.</u> The will has won at the ballot box.</p>	<p>T: Emphasising victory. Allusion between the political party and democracy. Reference to the wiretap scandal of 2014. Emphasising external threat (media, gulenist movement, opposition) and the heroic struggle against them. Underlining the strength of the nation. Expressing the solution in terms of politics.</p>	<p><i>Topos of victory</i> <i>Topos of threat</i> <i>Topos of external force</i> <i>Topos of justification</i> <i>Topos of explicit comparison</i> <i>Topos of blame</i></p>
<p>As the AK Party, we will analyze the election results, as we have done in all other elections. [...] <u>But is the opposition occupied with such an issue?</u> <u>No.</u> They have always caught unprepared in the elections. [...] <u>The opposition should read the message people have given in the ballot in the correct way. The opposition should do healthy self-criticism.</u></p>	<p>T: Promise regarding working on the satisfaction of voters. Accusing the leaders of the opposition. Providing advice as well as criticism for the leaders of the opposition.</p>	<p><i>Topos of illustrative example</i> <i>Topos of justification</i> <i>Topos of criticism</i> <i>Topos of explicit comparison</i> <i>Topos of blame</i></p>
<p>Come on, <u>let's turn over a new page.</u> O, <u>the opposition, o, the people who have given their hearts to the opposition.</u> [...] <u>The principles, values must be the fundamentals of the politics. Let's raise Turkey together.</u> Those who are used by Turkey's <u>enemies as pawns</u> were disappointed today. <u>These pawns once again saw how glorious, how noble, how heroic these people are.</u></p>	<p>T: Goal-setting. Further accomplishments for the future. T: Reference to the people who voted for the opposing political parties. Expressing the core qualities and ideal of politics. Calling for support regarding the future. The defeat of the</p>	<p><i>Topos of blame</i> <i>Topos of superordinate aim</i> <i>Topos of self-justification</i> <i>Topos of victory</i> Claim: <i>Turks are the heroes.</i></p>

	enemies.	
<p>We have come [to power] to serve the people, not to be a master over them. [...] As long as the world stands, God willing, <u>our flag will continue to wave in the highest bastions forever</u>. For this, what have we said? We have said <u>one nation with Turks, Kurds, Laz, Caucasians, Abkhazians, Bosniaks and Roma people</u>. I do not love a Turk for being a Turk, a Kurd for being a Kurd, or a Laz for being a Laz. <u>I love them because Allah who has created me has created the 77 million people</u>. [...] <u>One nation, one country, one flag, one state</u>.</p>	<p>T: Achievement. Expressing required qualities for politics. The success of the AK Party. Defeating all opposition. Reference to higher authority, to God. Stating that the ethnic groups in Turkey are all equal thanks to the spiritual belief that unites them.</p>	<p><i>Topos of victory</i> <i>Topos of continuation</i> <i>Topos of definition</i> <i>Topos of superordinate aim</i> <i>Topos of self-justification</i></p>
<p>They have entered our institutions over in 35-40 years. They infiltrated wherever. <u>We became the victim of our good intentions</u>. Now it is time to <u>comb them out</u>, within the law. [...] <u>We have tried to glorify whatever task my God has given us</u>. [...] We feel <u>the pride of carrying the great Turkish flag</u>, which we took over from our predecessors, to <u>high bastions</u>.</p>	<p>T: Self-representation. Reference to the Gulenist movement. Calling for action against the movement. Expressing retaliative motives. Addressing a higher authority, using religious terms. Expressing strong belief regarding the nation's future. Stating that the power has been granted to them.</p>	<p><i>Topos of justification</i> <i>Topos of appeal to authority</i> <i>Topos of presupposition</i> <i>Topos of superordinate aim</i> <i>Topos of determination</i> <i>Topos of victimization</i> <i>Topos of blame</i></p>
<p>We are at joy to have <u>strengthened politics</u>. [...] Today, <u>nobody should be sad or sorry</u>. The 77 million people should know that <u>Turkey won today</u>. [...]</p>	<p>T: Overcoming danger. Firm belief in the success of the party. Fight against oppression. Expressing dedication, ideals, goals. All members of the nation are considered as the winners and the inheritors of the new system.</p>	<p><i>Topos of superordinate aim</i> <i>Topos of struggle</i> <i>Topos of presupposition</i> <i>Topos of pride</i> <i>Topos of self-justification</i></p>
<p>[...] <u>Not even one person among the 77 million lost</u>, because a cadre that is ready to serve them without any discrimination is in office. <u>They may think differently</u>; <u>they may have voted for different political parties</u>; they may have cursed us. <u>They may have insulted us</u>. <u>We have stomachached most of them</u>; we have taken many of them to</p>	<p>T: Positive self-representation. The success of the AK party. Expressing the pride and happiness thanks to victory. Tolerance towards those who voted for the opposing parties.</p>	<p><i>Topos of victory</i> <i>Topos of illustrative example</i> <i>Topos of praise</i> <i>Topos of continuation</i> <i>Topos of blame</i> <i>Topos of tolerance</i> <i>Topos of gratitude</i></p>

<p>court. [...]I am thanking once more my nation.</p>	<p>Criticising the opposition. Reference to the coup attempts of the past. Stating the commemorative day of winning for the nation. Thanking all the supporters who have voted for the AK party.</p>	
<p>[...] I wish from God that these elections bring goodness to Turkey. May God protect my country, my nation. The nation is invincible. I say happy victory; let our victory be blessed. [...]</p>	<p>T: Expressing gratitude for the voters, colleagues, supporters. Addressing higher authority. Expressing the model of the nation. Asking for protection. Pointing out the indestructibility of the nation.</p>	<p><i>Topos of victory</i> <i>Topos of illustrative example</i> <i>Topos of praise</i> <i>Topos of criticism</i> <i>Topos of higher authority</i> <i>Topos of gratitude</i></p>
<p>We walked together on these roads. We got wet together under the pouring rain. [...] Everything reminds me of Turkey.</p>	<p>T: Referring to the party and the nation as a unique entity. The mutual endurance of hardships. Stating that the country means everything to him.</p>	<p><i>Topos of pride</i> <i>Topos of similarity</i> <i>Topos of endurance</i></p>

Appendix F

Table 5. The identification of nationalistic discursive strategies of Recep Tayyip Erdoğan in the speech after the results of the local elections

Strategies (Constructive, Perpetuation, Transformation)	Devices (Categorization, Stereotyping, Comparison)	Purpose
Justification and Relativisation		
Shift of Blame and Responsibility Rationalisation	Emphasising the difference between ‘us’ and them, isolation Scapegoating/victim-perpetrator inversion. (“They may have insulted us” “They spoke of lies, dissimulation, slander, sedition and intrigue”.)	To create a division. Present an enemy against which people can be united. Emphasizing the existence by listing their crimes.
Downplaying/Trivialisation Discontinuation	Emphasis of negative sameness or negative common features, emphasizing the difference between now and then. (“We are at joy to have strengthened politics” “We became the victim of our good intentions”)	In order to represent the enemy as an entity. The comparison between now and then is essential for justifying the betterment of the nation under the recent party’s

		rule.
Legitimation	Assigning authority (“We have tried to glorify whatever task my God has given us”)	Acknowledging a higher power that we all serve. The party receives its power from a supernatural force.
Constructive		
Nomination	Categorization devices Tropes such as metaphors Verbs and nouns used to denote processes and actions (“These pawns once again saw how glorious, how noble, how heroic these people are.”)	To represent the people who voted as the heroes, defenders of the country.
Predication	Stereotypical, evaluative attributions of positive traits, explicit comparisons, similes metaphors, presuppositions/implicatures (“These precious people deserve the greatest appreciation”)	To formulate a belief that the nation of Turkey does not bow and it is indestructible because of the possession of immense power.
Assimilation, Inclusion and Continuation	Comparison, harmonisation (“Let’s raise Turkey together” “We feel the pride of carrying the great Turkish flag”)	The national mode of character should include pride of the flag, which is the symbol of the nation. People should continue raising Turkey as they raise the flag.
Singularisation	Presupposition of national uniqueness (“One nation, one country, one flag, one state.”)	Uniting people under the umbrella of Turkish greatness, as an entity.
Unification and Cohesivation	Emphasis on unifying common/shared features Emphasis on national model character (“you have protected the ideal of a great” “supported your prime minister” “against attempts to change the direction of Turkey”)	The identification of particular features as national values, promoting a sense of uniqueness. The common feature is the common will, which is not to change the system. Everybody shares the win.
Perpetuation		
Positive Self-Presentation	Referential assimilation, positive attributions (“I’ve been saying for months that “We’ll walk into their dens”)	Justifying that he knew about the enemy and face it together with the nation

Continuation	Comparison, emphasis on continuity (“our flag will continue to wave in the highest bastions forever”)	Turkey must become more successful, the uniqueness must be protected.
Demontage (Dismantling) and Destruction		
Discrediting Opponents Negative Presentation of Others	Employing negative singularisation (“We spoke of plans, projects. They spoke of lies, dissimulation, slander, sedition and intrigue”)	It is a means of self-justification, the others should be seen as scandalous, in order to gain more supporters.