

**Two Views, Two Discourses:
A Critical Analysis of How Ideology is Interpreted
and Reinforced through Opinion Articles**

Assignment for: Written Discourse Analysis

January 2007

1. Introduction

This paper will look at two editorials about the execution of Saddam Hussein, using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), to dissect, compare and discuss the relationship of each text to its represented audience. After a brief introduction of the role and purpose of CDA, an analysis of the two texts will follow, which will then be followed by a comparison showing the differing ways in which ideology is contained within discursive practices, even within the same genre. We will also look at how certain viewpoints are either foregrounded or backgrounded, giving voices to their respective audiences.

2. Critical Discourse Analysis

'Discourse' refers to spoken or written texts in their social context (Caldas-Coulthard & Holland, 2001: 2). Discourse Analysis is the study of how the production, interpretation and re-interpretation of discourse impacts on social relations. CDA is further concerned with the reparation of social inequalities and looks at how discourse functions to reinforce these inequalities. In *Critical Discourse Analysis*, Fairclough uses the Gramscian principal of hegemony to relate power relations to discourse:

Hegemony is about constructing alliances, and integrating rather than simply dominating subordinate classes, through concessions or through ideological means, to win their consent....discoursal practice is a facet of struggle which contributes in varying degrees to the reproduction or transformation of the existing order of discourse, and through that of existing social and power relations.

(Fairclough, 1995:76-77)

There are numerous ways in which writers persuade, rather than coerce or force, people to more easily accept their views. Moreover, these discourses have the effect of reinforcing presently held beliefs. Discourse Analysis gives us the tools to dissect these texts and CDA allows us to see how these habits of discourse are reproduced and interpreted.

3. Methodology

Each news article will be described first in its cultural context, then analysed in greater detail in terms of *ideational meanings*, *interpersonal meanings*, *cohesion*, and *intertextuality*. The methodology of analysis follows to a large extent that used by Caldas-Coulthard and Holland (2001: 126-38) and is explained as follows:

3.1 Cultural Context

This section is divided into *field*, *tenor* and *mode*. Field describes the subject matter, genre and purpose of the text in its cultural context. Tenor describes the writer, the stance he/she takes, and the audience to which the text is targeted. Mode is the medium through which the text is communicated. These can encompass not only print but broadcast and internet media as well. The scope and size of its audience is also taken into account.

3.2 Ideational Meaning

Ideational meaning refers to how the text places meaning and significance on its actors and the actions described. These are further divided into two categories: *process* types and *participants & nominalisations*. Process types are verbs and verbal groups which describe actions or states of being. Caldas-Coulthard and Holland (ibid.) identify four process types: *Relational processes* state existence or states of being or possessing; *material processes* describe physical actions; *mental processes* describe mental activity and *verbal processes* describe verbal activity.

Participants and nominalisation describes how foregrounded or backgrounded the agents of actions are placed in the text. This is a key factor. Nominalisation is the de-emphasis or even removal of agency from the action. It is the placing of agency that determines to what extent blame/responsibility is placed for actions. The backgrounding or removal of agency tends also to make actions seem natural, or even *a priori*. For example, saying “To criticize such a great leader is tantamount to treason” strikes a very powerful chord; yet restating it as “I think criticizing such a great leader is tantamount to treason” takes away some of the power and seeming truth of the original statement. This facet has a key meaning for hegemony, as Fairclough states: “Naturalized discourse conventions are a most effective mechanism

for sustaining and reproducing cultural and ideological dimensions of hegemony” (1995: 94).

3.3 Interpersonal Meaning and Modality

Modality looks at words and statements which foreground the writer’s opinion on a subject. It is “what people commit themselves to when they make Statements, ask Questions, make Demands or Offers” (Fairclough, 2003: 165). As we will be looking at two opinion pieces, these instances will most likely be prominent.

3.4 Cohesion

Cohesion looks at how parts of text connect to produce meaning. In particular, we will be looking at *exophoric references* which make reference to the world outside of the text. The italicized phrase in the sentence, “This is a prime example of *all the corruption in government*” is an example of this, where *the corruption in government* is taken to be an assumed fact that need not be proven.

3.6 Intertextuality

These are allusions and references to other texts, with the hopes of establishing a kind of authority through such references.

4. Analysis of Washington Times Piece

4.1 Cultural Context

This text originates in the United States. At the time of writing, that country had been involved in a war in Iraq that was increasingly unpopular, both at home and abroad. The capture, trial and execution of Iraq’s former leader, however, were elements of the war that its proponents claimed as a victory. Even so, the execution of Saddam Hussein was an event that was not without controversy.

4.1.1 Field

The article is an “opinion” piece written by a weekly columnist. In regards to the criticism of how the execution of Saddam Hussein was handled, it seeks to defend the outcome.

4.1.2 Tenor

The writer, Helle Dale, is a weekly columnist who writes about foreign affairs and usually takes a conservative stance. Her audience is likewise conservative and expects their point of view to be directly substantiated through such “opinion” pieces.

4.1.3 Mode

The Washington Times is regarded as a conservative publication whose audience expects to read a likewise conservative viewpoint. Through its website, it most likely reaches a much larger audience than its print form. It is often associated with media of similar political ideology such as Fox News and the Wall Street Journal.

4.2 Ideational Meaning

4.2.1 Process Types

The word *opinion* would normally lead one to expect to hear one’s thoughts and ideas. It is therefore interesting to note that, despite being an opinion piece, over 50% of the process words are relational and approximately less than 10% are mental (see Appendix 3.1). This can be explained by the fact that relational processes are used to represent a reality which is needed to be true in order for the writer’s argument to be true. Let us examine the first paragraph:

(1) *Hard as it is to imagine*, some people around the world *are taking exception* to the execution of Saddam Hussein. (2) If ever there *were a candidate* for the death penalty, surely Saddam *would be it* — a dictator who *ruled by* cruelty and terror, *slaughtering* his own people in the name of control. (3) Respect for human life, *one would think*, *leads to* the conclusion that someone who *acts* with such profound contempt for its value, and *does it* on such a scale, *forfeits* the right to his own.

Here, as in most of the piece, relational processes are used to either describe those who criticized the execution, or else describe a “reality” which justified the outcome. The author’s use of relational processes in describing the critics should also be highlighted: “*Hard as it is to imagine...*”; “*...one would think...*”; “*Some have fallen for this ploy...*” in sentence 8; and “*To think of...is amazing*” in sentence 9. These statements indirectly accuse critics as being somehow gullible to the point of disbelief.

Also in this excerpt, as in a great deal of the text, material processes are used negatively in describing Hussein's actions. For example, "ruled by cruelty and terror, slaughtering his own people... (2). Negative material processes assigned to an agent build up in the reader's mind a justification of any "punishment" that would have occurred. Verbal processes account for two out of the three quotes in this piece, but more on this will be covered below in the section on Intertextuality.

4.2.2 Participants and Nominalisation

Agency, indicating responsibility for actions, is the key issue here. And the most striking thing is that although the targets of the piece are the *critics of the trial and execution of Saddam Hussein*, these critics are never named. The closest Dale comes to naming is: "one writer on the BBC Web site" (16). There will be more on this quote later. One effect of this tactic is indirectly assimilating the critics of the trial with Hussein himself. The lack of clear agency leads the reader to assume that the views of the critics and those of Hussein are one and the same. This simplification of the issue is not uncommon in political rhetoric.

The nominalisation of the author's opinion can be found in the full text of sentence 9: "To think of Saddam as a leader in national reconciliation is amazing, but some people do". Instead of stating "To me, it is amazing that some people think of Saddam as a leader in national reconciliation", the author makes her opinion sound more like a universally agreed-upon truth. The conservative readership of the Washington Times however, would not require such an interjection of the first person. Indeed it would seem redundant since the viewpoints of Dale and her readership are basically the same.

If we look at named participants in a more general sense, the main group mentioned are Iraqis, who are mentioned three times (in sentences 8, 7 and 25). "Some people" (1,9), "some" (8), and "others" (12) are the unnamed critics of the trial, while "we", used three times in the latter half of the piece, would ostensibly seem to refer to the American public. However, given the partisan nature of the publication, "we" would more likely refer to the conservative readership who shares Dale's ideology.

4.3 Interpersonal Meaning and Modality

As mentioned, in the genre of an opinion piece, a high degree of foregrounding of the author's view is expected. Even if this article were not located in the "Opinion" section of the newspaper, the very first phrase "Hard as it is to imagine" signifies to the reader the genre to which it belongs. Here is another example of the author giving her outright opinion:

(12) Others feel that a national leader should not be subject to the death penalty. (13) That would mean that murdering people on a grand scale, in the fashion of Hitler, Stalin or Pol Pot, makes you less culpable than murdering people on a one on one basis. (14) Obviously, *this argument makes no sense*.

Another aspect here is the *presupposition*. Goatly ties presuppositions with nominalisations, stating "nominalisation is a way of smuggling in presuppositions" (2000: 77). This does overlap with the nominalisations section above, but as we will see presuppositions are tied with both nominalisations and the redefining of opinion as reality. Presuppositions turn claims into facts, allowing the reader to assume that the event actually exists, when in fact it might be highly contested. Take for example sentence (19):

In order to legitimize Iraq's future, we *should* take the time to do so *rather than allow* another set of *myths* about Iraq to mushroom, like *the myth that Saddam had no weapons of mass destruction* despite the mass murder of the Kurds in the 1980s and the use of chemical weapons against Iranian soldiers in the Iraq-Iran war.

In veiling the sentence as a prescriptive sentence with the modal *should*, Dale defines the statement "Saddam had no weapons of mass destruction" as a myth. How does this happen? First, the verb "allow" is placed in the secondary clause, distancing it from the subject "we". This gives it an air of indirect responsibility. Thus, the claim that Saddam had no weapons of mass destruction becomes a myth that "we" have allowed to "mushroom". In addition, this sentence further obfuscates the justification of the Iraq war in 2003 with events that happened many years earlier. Indeed, the

sentence is so busy with information that the judgement of which facts are true and which are not becomes difficult for the casual reader.

4.4 Cohesion

Like the previously mentioned example of the contested existence of weapons of mass destruction, there are other statements which are taken to be “truths”. These, however, are of an exophoric nature. That is, they make reference to an agreed-upon idea of “common-sense”. Caldas-Coulthard and Holland name these “secure ideological assumptions” (2001: 134). Dale’s readership, sharing her ideological opinions, would most likely not question the accuracy of these claims.

In sentence 21, Dale states, “There were advantages and drawbacks to this approach (of allowing the Iraqi government to try Saddam), but ultimately it was the right one”. Without analysing or even stating what these advantages and drawbacks were, the judgement is made that the decision was just. To justify this, Dale makes a reference to the Nuremburg trials. Disregarding the ill-defined logic being employed here, the reference serves to compare Saddam to Hitler, which in the reader’s mind indirectly equates the Iraqi war to World War Two. In the reader’s mind, this serves to further justify the legitimacy of the current military involvement in Iraq.

Indeed, the mentioning of Hitler calls to mind the exophoric references to other named leaders. In the second paragraph, Hussein is categorized with Fidel Castro and Slobodan Milosevic. In the fourth paragraph, the category is furthered by the mentioning of not only Hitler but also Stalin and Pol Pot. This results in a superordination of these people, including Hussein, into the category of “mass-murdering dictator”, thereby strengthening Dale’s argument. And ‘slipping in’ Fidel Castro as a mass-murderer, debatable as that may be, is also accomplished here to further strengthen the shared views of her readership.

In the conclusion, another judgement is made: “In the end, it was only fair that Iraqis be allowed to reach the final verdict over the man who had held their country in his iron grip for over 20 years” (25). The use of the word “fair” collocates with the word “verdict” to bring to the reader’s mind the concept of “justice”. This collocation both

ties the writer's statement to the idea of "justice" and signifies to the reader that this outcome, whatever the means, was justified.

4.5 Intertextuality

There is much referencing of other texts. Each of the three paragraphs representing the "other side" of the debate uses these intertextual references for different purposes. Firstly, Dale accuses some critics as "falling for the ploy of Saddam's final letter" (8), which she proceeds to quote and also redefine as a call for "national reconciliation". A second-hand reference to the anecdote of an unnamed "friend" is then used to counter this plea in the letter. The truth of this reference is not as important as something else that happens here: By negating Hussein's statement, the author is also, through the associations made in the paragraph, negating the stance of the critics.

In the next paragraph, the argument that "a national leader should not be subject to the death penalty", (12) is stated. Any source of this argument is omitted. Neither are any details of this argument given. It is no surprise that Dale easily nullifies this argument.

The third paragraph representing the critics is perhaps the most intriguing. It consists of a lengthy quote attributed, as mentioned above, only to an unnamed writer on the BBC website. A quick search for this quote a week after the publication of Dale's piece resulted only in her text and websites which re-published it. There were no records of an original quote, either from the BBC or elsewhere. Considering the rest of the article following the quote is dependent on answering this charge, the legitimacy of this quote is an important issue indeed.

But perhaps more importantly is how the reference to the BBC resonates with Dale's readership. To many American conservatives, the BBC is part of what is considered the "liberal media". The fact that it is not American also enhances its discursive position as the "other", and therefore makes it easier for Dale, and her readers, to dismiss.

5. Analysis of Saudi Gazette Piece

5.1 Cultural Context

The text is taken from the Saudi Gazette, an English-language publication from Saudi Arabia. Given that 5 million people of its population of 27 million consists of foreign workers, one can be assured that its audience does not strictly consist of Saudis. Nevertheless, the views expressed are more often those of a Saudi/Islamic viewpoint rather than a Western one.

Saudi Arabia has a complicated relationship with the United States and the Iraq War. The presence of American troops in Iraq since the Gulf War has been the cause for much discontent in that country. Also, the fact that a significant portion of Iraq and most of Saudi Arabia are of the same Muslim denomination (Sunni) has also been cause for tension, particularly since the US toppled Saddam Hussein (a Sunni) and replaced him with a Shia (the rival Muslim denomination). Despite this, for economic and political reasons, the American government has maintained close ties with the government of Saudi Arabia.

5.1.1 Field

Like the first article analyzed, this piece also falls in the opinion genre. However, its purpose is slightly broader than that of the first piece, which was the dismissal of those who criticized Hussein's execution. It seeks to criticize not only the trial and execution, but also American involvement in Iraq; and by extension, the Middle East.

5.1.2 Tenor

The article is credited to Reema Memon, a "free-lance writer based in Jeddah". This signifies that perhaps this person is not a weekly, much less paid, contributor, and definitely not part of the staff of the paper. This detachment would most likely suggest to the reader that the viewpoint expressed does not necessarily reflect that of the paper, and furthermore, might even be more independent and uninhibited.

5.1.3 Mode

This is also an opinion piece, and therefore expresses a viewpoint in the hopes of either convincing or reinforcing the views of its readers. Since this publication is most likely read by Saudis and foreign workers alike, it is expected that its viewpoint

would be a combination or mixture of views. It should be kept in mind however, that many foreign workers in Saudi Arabia, might have more sympathy with their host state than the views of the other side of the debate being discussed.

5.2 Ideational Meaning

5.2.1 Process Types

There is a high instance of relational processes in this article as well as the Dale piece. 29 out of the 53 process phrases can be categorized as defining or attributing a quality to something (see Appendix 3.2). The material processes are roughly 40% (19/53). This excerpt provides a good example of process usage in the text:

(10) Executing Hussein *provides* a means of another battle between the Muslim world – the Shiites and the Sunnis. (11) A conflict the Arab world *is trying to resolve and make peace*. (12) The Muslims now *need to start from scratch* if differences *need to be solved* amongst themselves – which of course *will be difficult* as Muslims are not strong enough *to compete with* the Bush-led empire. (13) So much *has occurred* in the Muslim world and yet Muslims *are reluctant to unite and oppose* “the Great America escorted by a great leader!”

A difference is the slightly lower instance of mental processes (2/53 in Memon, 5/80 in Dale). In both articles, these processes are attributed to the opposition (with one exception in sentence 18 of Dale). Editorials, it seems, do more to represent a reality to their intended audience than merely stating the thoughts of their writers.

5.2.2 Participants and Nominalisation

In the Washington Times article, we saw that the critics of the trial and execution were to an extent conflated with Hussein himself. In this piece, Hussein becomes the object of passive phrasing:

(3) (The) Iraqi leader was not, however, *tried and sentenced* under the patronage of a working class tribunal. (4) He was the defendant in a trial *established* by an occupation regime after the *invasion and conquest* of Iraq by

the United States. (5) In other words, his crimes *were judged* and the penalty *imposed* by those guilty of even greater crimes than his own.

Although the use of the passive tense is commonly thought of as downplaying the subject (here, the United States), it is used to a different end in this paragraph. In this key introductory paragraph, the passive tense is used to change the focus at hand from Saddam Hussein to the United States, without clearly naming the United States as the focus of criticism. A possible reason for this was discussed in Dale's article: there is controversy over how much control, and therefore actual agency, the United States government has in the Iraqi government. The passive phrasing here allows the writer to conflate the two as one, without explicitly stating so. The naming of the United States in sentence 4 is uncontroversial, since it did invade and "conquest" the country of Iraq (although these terms are quite loaded – see the next section). But in the next sentence, the phrase *in other words* redefines the previous sentences, and in so doing also redefines the judges of the trial (*those guilty of even greater crimes*) as the United States.

Looking at the participants in a more general sense, the most named group, with five occurrences, is the proper noun *Muslims*. If we include the collocated terms *Arabs* (2), *Sunnis*, *Shiites*, *Muslim world* (10), *Arab world* (11), and the use of *Muslim* as an adjective, the count comes to twelve. Sentence 12 is a good example of the contextualization:

The *Muslims* now need to start from scratch if differences need to be solved amongst themselves – which of course will be difficult as *Muslims* are not strong enough to compete with the Bush-led empire.

Like this sentence, *Muslims* and its collocated terms are used prescriptively in the article. The intent here is clearly to establish a position of solidarity with the readership. In sharp contrast, Dale's article has no occurrences of this word, choosing instead *Iraqi* or *Kurd*, discursively positioning them as adversaries, so that their common superordination *Muslim* is also displaced.

5.3 Interpersonal Meaning and Modality

Memon's article has much more foregrounding of her opinion than Dale's. This is most likely due to the fact that while Dale uses three paragraphs to describe her opposition, Memon uses only an intertextual quote which introduces the article itself. This being the case, almost every sentence in the remaining piece has evidence of the writer's opinion. We have already seen her introductory paragraph. Let us take a look at the next one:

(7) Saddam Hussein's death sentence *was faulty* from all angles and points of view under an *unbiased judgment*. (8) The execution of former Iraqi president Saddam Hussein *serves not justice, but the political purposes* of the Bush administration and Iraqi government. (9) The manner in which the execution was carried out – *hurriedly, secretively, in the dark of night* – only highlights the *lawless and reactionary* character of the entire American *enterprise* in Iraq.

As was seen with the first paragraph, we can see a shifting of focus here from the trial of Saddam Hussein to the American government. The use of the evaluative terms *was faulty*, *unbiased judgement*, and *serves not justice* will be further analysed in the next section, but for now notice only that they, along with the other italicized terms, show the writer's opinion quite clearly. The judgement referred to is not of Hussein, but of "the Bush administration". The use of *enterprise* in sentence 9 is also loaded, implying the US interest in Iraq to be more economic than political.

The next paragraph not only further defines the writer's opinion, but also quite directly appeals to her readership as well.

(10) Executing Hussein provides a means of another battle between the Muslim world – the Shiites and the Sunnis. (11) A conflict the Arab world is trying to resolve and make peace [sic]. (12) The Muslims now *need to start from scratch if differences need to be solved amongst themselves* – which of course will be difficult as Muslims *are not strong enough to compete with the Bush-led empire*. (13) So much has occurred in the Muslim world and yet *Muslims are reluctant to unite and oppose* "the Great America escorted by a great leader!"

The purpose of this paragraph is two-fold. It gives a prescriptive diagnosis of what is wrong with the “Muslim world” and the problems it is having with the “Bush-led empire”. In doing so, this paragraph also serves another purpose: It also consolidates the readership into the author’s ideology. Although the pronoun “we” is never used, nor is the modal “should”, one would be hard pressed to find statements such as “Muslims are not strong enough to compete with the Bush-led empire” or “Muslims are reluctant to unite and oppose ‘the Great America escorted by a great leader!’” in many American newspapers. In the cultural context, there is no question that through the use of the prescriptive verb “need” with the subject “Muslims”, the author is speaking as a Muslim, and on behalf of Muslims. Likewise, the Muslim readership more fully embraces the text and more readily allows it to speak for them. Additionally, they also become more open to the prescriptions contained, thereby giving more power and authority to the writer.

5.4 Cohesion

There are a number of secure ideological assumptions which, like the ones in the Dale article, the reader will most likely ignore due to a shared ideological worldview. These are made through exophoric references:

(2) *It’s not necessarily the opinion of many Arabs...*

(10) *...another battle between the Muslim world...*

(13) *So much has occurred in the Muslim world and yet Muslims are reluctant to...*

(18) *...the grisly daily toll the unjustified [sic] and the inexcusable Iraqi and American deaths.*

(21) *Hussein’s death is a clear-cut way for Bush to further cause differences among Muslims.*

In sentences 13 and 18, the exophoric references are attached with the evaluative adjectives *reluctant*, *grisly*, and *inexcusable*. In this way, the references are modified with the author’s interpretation, in effect redefining the reference. Through interpersonal ties with the readership and a common knowledge of the referents, the reader becomes more open to agreeing with these interpretations.

Like the Dale piece, Memon also uses collocation:

(7) Saddam Hussein's death *sentence* was *faulty* from all angles and points of view under an *unbiased judgment*. (8) The *execution* of former Iraqi president Saddam Hussein *serves not justice*, but the political purposes of the Bush administration and Iraqi government.

The use of sections italicized here collocate ideas of law and justice but are shifted from Hussein to *the Bush Administration*. With reference to Dale, this is a similar use of collocation to bring ideas of justice to the reader, although of course, the matter of who is being judged is altered here.

5.5 Intertextuality

It is in this section that we can see that the structure of Memon's article is quite different than that of Dale's. Although both writers use intertextual references as way of representing the opposition opinion, Dale places his three references in the middle of his piece, whereas Memon places her sole reference at the very beginning. Both writers follow the claim/counter-claim textual pattern, "where a series of claims and contrasting counter-claims is presented in relation to a given issue (Holland and Johnson, 2000: 23). Dale, one will recall, follows each claim with its corresponding counter-claim, leaving his conclusion an extended argument arising from his last counter-claim. But because Memon prefaces her piece with the claim to be argued against, her piece is framed so that the rest of it consists almost entirely of her counter-claim. This is the reason that, despite the fact that her piece is briefer than Dale's, it actually contains more of her own opinion.

Another point of comparison here is the fact that both writers are quoting from what Dale's audience would label "liberal" media: The New York Times and the BBC. But perhaps the more important point to be considered here is that both the Times and BBC are *major media*; that is, they are global news organisations whose audience, and therefore influence, is wide reaching. The readership of the Washington Times and the Saudi Gazette have reasons they have chosen to read those publications, either in

addition to or as an alternative to major media, and tied in with those reasons may be the fact that they do not see their views represented in major media.

6. Comparison

Despite their wide ideological differences, we have seen many similarities between the two articles. Both are opinion pieces which use the claim/counter-claim format. Both use *major* or *mainstream* media, not only as sources for claims, but as a signified *other*, in order to strengthen and define their ideological positions. Also to maintain these positions, both use ideological assumptions which their readerships will not question. In addition, most likely related to the fact that they are opinion pieces, both use a high degree of relational processes in order to construct a reality which suits their ideologies, as well as those of their readerships. Likewise, the subsequent placing of material processes in both pieces shows that these processes are used as evidence of deeds (or misdeeds), which serve to strengthen the writer's claims

Where the two pieces differ point to geographical, cultural and political differences between the papers and their audiences. Dale's piece is structured as a conservative response to criticisms about the execution, and it tries to adhere to this one issue. It seeks to individuate groups (hence the absence of the term *Muslim*) and only dismisses the criticisms of the execution, not the war. Its readership is Americans who, for the most part, are far removed from Iraq, both geographically and culturally.

On the other hand, Memon's readership, despite not being Iraqi, has more ties with the issue. Politically, culturally, geographically, and even theologically, they have more invested. This perhaps is the main reason her piece reads more like a call to action. It is much more prescriptive, as we have seen, and it seeks to unite, rather than divide Muslims. It also seeks to place the event in a larger context, tying it to larger issues of US involvement in the Middle East.

7. Conclusion

According to Van Dijk (1995:1), precious little has been written on editorials with regards to Critical Discourse Analysis. This is surprising, since, as he states:

When expressed in editorials, opinions and ideologies are being produced by journalists and other writers, who...exhibit their shared social representations, and participate in the complex processes of newspaper production and reception as well as in intergroup interaction and institutional reproduction. (1995: 2)

Furthermore, Fowler (1991:231) has stated that newspapers assume that there is only one rational point of view. The publication of news becomes the publication of 'truth'. The purpose of editorials, therefore, is to emphatically *reaffirm* this 'truth' for the intended audience. The intended audience uses this point of view, especially in the partisan contexts we have seen, to substantiate its own ideology and, in turn, empower the writers to continue voicing and representing their interests. This process, as we have seen, may differ in content, but its form transcends both culture and ideology.

Bibliography and References

Caldas-Coulthard, C.R. & Holland, B. (2001) "Critical Discourse Analysis", in Coulthard, M. et al, *Written Discourse*, University of Birmingham: CELS.

Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1995) *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2003) *Analysing Discourse*. London: Routledge.

Fowler, R. (1991) *Language in the News. Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge.

Goatly, A. (2000) *Critical Reading and Writing*. London: Routledge.

Holland, R. & Johnson, A. (2001) "Patterning in Texts", in Coulthard, M. et al, *Written Discourse*, University of Birmingham: CELS.

Van Dijk, T. (1995) "Opinions and Ideologies in Editorials", unpublished paper for *The 4th International Symposium of Critical Discourse Analysis, Language, Social Life and Critical Thought, Athens, 14-16 December, 1995*.
(<http://www.discourses.org/Unpublished/Opinions%20and%20ideologies%20in%20editorials.htm>)

Appendix 1

The Washington Times

Saddam-less

By Helle Dale

Published January 3, 2007

(1)Hard as it is to imagine, some people around the world are taking exception to the execution of Saddam Hussein. (2)If ever there were a candidate for the death penalty, surely Saddam would be it — a dictator who ruled by cruelty and terror, slaughtering his own people in the name of control. (3)Respect for human life, one would think, leads to the conclusion that someone who acts with such profound contempt for its value, and does it on such a scale, forfeits the right to his own.

(4)Saddam displayed no remorse whatsoever, even in his final moments. (5)The unfortunate cell phone video recording of his execution, displaying shouting and cursing from the audience and defiance from the convicted, indicates that Saddam was someone whose ego had not been dented by doubts about what he had done to Iraq. (6)Dictators from Fidel Castro to Slobodan Milosevic tend to exhibit the same imperviousness to acknowledgement of the evils they have done. (7)Their hard protective shell does not allow for remorse or pity for their victims.

(8)Some have fallen for the ploy of Saddam's final letter, which called for Iraqis "not to hate, because hatred does not leave space for a person to be fair." (9)To think of Saddam as a leader in national reconciliation is amazing, but some people do. (10)A friend of mine who had met Saddam Hussein in the 1980s said that he justified the mass murder by chemical weapons of 5,000 Iraqi Kurds by the need to impose discipline. (11)That was Saddam's way of effecting national reconciliation when he was in power.

(12)Others feel that a national leader should not be subject to the death penalty. (13)That would mean that murdering people on a grand scale, in the fashion of Hitler, Stalin or Pol Pot, makes you less culpable than murdering people on a one on one basis. (14)Obviously, this argument makes no sense.

(15)Unfortunately, the argument that so far has surfaced the most is that Saddam's trial was the victor's justice carried out by a puppet government. (16)In the words of one writer on the BBC Web site, it was a "sordid, barbaric climax to a series of events triggered in the name of democracy and justice yet mired in the lies, deception and moral jingoism of two governments whose own conduct became no better than that of the man they deposed. (17)For Iraqis, justice may have prevailed, but the arrogance and sheer political incompetence of the United States and the whole of the British Labour party (for they are all responsible) has left a terrible legacy that will fester throughout the world for decades to come."

(18)Now that Saddam has passed into history, how far should we go in exploring and answering these arguments? (19)In order to legitimize Iraq's future, we should take the time to do so rather than allow another set of myths about Iraq to mushroom, like the myth that Saddam had no weapons of mass destruction

despite the mass murder of the Kurds in the 1980s and the use of chemical weapons against Iranian soldiers in the Iraq-Iran war.

(20)It was precisely to give legitimacy to the judgment that the United States declined to persecute Saddam after his ignominious capture just over three years ago. (21)There were advantages and drawbacks to this approach, but ultimately it was the right one. (22)Had we followed the pattern of the Nazi Nuremberg trials after World War II, victor's justice would certainly have been charged (as it was about Nuremberg as well).

(23)An international tribunal would have been another option, though the case of Serbian strongman Slobodan Milosevic showed how limited that approach can be. (24)Milosevic, of course, died of a heart attack after making a mockery of the tribunal in The Hague for years at a cost of millions of dollars.

(25)In the end, it was only fair that Iraqis be allowed to reach the final verdict over the man who had held their country in his iron grip for over 20 years. (26)That the trial at times turned into a farce was to a far greater degree due to Saddam's antics in the courtroom and threats of hunger strike than anything done by the justices, who persevered in the face of great personal danger. (27)What is important now is that the evidence is preserved and remains accessible for history's verdict on what happened in Iraq.

Appendix 2

Saddam's Treatment Faulty from the Start

Wednesday, 03 January 2007

By Reema Memon
The Saudi Gazette

(1) "Saddam Hussein was a vicious, brutal tyrant who ordered the murders of thousands of his own citizens; a soulless beast that the world will not miss," the New York Times announced.

(2) It's not necessarily the opinion of many Arabs, but it's being promoted by the world's top media outlet. (3) Iraqi leader was not, however, tried and sentenced under the patronage of a working class tribunal. (4) He was the defendant in a trial established by an occupation regime after the invasion and conquest of Iraq by the United States. (5) In other words, his crimes were judged and the penalty imposed by those guilty of even greater crimes than his own. (6) Crimes that include killing hundreds of innocent people not every year, not every month – but every single day.

(7) Saddam Hussein's death sentence was faulty from all angles and points of view under an unbiased judgment. (8) The execution of former Iraqi president Saddam Hussein serves not justice, but the political purposes of the Bush administration and Iraqi government. (9) The manner in which the execution was carried out – hurriedly, secretly, in the dark of night – only highlights the lawless and reactionary character of the entire American enterprise in Iraq.

(10) Executing Hussein provides a means of another battle between the Muslim world – the Shiites and the Sunnis. (11) A conflict the Arab world is trying to resolve and make peace. (12) The Muslims now need to start from scratch if differences need to be solved amongst themselves – which of course will be difficult as Muslims are not strong enough to compete with the Bush-led empire. (13) So much has occurred in the Muslim world and yet Muslims are reluctant to unite and oppose "the Great America escorted by a great leader!" (14) The most fundamental political motive of the Bush administration is its desire to minimize a major opponent, openly before the eyes of the world to simply demonstrate his ability and will to do so. (15) In the view of the White House, Saddam is an object lesson to any future opponent of American interests. (16) A lesson to anyone: Defy the will of Washington and the bloody fate could be yours. (17) The execution also provides the Bush administration with an event it can claim as proof of US "success" in Iraq. (18) The media coverage of the execution has caused a diversion from the grisly daily toll the unjustified and the inexcusable Iraqi and American deaths. (19) The timing of the execution is curious. (20) Sentencing a Muslim leader on one of the most special days of the Muslim calendar marks a surety of this event to be an unforgettable one.

(21) Hussein's death is a clear-cut way for Bush to further cause differences among Muslims. (22) The time has come for the Muslims to come to their senses together and create an indestructible bond to not only remind Bush how strong and powerful they are, but to also shake him up and let him think twice before conducting another preemptive strike of another country.

(23)The US government is responsible for the deaths of more Iraqis than Saddam Hussein – an estimated 655,000 since the US invasion in March 2003. (24)True justice for the tortured and agonized people of Iraq will come only when those responsible for the assault and attacks face their own trials for waging an illegal war of aggression.

– **Reema Memon is a free-lance writer based in Jeddah.**

Appendix 3

Process Types

3.1 Process Types in “Saddam-less”

Key: bold text	relational processes
<u>underlined text</u>	material processes
<i>italicized text</i>	mental processes
boxed text	verbal processes

Hard as it **is** to imagine, some people around the world **are** taking exception to the execution of Saddam Hussein. If ever there **were** a candidate for the death penalty, surely Saddam **would be** it — a dictator who ruled by cruelty and terror, slaughtering his own people in the name of control. Respect for human life, one *would think*, **leads** to the conclusion that someone who acts with such profound contempt for its value, and does it on such a scale, forfeits the right to his own.

Saddam **displayed** no remorse whatsoever, even in his final moments. The unfortunate cell phone video recording of his execution, **displaying** shouting and cursing from the audience and defiance from the convicted, **indicates** that Saddam **was** someone whose ego **had not been dented** by doubts about what he had done to Iraq. Dictators from Fidel Castro to Slobodan Milosevic **tend to exhibit** the same imperviousness to acknowledgement of the evils they have done. Their hard protective shell **does not allow** for remorse or pity for their victims.

Some **have fallen** for the ploy of Saddam's final letter, which called for Iraqis "not *to hate*, because hatred **does not** leave space for a person to **be fair**." *To think of Saddam as a leader in national reconciliation is* amazing, but some people *do*. A friend of mine who had met Saddam Hussein in the 1980s said that he *justified* the mass murder by chemical weapons of 5,000 Iraqi Kurds by the need to impose discipline. That **was** Saddam's way of effecting national reconciliation when he **was** in power.

Others *feel* that a national leader **should not be** subject to the death penalty. That would mean that murdering people on a grand scale, in the fashion of Hitler, Stalin or Pol Pot, **makes** you less culpable than murdering people on a one on one basis. Obviously, this argument **makes** no sense.

Unfortunately, the argument that so far **has surfaced** the most **is** that Saddam's trial was the victor's justice carried out by a puppet government. In the words of one writer on the BBC Web site, it **was** a "sordid, barbaric climax to a series of events **triggered** in the name of democracy and justice yet **mired** in the lies, deception and moral jingoism of two governments whose own conduct **became** no better than that of the man they deposed. For Iraqis, justice **may have** prevailed, but the arrogance and sheer political incompetence of the United States and the whole of the British Labour party (for they are all responsible) **has left** a terrible legacy that **will fester** throughout the world for decades to come."

Now that Saddam has passed into history, how far should we go in *exploring* and

answering these arguments? In order to **legitimize** Iraq's future, we should take the time to do so rather than allow another set of myths about Iraq **to mushroom**, like the myth that Saddam **had** no weapons of mass destruction despite the mass murder of the Kurds in the 1980s and the use of chemical weapons against Iranian soldiers in the Iraq-Iran war.

It **was precisely to give** legitimacy to the judgment that the United States declined to persecute Saddam after his ignominious capture just over three years ago. There **were** advantages and drawbacks to this approach, but ultimately it **was** the right one. Had we followed the pattern of the Nazi Nuremberg trials after World War II, victor's justice would certainly **have been charged** (as it **was** about Nuremberg as well).

An international tribunal **would have been** another option, though the case of Serbian strongman Slobodan Milosevic **showed** how limited that approach **can** be. Milosevic, of course, died of a heart attack after making a mockery of the tribunal in The Hague for years at a cost of millions of dollars.

In the end, it **was** only fair that Iraqis be allowed to reach the final verdict over the man who had **held** their country in his iron grip for over 20 years. That the trial at times **turned into** a farce **was** to a far greater degree due to Saddam's antics in the courtroom and threats of hunger strike than anything done by the justices, who persevered in the face of great personal danger. What **is** important now is that the evidence **is** preserved and **remains** accessible for history's verdict on what happened in Iraq.

Relational processes	48
Material processes	23
Mental processes	5
Verbal processes	4
Total	80

Table 1: Process types in "Saddam-less"

3.2 Process Types in “Saddam’s Treatment Faulty from the Start”

Key: bold text	relational processes
<u>underlined text</u>	material processes
<i>italicized text</i>	mental processes
boxed text	verbal processes

“Saddam Hussein **was** a vicious, brutal tyrant who ordered the murders of thousands of his own citizens; a soulless beast that the world **will not miss**,” the New York Times announced.

It’s not necessarily the opinion of many Arabs, but it’s being promoted by the world’s top media outlet. Iraqi leader **was not**, however, tried and sentenced under the patronage of a working class tribunal. He **was** the defendant in a trial established by an occupation regime after the invasion and conquest of Iraq by the United States. In other words, his crimes were judged and the penalty imposed by those guilty of even greater crimes than his own. Crimes that **include** killing hundreds of innocent people not every year, not every month – but every single day.

Saddam Hussein’s death sentence **was** faulty from all angles and points of view under an unbiased judgment. The execution of former Iraqi president Saddam Hussein **serves not** justice, but the political purposes of the Bush administration and Iraqi government. The manner in which the execution was carried out – hurriedly, secretly, in the dark of night – only highlights the lawless and reactionary character of the entire American enterprise in Iraq.

Executing Hussein **provides** a means of another battle between the Muslim world – the Shiites and the Sunnis. A conflict the Arab world is trying to resolve and make peace. The Muslims now **need to** start from scratch if differences **need to be solved** amongst themselves – which of course **will be** difficult as Muslims **are not** strong enough to compete with the Bush-led empire. So much **has occurred** in the Muslim world and yet Muslims **are** reluctant to unite and oppose “the Great America escorted by a great leader!” The most fundamental political motive of the Bush administration **is** its desire to minimize a major opponent, openly before the eyes of the world to simply demonstrate his ability and will to do so. In the view of the White House, Saddam **is** an object lesson to any future opponent of American interests. A lesson to anyone: Defy the will of Washington and the bloody fate could **be yours**. The execution also **provides** the Bush administration with an event it can claim as proof of US “success” in Iraq. The media coverage of the execution has **caused** a diversion from the grisly daily toll the unjustified and the inexcusable Iraqi and American deaths. The timing of the execution **is** curious. Sentencing a Muslim leader on one of the most special days of the Muslim calendar **marks** a surety of this event to be an unforgettable one.

Hussein’s death **is** a clear-cut way for Bush to further **cause** differences among Muslims. The time **has** come for the Muslims to *come to their senses* together and create an indestructible bond to not only *remind* Bush how strong and powerful they **are**, but to also shake him up and *let him think twice* before conducting another preemptive strike of another country.

The US government **is responsible** for the deaths of more Iraqis than Saddam Hussein – an estimated 655,000 since the US invasion in March 2003. True justice for the tortured and agonized people of Iraq **will come** only when those responsible for the assault and attacks **face** their own trials for waging an illegal war of aggression.

Relational processes	29
Material processes	19
Mental processes	2
Verbal processes	3
Total	53

Table 2: Process types in “Saddam’s Treatment Faulty from the Start”