An Application of Fairclough's Three Dimensional CDA Approach to Fraser Anning's Speech in Australian Senate

Correspondence:	Dr. Wasim Hassan <meemash504@gmail.com>	Lecturer in English, National Textile University, Faisalabad, Pakistan
	Abaid ur Rehman	M.Phil. Scholar, Riphah International University, Faisalabad Campus, Pakistan
	Asad Zafar	M.Phil. Scholar, Riphah International University, Faisalabad Campus, Pakistan
	Farwa Akbar	Department of Applied Linguistics, Government College University, Faisalabad, Pakistan
	Samyya Masood	Department of Applied Linguistics, Government College University, Faisalabad, Pakistan

Abstract

The aim of this study was to highlight impression markers, identify key concerns, and describe cultural as well as social implications of a speech delivered by William Fraser Anning (an Australian Senator) in the Australian Senate on August 14, 2018. In this regard, Fairclough's three-dimensional model was employed to interpret the data. The speaker was observed employing different impression markers (e.g., discourse and punctuation markers, cultural and historical references, personal pronouns, self and other markers, and expressive and rational values) to create coherence in the speech, emphasize the stance, and thereby grab the attention of the audience. Social problems, common man's worries like joblessness, poor living standard, race, ethnicity and immigration were the concerns of the speech. Muslim immigrants were not treated as humans equal to Australians or other Europeans. They were labeled as 'welfare-blunders', 'terrorists', 'gang-terrorists', 'criminals', and 'illegal occupants'. The speech was followed by an extremist attack on a Mosque in New Zealand. It might cause serious threat to peaceful co-existence, immigration process, and basic human rights.

Keywords: critical discourse analysis; ethnicity; William Fraser Anning; immigration; race; three-dimensional approach

1. Introduction

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) studies the exertion of political, social and economic power relations through text or speech. CDA analysts take an outside position with their research and their aim is to expose the social and political inequality in order to change it with social justice and equality in economics as well as politics for different sections of the society (Van Dijk, 1989). CDA is an inspired and restricted attempt to analyse how language is used not only to describe the things but also to do the things (Brown & Yule, 1983). It studies the language in relation to supremacy, ideas, civilization and favoritism etc. or in other words the main focus of discourse analysis is the social use of language. But the purpose of this study is to analyse William Fraser Anning's maiden speech. According to Fairclough's (1992, 2001) three phrase models each phase is linked to the other in discourse analysis i.e., textual, interpretational and social levels that need an entirely different way of analysis but they are interrelated to one another. Embarking on the said framework, this research aims to:

1. Highlight impression markers in William Fraser Anning's speech in the Australian Senate on August 14, 2018;
2. Identify main concerns of the speech; and
3. Relate possible social and cultural impacts implied in the speech.

William Fraser Anning was born on October 14, 1949 in Australia. He grew up in Queensland where his forefathers left a large estate for him. His grandfather was a British national and came to Australia in 19th century. Anning was elected as a senator in the Australian Upper House in 2016. In June 2018, he joined Katter's Australian Party (KAP) but was expelled from this political party in October 2018 due to his maiden speech in upper house where he expressed his views on race, ethnicity and immigration. After that Anning founded his own political party 'Fraser Anning's Conservative National Party' in April 2019. Anning holds anti-Muslim and anti-immigrant anti-democratic views due to which he is severely criticized all over the world. According to Anning, Muslims should not be allowed to enter the Australian soils and environment. In his view, the Muslims are fanatics and extremists who create trouble for the people of Australia. Even after the shooting of the Muslims in Christchurch Mosque on 15th of March 2019, he again stood up with his anti-Islam and anti-Muslim views. According to some of the well-known international news channels like ABC News Anning has strong links with those who are a part of Christchurch Muslim shooting in 2019.

2. Literature Review

According to Fairclough (1993), who is of the view that CDA is a kind of discourse analysis that creates strange relationships between different social and cultural groups. According to him there are three stages of discourse analysis. The first stage is related with analysing the beliefs of the authors or speakers of the texts or talks. While, the second stage guides that how discourse has an influence on society whereas the third phase of CDA is about studying individuality and practicality. According to Fairclough (1993) linguistic selection has an impact on the society in the formation and application of a specific theory, ideology, belief and strategy which is ultimately used to gain power and supremacy in the politics, economics and society. According to Fairclough (1993), there are different sections and groups in a society having different belief systems that are expressed in the language. Thus, the purpose of conducting the discourse analysis is to highlight and understand the said belief systems and to know how they are expressed and communicated to the public in general. Fairclough (2001) says that the idea of common sense is developed and put into the minds of common people through the tactful use of language in such a brilliant way by the elite class that the common people find it difficult to resist to such beliefs and ideologies as are sent their way from the dominant class (also see Shah & Mubarak, 2018).

Brown and Yule (1983) maintain that the way, language is used, does not only provide the meanings of things rather it is well beyond this simple naming the things theory. The purpose of conducting critical discourse analysis is to understand how and in which context the language has been used and how it impacts on the society. According to Corson (1995), CDA uses certain linguistic techniques to search for the relationship of language and power, language and politics, language and society, and language and identity. According to Chilton (1996) there is a significant role of the metaphors in discourse analysis. For, in Chilton's view, an ideology is represented through metaphors. This type of ideology forms pragmatism.

According to Van Dijk (1991) there is a strong connection between a leader, politics and media because media plays an important role in spreading the political views and beliefs of a political person. He adds that media is the mouthpiece of the political elite in implementing their agenda in the society. According to Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl and Liebhart (2009) critical discourse analysis provides comprehension of the relationship between language society, politics and economics. It attempts to build up the links of language with power. Therefore, language is the focal point of CDA because it highlights the beliefs and identities. It not only tries to search the relationship between power and language but also gives a chance of criticism over the practices of power, and ethnic, economic and cultural dominance. In the view of Carroll (2004), CDA gives different perspectives of analysing a text because it provides a theory and its application of using the data for the analysis of postmodern and sociological analysis of a text.

Van Dijk (1997) conducted a research on the CDA of speeches and debates delivered in the British parliament. According to him the talks on racism and favourtism for the indigenous community spread anti-immigrant views which strengthen the concept of self and other. CDA, in Van Dijk's (1989) view, is such an interesting field of study that allows to expose the tactics of the ruling elite showing how they use their powers and offices to corrupt the social planning and how they use the language in the favour of their own class. According to Weiss and Wodak (2003), CDA shows the way to analyse the so-called neutral language in the newspapers, parliaments, manuscripts and reports distorting the reality in favour of the dominant class. Similarly, according to Van Dijk (1993), there are many social classes that exist in a community or society and they all tend to engage in a struggle or conflict with one another to get dominance and resist against the dominant group. Wodak (2001) adds that CDA is an interdisciplinary branch of knowledge that studies language in connection with history and society. According to her text is produced in connection with the social and psychological factors too. She states that there is strong bonding between text and practices done in a society. She implemented her framework on the speeches and debates of Kurt Waldheim for presidential elections. The findings of her research include that the prominent figures have a strong impact on the discussions and talk of the common people. Moreover, prejudice and hatred are formed by these political people amongst different races and sections of the society. She also conducted a research on prejudice and hatred in Austria. She observed that the hatred and prejudice could occur anywhere including public discourse, discourse of the media and religion, politics and economics.

It is clear from the above review of literature that the all-key figures in critical discourse analysis (i.e., Brown & Yule, 1983; Chilton, 1996; Corson, 1995; Fairclough, 1992, 1993, 2001; Van Dijk, 1989, 1995, 1997; Weiss & Wodak, 2003; Wodak, 2001) have supported for such a method and approach of studying language as can bring out the real truth and purpose of the language users. For, the main aim of CDA, according to the mentioned experts, is to expose the manipulators of language and communities for their own benefit. It further supports those who are the victim of this power play and dominance game through language. Therefore, the purpose of CDA is quite positive and it aims to bring positive change in society and the world.

3. Methodology

Researchers either use qualitative techniques or quantitative methods to conduct the research. In qualitative research, the data is interpreted and discussions are made in the form of passages and paragraphs whereas in quantitative techniques data is elaborated with the help of quantities given in the form of tables, graphs and formulas of different kinds to calculate the ratio and means etc. used for the analysis and interpretation of the data. As this research is based on the analysis of Fraser Anning's speech, qualitative techniques have been adopted to interpret the data.

3.1 Data Collection and Analysis

The data for this study comprised of Anning's first speech that was retrieved from the internet source i.e., Google and was analysed and interpreted employing three-dimensional framework by Fairclough (1992, 2001). This framework stresses that every communicative event has three dimensions i.e. (1) it is a text (image, speech, writing or combination of these), (2) it can be a discursive practice involving the consumption and production of the texts, and (3) it can be the social practice. Fairclough (1992) also introduced three stages of CDA (i.e., description, interpretation and explanation) which corresponded to the three levels of the discourse. According to Fairclough's each stage is linked to the other in discourse analysis i.e., textual, interpretational and social levels that need an entirely different way of analysis but they are interrelated to one another.

4. Analysis, Observations and Discussion

4.1 Textual Analysis

Textual analysis is the analysis of the language used in a particular text or discourse. It aims to find out the elements of cohesion, semantics and morphology within a given text. Fraser Anning's speech comprises of approximately 4000 words. The long text can contextually include many parts like 'Hate speech, Anti-immigration, Anti- Muslim, anti-democratic, Christchurch attack', because after this speech Muslim community has to face many terrorist attacks.

The lexical choice used in his speech is very simple. The sentence structure is declarative and (i.e., SOV) is very complex. The information has been given by him with complete details in order to make his speech more than worse for the Muslims community. He uses first person narrative like 'I' 50 times and 'we' more than 40 times which show his collective approach. It is his art of speech that he has quoted the events of the past to relate them with the present so that the Australians may be taught to stay away from the Muslims. The example of the incident of train fire, by a Muslim a century ago, has been quoted by him to strengthen his stance.

He has widely used discourse markers i.e., 'however, of course, thus, so that, first and foremost, firstly, finally, I think so, more broadly, in this way, etc.' to create coherence in his speech and grab the attention of the listeners. He has also used punctuation like dashes, Whitlam—and, fathers—them, property—either, concubine—must, Hill—and, farms—owned, generations—and numeral numbers (50, 25 ,457) compound words like (pre-Whitlam, non-European, re-industrialization, cattle-grazing, acronyms like QIDC, APRA, and PDRSB.

4.2 Process Analysis

Process analysis is the second level of Fairclough's model. At this level, the researchers need to find out how a text is generated, circulated and used in a social set up. The words (i.e., deplorable, racist, white supremacist and rubbish), spoken by Anning against the Muslims, reflect his hatred against the Muslims in particular and immigrants in general. Anning has a platform of hatred dressed up as a support for the 'Aussie battler' i.e., a person who is white, middle-class and ignorant, who buys into white hegemony.

Anning uses expressive and rational values in his speech. By expressive value we mean that how a speaker expresses his or personal experience in the discourse. Anning quoted the white men, (who suppressed others for the sake of success of their own race), as politicians,

army men or civilians. According to him it is a noble deed to oppress and suppress others because this land belongs to the Australians and not the immigrants.

He uses pronouns (We & Our) many times in the speech. The purpose of using these pronouns is to show that he himself is the member of a society which should provide him moral and legal support in achieving his goals. 'I' and 'We' is also used to show power to the others as a group. In fact, Anning wants Muslims to be excluded from Australia's migrant intake, and welfare payments be banned for all migrants within the first five years of their living there. In this regard, he uses the word 'final solution'. The use of hate words shows that Muslims are the butt of his hatred and he is anti-Muslim; According to him Muslims are higher in crime and terrorism but he has hardly produced any evidence for this to support his argument.

4.3 Social Analysis

Anning says that recently, he has entered the senate. He and his family ran goldstone hotel. He was the supporter of the national party which strongly reflected his beliefs. It was his first and foremost duty to raise the voice about social value, personal responsibility, low taxes, and freedom. For, this is the key role of the government to provide law, physical security, and other basic facilities. Therefore, the government should provide well paid jobs to the people. Because every common person has the right to keep in fair days, earn fair money, and get a decent life. He has right to provide his kids a better life. Because Good gives equal rights to the people to live free anywhere.

Queensland praised the White Australia Policy of the Senator Fraser Anning and decided that there should be a general consensus about the stoppage of immigrants to Australia which was the last solution to the acts of terrorism in country. According to him, the Australians have the right to stop the flow of immigrants in the country and for this he proposes that there should be a ban on the immigration from the non-Christian countries and communities. Instead, the people from Europe may be invited and encouraged for immigration so that a ratio between immigrants and the locals may be maintained. He also objected the Australian support for those oppressed in Palestine by the people, army and government of Israel. According to him, those, who are oppressed in Palestine, are outsiders and there is no need for Australia to be a part of any funding or support for the outsiders. According to him, Muslim immigrants did not have the capability of adapting to their newly found land of Australia after their immigration because of their culture and religion which strictly prohibits them from being a part of an alien and Christian community. In Anning's view, Muslims were present in Australia for their own good instead of adding any positive element to the Australian nation. He also quotes the incident of gun fire in a train which took place in 1915. According to him, such attacks were started by the Muslims on Australian soil. He further labels the Muslims as 'welfare-blunders', 'terrorists', 'gang-terrorists' and 'criminals'. Moreover, he shows ethnic bias towards the black Muslims by calling them illegal occupants of Australia.

It clearly shows that his speech is mainly targeting the Muslims. It is out of his sheer hatred for Islam and love for Christianity instead of his love for Australia that he insists to ban the Muslims for entering Australia. He suggests that there should be a voting in the upper house to stop the flow of Muslim immigrants into the country. The language used by him, where he quoted the words like 'Nazi and holocaust', shows his aggression and revengefulness against the Muslims and Islam. He also made the Muslims a butt of severe revenge by quoting a reference to the killings and murders of the Christians in Ottoman Empire. His speech proved dangerous for a peaceful social existence. The agenda, presented by him, was followed by some of the Christians. As a result, there was an extremist attack on the Mosques in New Zealand. Even after the attack on the Mosques in Christchurch, he did not shun expressing his anti-Muslim and anti-immigrant views because he said that the laws that allowed Muslims to enter their territory were the reason for this killing. Instead of blaming the white supremacists for the attack, he called the Muslims as fanatics and extremists.

5. Conclusion

Embarking on above results and discussions, this study concludes that William Fraser Anning employs different impression markers to present his stance emphatically. He uses discourse and punctuation markers, cultural historical references, and expressive and rational values to create coherence in his speech, emphasize his stance, and thereby grab the attention of the audience. He also uses positive-self and negative-other markers to present himself and Australians as well as Europeans being good and civilized and the Muslims as well as immigrants with negative labels. In addition to these, he uses personal pronouns to show himself as a moral as well as responsible man (using 'I') and as the member of a powerful group (using 'we'). To win the applause of the common man in Australia, he talks about common problems like joblessness, poverty, freedom, low standard of living etc. Social problems, common man's worries like joblessness, poor living standard have been some of the concerns of the speech. However, hatred against the Islam, Muslims, and immigrants emerged as the central point of the speech. The speech particularly stressed the need of ban on Muslims' entry in Australia. Instead, it suggested getting immigrants from Christen countries. In this way, it showed love for Christianity and hatred for Islam. It treated the Muslims with discrimination, (by labeling them negatively e.g., 'welfare-blunders', 'terrorists', 'gang-terrorists' and 'criminals') as compared to the Whites who were treated as the supreme being. In addition, the speech showed ethnic bias towards the black Muslims by calling them illegal occupants of Australia. Different social and cultural and social implications can be related with this discourse. On one hand, it can be very useful for the common man in Australia because it has highlighted different social problems faced by the people in Australia. Plus, it can be proven helpful for the unification of the Australians and Europeans. On the other hand, it can be dangerous to the peaceful co-existence of the people in the world, particularly the Muslims as it labels the Muslims and Muslim culture negatively.

References

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carroll, W. K. (2004). *Critical strategies for social research*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Chilton, P. A. (1996). *Security metaphors: Cold War Discourse from Containment to Common House*. New York: Peter Lang.

Corson, D. (1995). *Discourse and Power in Educational Organizations*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical Discourse Analysis and the Marketization of Public Discourse. *Discourse and Society, 4*(2), 133–168. doi: 10.1177/0957926593004002002.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power.* London: Longman.

Shah, S. K., & Mubarak, A. (2018). Media discourse as Representative of Sociocultural Milieu of Law and Order in Pakistan: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Newspapers' Headlines about Model Town Tragedy, Lahore. *Pakistan Journal of Language Studies, 2*(2), 1-13.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1989). *A handbook of discourse analysis.* London: Academic Press Limited.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism.* London: Sage Publications.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is political discourse analysis? *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, *11*(1), 11-52.

Weiss, G., & Wodak, R. (2003) Introduction: Theory, Interdisciplinarity and Critical Discourse Analysis. In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (eds.), *Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about–A Summary of its History, Important Concepts and its Developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 1-13). London: Sage.

Wodak, R., de Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., & Liebhart, K. (2009). *The Discursive Construction of National Identity.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.