

Political Discourse Analysis of Aliyev's Address to the Nation Regarding the Second Karabakh War

Elif ŐEŐEN¹, Duygu ÜNALAN² & Őeyhmus DOĐAN³

Abstract

In war and conflict situations, both on the front and on the political plane, the parties resort to political discourses for persuasion and propaganda in order to justify and legitimize their actions, to manage the flow of information by spreading their point of view. In this context, the study aims to reveal how the persuasive rhetorical tools in political discourse are used in relation to an important issue such as war, in the example of the President of Azerbaijan İlham Aliyev's address to the nation during the Second Karabakh War. In this direction, 6 speeches of Aliyev between October 4, 2020 and November 10, 2020 were analyzed within the framework of Ponton's political discourse analysis method. It was seen that Aliyev effectively used ethos to renew the self-confidence of the Azerbaijani people, and pathos effectively to reveal her emotional state, especially in his speeches to the nation. Aliyev supports the justification of Azerbaijan by using logical arguments and historical evidence in all his speeches. In this context, it was concluded that Aliyev supported his discourses with body language by using persuasion and rhetorical tools effectively and appropriately, thus reinforcing the effect of his speeches.

Key Words: Political Discourse, Nagorno Karabakh, Persuasion, Propaganda, Rhetorical Tools

Aliyev'in İkinci KarabaĐ SavaŐı ile İlgili Ulusa SesleniŐ KonuŐmalarının Politik Söylem Analizi

Öz

Azerbaycan ile Ermenistan arasında tarihsel ve toplumsal arka planı 1980'li yıllara dayanan DaĐlık KarabaĐ sorunu yıllarca çözümsüz kalmıŐ, birincisi 1990'lı yılların, ikincisi ise 2020'li yılların baŐında iki savaŐ yaŐanmıŐtır. Hem cephede hem de politik düzlemde sürdürölen savaŐ ve çatıŐma durumlarında, taraflar eylemlerini haklı çıkarmak ve meŐrulaŐtırmak, kendi bakıŐ açılarını yayarak bilgi akıŐını yönetmek ve ayrıca kamuoyunun desteĐini kazanmak için ikna ve propaganda amaçlı politik söylemlere baŐvurmaktadırlar. Bu bağlamda çalıŐma, politik söylemdeki ikna maksatlı retoriksel araçların savaŐ gibi önemli bir konu ile ilgili olarak nasıl kullanıldıĐını Azerbaycan Cumhurbaşkanı İlham Aliyev'in İkinci KarabaĐ SavaŐı süresince gerçekteŐirdiĐi ulusa sesleniŐ konuŐmaları örneĐinde ortaya koymayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu doĐrultuda, Ponton'un politik söylem analizi yöntemi çerçevesinde Aliyev'in 4 Ekim 2020-10 Kasım 2020 tarihleri arasındaki 6 konuŐması çözümlenmiŐtir. Aliyev'in özellikle ulusa sesleniŐ konuŐmalarında Azerbaycan halkının kendine olan güvenini tazelemekte ethosu, duygu durumunu ortaya koymakta ise pathosu etkili bir biçimde kullandıĐı görölmüŐtür. Aliyev tüm konuŐmalarında mantıksal argümanları ve tarihsel kanıtları kullanarak Azerbaycan'ın haklılıĐını desteklemektedir. Bu bağlamda Aliyev'in konuŐmalarında ikna araçlarını ve retoriksel araçları etkili ve yerinde kullanarak beden dili ile de söylemlerini desteklediĐi, böylece konuŐmalarının etkisini pekiŐtirdiĐi sonucuna varılmıŐtır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Politik Söylem, DaĐlık KarabaĐ, İkona, Propaganda, Retorik Araçlar


Atf İçin / Please Cite As:

ŐeŐen, E., Ünalán, D., & DoĐan, Ő. (2022). Political discourse analysis of Aliyev's address to the nation regarding the second Karabakh War. *Manas Sosyal Arařtırmalar Dergisi*, 11(4), 1739-1751.


GeliŐ Tarihi / Received Date: 13.01.2022

Kabul Tarihi / Accepted Date: 28.04.2022


¹ Doç. Dr. – NiĐde Ömer Halisdemir Üniversitesi, İletifim Faköltesi, elifsesen@gmail.com

 ORCID: 0000-0002-8513-9647

² Doç. Dr. – NiĐde Ömer Halisdemir Üniversitesi, İletifim Faköltesi, duyguunalan85@gmail.com

 ORCID: 0000-0002-7420-2006

³ Doç. Dr. – NiĐde Ömer Halisdemir Üniversitesi, İletifim Faköltesi, seyhmusdogan@hotmail.com

 ORCID: 0000-0002-5993-0363

Introduction

The Caucasus, which is the scene of serious competition between many countries in the field of energy, especially between the USA and Russia, is of crucial importance due to its geopolitical, geostrategic, and geo-economic characteristics (Bozkuş Deveci, 2016, p. 139). One of the most important issues affecting the stability in the region is the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. Nagorno-Karabakh, a part of the South Caucasus, is a conflict between Azerbaijan and Armenia that has a long historical background, has been unresolved for a long time, and is on the international agenda although it is regional (Zor, 2018, p. 57). The Nagorno-Karabakh conflict remained serious for more than 25 years without any significant changes after the ceasefire agreement signed after the First Karabakh War in May 1994. The approaches of the countries in the region and the Western powers played an important role in the emergence of the conflict which remained unresolved for a long time and most strongly determines the social, political, economic, military, and diplomatic relations between Azerbaijan and Armenia, which gained its independence after the collapse of the USSR (Gürbüz, 2008, p. 117). Today, after two wars, the first in the 1990s and the second in 2020, a picture has emerged in which the persuasiveness of political discourse behind the front is as important as military success on the front.

In situations of war and conflict, parties use political discourse for persuasion and propaganda to justify and legitimize their actions, control the flow of information by disseminating their point of view, and win public support. Indeed, the use of propaganda in war is an integral part of human history (Jowett & O'Donnell, 2017, p. 265). Psychological warfare involves propaganda as planned and designed persuasive communication against the enemy, along with military, economic or political measures to gain support at home and abroad. Persuasion, which expresses the listener's intention and action to change his or her mind, is a complex and interactive process in which the sender and receiver interact with verbal and non-verbal symbols. In persuasive communication, the identification is important. A discourse that conveys shared feelings, images, and ideas that make the audience feel like one heart strengthens persuasion. In building such discourse, the role and importance of mass media in enabling political actors to communicate their thoughts to a wider mass seems to have increased from the past to the present. The mass media, which are constantly diversifying and expanding their sphere of influence, offer political actors new opportunities to reach larger masses. The new communication technologies now also enable individuals, groups, organizations, institutions or states to carry their messages into international politics. For example, political actors' posts on social media platforms can be seen by large numbers of people inside or outside the country, and their posts on video-sharing sites can be seen by thousands of people. In this respect, internet-based new communication technologies are a powerful tool to support, set the agenda, and guide political discourse in both domestic and foreign policy. Especially in situations of war and conflict, where controlling the flow of information is a priority, it is important for parties to use the power of these tools to strengthen their positions and discourses.

This study aims to use the example of the President of Azerbaijan Ilham Aliyev's address to the nation during the Second Karabakh War to show how persuasive rhetorical devices are used in political discourse concerning an important issue such as the war. In the following sections of the study, the historical development of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict and the Second Karabakh War is first briefly discussed, and then the concepts of propaganda and political discourse are highlighted.

The Background of Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict and Second Karabakh War

Geographically, the name of Karabakh was given to the lands consisting of mountainous regions and plains between the Kür and Aras rivers and Göyçe Lake by the nomads who came here from Central Asia in the 11th century (Rasizade, 2011, p. 217). Nagorno-Karabakh, a region rich in mineral resources, has been ruled by many states throughout history, from the Hurrians to the Urartians, from the Sassanids to the Huns, from the Abbasids to the Seljuks (Khalilov, 2008). The Karabakh Khanate remained a part of Azerbaijan Tsarist Russia until the end of the First World War (Aslanlı, 2013, p. 11). Russia's policy in the region, not wanting to lose its dominance in the Karabakh region, which had declared autonomy in 1918, is one of the main reasons both for the emergence of the conflict and for its long persistence (Yiğit & Gülbiten, 2017, p. 6). The Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, which can be described as the most important issue between Azerbaijan and Armenia, began in the region where no independent Armenian state could be established from the 11th to the end of the 19th century when Russia promised Armenians to establish a state in this region to implement its policy of descent to the warm seas (Yılmaz, 2013, p. 72). The population change, which was due to a long-term and deliberate resettlement policy, led to conflicts between Azerbaijani Turks and Armenians. For Azerbaijan, which has been economically and socially

damaged by the activities of Armenians trying to settle in the region and increase their population, the issue is of great importance and priority both in domestic and foreign policy.

The Nagorno-Karabakh conflict has grown exponentially since the 1980s, although it has a long history (Aslanlı, 2013, p. 13). The event that ignited the conflict was the approval by Nagorno-Karabakh Local Council on 20 February 1988 that the region would join Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR rejected Karabakh's decision to separate from the USSR of Azerbaijan and join the USSR of Armenia. On 12 January 1989, citing the increasing conflicts, annexed the region directly to the Moscow administration (Vaserman & Ginat, 1994, p. 351). With the collapse of Soviet Russia, the search for the rights of Armenians in the Karabakh region accelerated, and on 1 December 1989, Armenians in Karabakh declared that they had joined Armenia (Gökçe, 2014, p. 2691), but this decision was not accepted by the Soviet Union administration. The conflicts in Karabakh also spread to Azerbaijan and since January 1990, the conflicts have intensified. The Nagorno-Karabakh War is a long and full-scale war. The conflicts, most of which took place between 1990 and 1994, claimed more than 25,000 lives (Tokluođlu, 2013, p. 320).

With the disintegration of Soviet Union and the independence of Azerbaijan and Armenia, which became members of international organisations, Karabakh has become an international problem. In the Council of Foreign Ministers the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), which met in Helsinki on 24 March 1992, it was decided to organize a conference in Minsk to resolve the Karabakh conflict. However, when the Armenians occupied Shusha, a town with a predominantly Azerbaijani population, and then Lachin, which connects Karabakh with Armenia, the conference was canceled and was decided to hold 'pre-conference talks' in Rome. Thus, the 'Minsk Group', which includes 12 countries, was actually born in Rome (Pashayeva & Göksel, 2011). In the meantime, Azerbaijan, which launched a counter-attack, recaptured some occupied settlements from the Armenian forces. Mediated by Kazakhstan, a ceasefire was declared on 27 August 1992 with the signing of the Almaty Declaration, but shortly afterward Armenia unilaterally declared that it did not recognize Almaty Declaration (Aslanlı, 2001, p. 404). 1993 was a year in which the conflicts continued as intensely as the ceasefire attempts. On 20 February 1993, the Rome Talks took place, attended by Azerbaijan and Armenia and the USA, Russia, and Minsk Group President Mario Raffaelli. However, during the negotiations, the process was interrupted by the Armenian attack on Kelbajar, located at an important connexion point between Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh, and with the occupation of Kelbacer, the United Nations Security Council also became involved in the process. In May 1993, a new peace initiative was launched by Russian President Boris Yeltsin, but this attempt, hoped for by Ebulfez Elchibey, who was in power in Azerbaijan at the time, did not produce any results. The coming to power of Heydar Aliyev in the same year brought a change of strategy in Azerbaijan's foreign policy. First, Aliyev acted with the idea that ensuring internal security and stability was necessary to solve the problem and immediately went about ending the war. Heydar Aliyev turned to a more realistic foreign policy that considered Azerbaijan's needs and the world order (Mammadyarov, 2009, p. 17). The Treaty of the Century, signed on 24 September 1994, plays an important role in this context. Due to this agreement, the leading countries of the world energy sector are directly connected with the Karabakh problem. It is increasingly expressed that the region must be stable to protect the interests of multinational companies investing in the region. For this to happen, the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict must be solved (Adams, 2009, p. 229).

The First Karabakh War ended with the ceasefire agreement signed on 9 May 1994 between Defence Ministers Azerbaijan and Armenia and the representatives of Karabakh Armenians (Eyvazlı, 2017, p. 61), but it was not possible to achieve a lasting peace between the parties. To resolve the problem, 23 meetings between the presidents of Azerbaijan and Armenia and 60 meetings between the foreign ministers and the co-chairs took place in the 10 years in the early 2000s alone (Aslanlı, 2013, p. 11). In 2007, a peace plan was presented by the Minsk Group in Madrid. The plan contains some principles such as protecting Azerbaijan's territorial integrity, disarmament in the region and equal rights for the people living in the region Nagorno-Karabakh (Diyarbakırlıođlu, 2020, p. 431). An updated version of the Madrid Principles was announced in Italy in July 2009. Thus, the OSCE Minsk Group Co-Chairs presented the basic principles of the proposal, which provides for the return of the regions around Nagorno-Karabakh to Azerbaijan with temporary status. These principles represent a compromise between the right to self-determination and the right to territorial integrity. However, the meetings, which took place within the framework of Madrid Principles in different places and at different times, did not produce any results. The greatest tensions and conflicts occurred in April 2016 after the ceasefire, and both sides suffered heavy

losses in the conflicts known as the '4 Day War' as they lasted between 2 and 5 April. With Russia's mediation, a ceasefire was declared again with the agreement signed in Moscow between the Chiefs of Staff of Armenia and Azerbaijan.

Ilham Aliyev, who was elected President of Azerbaijan in 2003, made a significant change in the country's policy regarding Karabakh, as the issue had remained unresolved for many years, and the stalemate was gradually turning into a solution. He pointed out the negative impact of the war on the region argued that if the problem could not be solved by peaceful means; war was inevitable (Yilmaz, 2010, p. 77). The election of Nikol Pashinyan as the Prime Minister of Armenia, who made statements in April 2018 that land restitution would not be considered on Nagorno-Karabakh, led to another change in the Armenia-Azerbaijan conflict (de Waal, 2018).

Armenia opening fire on Tovuz on the route of the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan oil and Baku-Tbilisi-Erzurum natural gas pipelines on 12 July 2020 (Ergun & Valiyev, 2020, p. 61). Although the tensions and conflicts in the region have been going on for a very long time, it can be said that the Second Karabakh War, also called the '44 Day War', started on 27 September 2020 and actually ended on 8 November 2020 with the capture of Shusha by Azerbaijan troops. Moscow Armistice Agreement (Triple Agreement) signed at the war's end.

Political Discourse, Persuasion, and Propaganda

Since politics also involves reconciling differences through discussion and persuasion, it is often argued that the central process to be considered in defining political action is communication. In this respect, politics and communication are two closely related fields, and political communication at its intersection is at the heart of almost all political activities and processes. Political processes take place at the micro and macro levels. At the micro-level, politics is understood as a struggle for supremacy with conflicts of interest between individuals, genders or social groups. At the macro level, it encompasses the actions of various political actors such as states, political parties, politicians, and interest groups. Political behaviours at these two levels, such as ideological, social or political debates, rallies or parliamentary speeches, interviews, statements, and even the legislation process, are actually linguistic actions, i.e., discourses (Chilton, 2004, p. 3).

Language plays a very important role in politics, which can be defined as a struggle for power to implement political ideas and ideologies since political actions are largely prepared and carried out with the help of language (Boric, Kanizaj & Krsul, 2016, p. 75). Whenever politicians speak in public, they plan their rhetoric carefully and choose their words wisely. One of the most important means by which politicians express their power and opinions is the way they linguistically underpin their ideas, namely their discourse. The political struggle occurs in language, and this respect can be understood as a 'war of discourses.' The political discourse can be verbal or non-verbal, formal or informal, but it always aims to persuade and act (Perloff, 2003, p. 78). Leaders speak with the power they derive from their position, and for political actors, language is not just a means to express their ideas (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 1). Political discourse, a particular example of political action and interaction, is the most important way of 'doing politics.' Political discourse, such as party manifestos or speeches at rallies, expresses the ideologies of different belief systems and functions largely through language (van Dijk, 2002, p. 17). Most political discourse involves speeches or statements by political actors, such as government leaders, ministers, and party leaders. Waver (2002, p. 27) says that politics has a close relationship with discursive structures, as it defines what is considered to be said or done.

Wilson (2015, p. 776) states that political discourse can be used in two senses. While the first describes a discourse that does not refer to an explicitly political content but is characterized as political depending on the context, the second refers to a discourse that is intrinsically ideological and directive. The main characteristic of political discourse is that it is more persuasive. Persuasion as a deliberate attempt to change the thoughts or behavior of individuals or groups can be defined as 'conveying a message with the aim of activating or motivating the individual to change or influence his or her behavior.' (Miller & Burgoon, 1973, p. 2). According to Özkan (2004, p. 156), persuasion encompasses three basic dimensions: conscious intention, influencing behavior, and conveying a message. Politicians have always used a variety of strategies and tactics to persuade. Politicians must not only understand complex social problems but also show that they can solve them. At this point, political discourse encompasses the framework that political actors construct to understand the problems and persuade the audience, the

rhetorical devices they use to present their proposed solutions, and the guidance they give to the audience on understanding certain concepts.

Lilleker (2013, p. 250) notes that defining problems and common goals helps lead people to those goals and end conflict and that this is closely linked to rhetoric, persuasion, and discourse. Aristotle's understanding of rhetoric is the first name that comes to mind when talking about rhetoric, which has been accepted as the art of activating people for a specific goal in Ancient Greece and aims to create an effect to achieve a specific purpose. Aristotle (2008, p. 44) defines political rhetoric as 'a kind of speech in which the speaker seeks to show that an action is appropriate or harmful' and points out that its main purpose is to encourage or discourage. According to him, persuasion in political rhetoric is based on three basic elements: Ethos, which expresses the personal character of the speaker; Pathos, which refers to appealing to the emotions of the audience; and Logos, which refers to presenting logical evidence to persuade the audience. The tradition of rhetoric that continued in the forums of the Roman Empire transformed with the collapse of Rome into religious preaching in the hands of the Catholic Church. In the 17th century, the Church created the first institution (Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide) with propaganda in its name to save its power, which had been shaken and weakened by the reform movements, and to restore its ideological control, thus laying the institutional foundation of propaganda, also defined as 'covert persuasion' (DeVito, 1986, p. 239).

The term propaganda was first used by Pope Gregory XV in 1622 with a positive connotation to describe the work of the Catholic Church (Ross, 2002, p. 19), but actually, propaganda is a phenomenon almost as old as human history. According to Pratkanis and Aronson (2008, p. 12), propaganda is 'the transmission of an idea through the skilful use of images, slogans and symbols that influence our prejudices and emotions' and includes efforts to 'construct the minds of individuals or groups through symbolic means' (Anık, 2016, p. 15). The functions of propaganda are to direct, motivate, guide, and persuade the ideas, opinions, perceptions, and feelings of the people who follow the propagandist. In other words, propaganda is basically a process of persuasion. In terms of politics, propaganda is part of the political discourse (Stanley, 2018, p. 85). To identify and analyze political discourse, one must understand how the political subject relates to the world by examining its position within the structure of meaning created by that discourse. This relationship is established through language and discourse and reinforced through rhetorical devices.

According to Kecskemeti (1973), propaganda provides the audience with a comprehensive conceptual framework for dealing with social and political reality. Integrative propaganda aims to uphold the ideology and interests represented by those in power who convey the propaganda messages, while provocative propaganda aims to mobilize people to join or support a cause. Both types of propaganda are frequently used by political actors in their political discourse. Integrative propaganda, for example, explains the causes of war to people in conflict or war situations to unite and keep people together; provocative propaganda is also used to weaken the other side and ensure that people support and participate in the war.

Method

Political discourse analysis (PDA) is a critical approach that focuses on analyzing texts and speeches by politicians in political contexts. PDA is about understanding the nature and function of political discourse and critiquing the role that discourse plays in generating, sustaining, abusing and resisting power in contemporary society (van Dijk, 1997, p. 11-15). By assuming that there is a link between language, politics, culture, and cognition, Chilton (2004, p. x-xi) focuses on the question of what language used in political contexts communicates to people in general. According to him, a socially relevant linguistic framework is required to analyze these connections as well as the intricacies of political thought and behavior. Within this framework, PDA is about understanding linguistic practices in which political speakers fill their words with evidence, authority, and truth and thereby gain legitimacy in particular political contexts. Therefore, the context, which is determined by the speaker, the audience, the environment, and the circumstances, is crucial for the analysis of political discourses (Farrel & Young, 2009, p. 33). Charteris-Black (2011) focuses on metaphor as a means of persuasion in political discourse. By relating metaphor to traditional rhetoric, Charteris-Black focuses on how metaphor enhances the ethos and pathos of political speech.

PDA generally applies Critical Discourse Analysis approaches to uncover power, ideology and dominance in discourse, using social theories, cognitive approaches, metaphor analysis and cultural studies

for analysis. Objects of research include political speeches, parliamentary discourse, media discourse, etc. (Wang, 2016, p. 2768). Political discourse analysis has developed in many directions over the last three decades, so that today one can speak of a number of different approaches. They borrow certain methods or tools from each other from time to time, but there is no single methodological approach. In this context, Ponton (2016, p. 123-124) proposes an analytical model that brings together different factors in the analysis of a political discourse text. The model in question consists of context, environment, camera angle, voice and body language, persuasive tools, and rhetorical devices. In this context, the political discourse analysis of Ilham Aliyev's address to the nation during the Second Karabakh War was conducted in the study. Aliyev delivered six speeches between 4 October 2020 and 10 November 2020. After decoding the speeches, which lasted a total of 3 hours and 20 minutes, the model listed the context, setting, camera angles, tone, and body language elements in all speeches in a single table and listed separately the elements related to the tools of persuasion and the rhetorical tools.

Findings and Comments

This section first examined the context, setting, camera angles, and body language elements. Then the persuasive tools and the rhetorical tools were assessed under separate headings.

Aspects of context, environment, camera angles, tone, and body language

Table 1. *Elements of context, environment, camera angles, voice and body language in Ilham Aliyev's speeches*

Context	Ilham Aliyev's address to the nation
Environment	Presidential office, AZ TV Studio Azerbaijan flag on left back, Azerbaijan national emblem on right back Aliyev is dressed in a clean black suit, white shirt and black tie Dressed in military uniform in a speech Ambient light
Camera Angles	Chest single shot Above the waist, single shot in a speech
Sound	Tone of voice rises in sentence stresses He swallows and clears his throat
Body Language	He speaks looking directly at the camera, occasionally looking at his notes Has a serious facial expression No gestures and facial expressions No smile Supports speech with hand gestures, fist and head movements

As stated in the study's theoretical basis, Ilham Aliyev was elected president in 2003 and emphasized the inevitability of war if the Karabakh problem, which has been growing since the 1980s, cannot be solved by peaceful means. During the Second Karabakh War, which began on 27 September 2020, Aliyev addressed the nation to inform about the process and convey Azerbaijan's achievements. Most of these speeches took place in the president's office; only his speech on 8 November 2020 was held in a television studio. The speech he gave in the TV studio coincided with the day the war ended, and in the speech proclaiming victory to the Azerbaijani people, Aliyev wears a military uniform as commander-in-chief. In his other speeches, Aliyev addresses the nation in a suit with the title of an official statesman. Aliyev, standing in his speech on 8 November, sits in his other speeches. All speeches were recorded in perspective.

Aliyev, who has a serious facial expression and tone in all his speeches, thus reflects the seriousness of the event. Aliyev, whose tone of voice rises during sentence stresses, supports his speech with hand and head movements. Aliyev, who uses a serious and confident tone of voice to convey the message that Azerbaijan's struggle is right, raises his right hand in the air at certain points in his speech by making a fist, conveying a strong Azerbaijani message. Moreover, Aliyev's hands are seen in all his speeches, which gives confidence to the audience and aims at making them believe in the correctness and accuracy of what is being said.



Image 1. *Chest single shot*

Image 2. *Single shot above the waist*

Aliyev's serious facial expression and tone change only in his speech on 10 November 2020, after the victory. In his speech on that day, it can be seen that his facial expression softens. Therefore, it can be said that the tone of voice and body language in Aliyev's speeches reflect his emotional state.



Image 3. *Single Ilham Aliyev and his wife, after the speech on 08.11.2020*

One of the notable points regarding body language in Aliyev's speeches is that after his speech on 8 November 2020, in which he declared that the war was won, as seen in the picture above, he stepped in front of the cameras with his wife and made a victory sign. By stepping in front of the cameras with his wife, he underlines both his reliable personality and the victory he has expressed with his body language.

Tools of persuasion

Table 2. *Persuasion tools in Ilham Aliyev's speeches*

Persuasion Tools	Ethos	Confident, dignified stance
	Pathos	Expressions of sadness, happiness, pride; emphasis on innocent people
	Logos	Historical evidence that Karabakh belongs to Azerbaijan Emphasis on ceasefire agreements and illegal behavior

Ethos

As stated in the theoretical basis of the study, ethos is related to the speaker's character. It can be said that the persuasiveness of a speech is directly related to the fact that the speaker creates the impression of a reliable and morally good person in the audience. In this context, it is stated that Aliyev uses ethos as an element of persuasion in his speeches. In all his speeches he emphasizes his self-confident and determined attitude.

- 'I have only one condition, leave our country!' (04.10.2020)
- 'We fulfill our mission with honor.' (17.10.2020)
- 'We need our land, not bloodshed! We will take back our country, the way we want, no matter what! Let everyone understand that!' (17.10.2020)
- 'We have not entered into any agreement that does not satisfy the curiosity of the Azerbaijani people by showing security, courage, and political will.' (08.10.2020)

As can be seen in the above examples, Aliyev said that in all his speeches he always expressed Azerbaijan's right to the international organizations and stressed that Azerbaijan withstood all the difficulties it faced during the war and remained firm with all its interlocutors. Thus, he wants to renew the confidence of the Azerbaijani people in him.

Pathos

Pathos is a good or bad thing, a feeling, a passion, a situation, a state experienced by a person (Liddell, Scott & Jones, 1996, p. 1285), and denotes various emotional states, joy, love, pity, sorrow, suffering, experience, etc. (Çelgin, 2010, p. 485). Pathos appears in Aliyev's speeches with feelings such as sadness, hope, honour, happiness, sincerity, and compassion. Aliyev sometimes expresses the sadness he felt during the war and sometimes the joy of victory Aliyev expresses his hope by saying: 'For thirty years we have lived in hope that the international troops will settle this matter' (04.10.2020) and expresses his sadness by saying: 'Unfortunately, we have seen that they try to humiliate the Azerbaijani people.' (04.10.2020)

He expresses his pride in the achievements of the Azerbaijani army by saying: 'The glorious Azerbaijani army continues its mastery of weapons with good luck' and 'The Azerbaijani army is a country with great fighting power and technical guarantee' (17.10.2020)

- 'With great pride, I inform about the liberation of our habitats, which my beloved people are impatiently pursuing.' (17.10.2020)

- 'I have said in my heart that I am a happy man because I have fulfilled the testament of the ancestors.' (08.11.2020)

- 'This statement is our glorious victory. And I am glad that today I can give this good news to the people of Azerbaijan'. (10.11.2020)

As in the above examples, Aliyev shares information about the cities liberated from the Armenian occupation in almost all his speeches. Aliyev's joy and pride in communicating this information are reflected in his words, but the excited and haughty expression in his tone also shows his joy.

Another striking element in terms of pathos in Aliyev's speeches is the expressions of sincerity and compassion he showed towards the innocent Armenian people. 'The Armenians who migrated to our country 200 years ago are also our citizens. Their lives must also be saved from this junta. If their essence cannot save their lives, we will help them. The Armenians living in Nagorno-Karabakh were our citizens, and the Azerbaijanis were tolerant people. These people did not commit any sin.' (26.10.2020)

In his speech, Aliyev lowers and raises the tone of his voice depending on his emotional state and amplifies the emotion he is in with word and sentence accents. His speech shows integrity in terms of pathos with his tone of voice, body language, and words, which is one of the most important methods of persuasion.

Logos

Logos, which can be defined as logic, reasoning, rational argument, is the way of persuasion, which is the aim of rhetoric, through data and statistics (Rife, 2010, p. 261; Gallo, 2016, p. 57). If one evaluates Aliyev's speeches, one finds that logical arguments are frequently used.

- 'The occupied territories will be returned to Azerbaijan gradually, and we have agreed to it. Let us return it in stages, let us return it in peace. Let the Azerbaijani and Armenian people live together afterward, as we have lived together This is a fair solution, a solution that complies with all international legal norms.' (04.10.2020)

- 'I can say that we are restoring historical justice. I could prove that this is our historical country. I gave information about the Kurecay Peace Treaty. In the world there was no information about this treaty. Unfortunately, there was no comprehensive information about this agreement in Azerbaijan either. The agreement is on the Internet, everyone can read it. There is not a single word about the Armenian people in this treaty because the Armenian people were not there at that time.' (26.10.2020)

As seen in the examples, Aliyev underpins his speech with international legal norms and treaties, thus justifying and substantiating his credibility by presenting historical evidence. In this context, it can be said that the logos also contributes to the formation of ethos.

Another persuasive strategy for the logos is giving numerical data on the weapons and ammunition seized or destroyed of other side. Aliyev develops a discourse on Azerbaijan's justification by highlighting international agreements and Armenia's behavior in not abiding by them. In almost every speech, Aliyev refers to historical arguments and backs up his arguments with words like 'This battle is a battle for the

homeland of our people. We are liberating our homeland from the invaders. During this period, the glorious Azerbaijani army freed many places from the enemy. We provide historical justice on the battlefield. Because the history of Nagorno-Karabakh is the eternal land of Azerbaijan.’ (26.10.2020).

Rhetorical tools

Table 3. *Rhetorical tools in İlham Aliyev’s speeches*

Rhetorical Tools	Alliteration	Karabakh is ours, Karabakh is Azerbaijan
	Exaggeration	The more he got horny, the more aggressive his greed grew.
	Anaphora/Epiphora	It damaged there, we taught a lesson, there was no lesson; it destroyed here, we gave a lesson, there was no lesson
	Contrast	we, they
	Parallelism	He humbles himself, humbles his people

Rhetoric, which can be defined as the effective use of language to capture the listener’s perception and create a change in thoughts and emotions or their intensity, consists not only of tools of persuasion. The use of figures of speech such as alliteration, hyperbole, and repetition while speaking are tools that enhance the impact of ethos, pathos, and logos while making the speech more fluent. These elements, which make up the rhythm/harmony of an impressive speech, also appear in the speeches of İlham Aliyev.

It is noteworthy that Aliyev frequently uses anaphora, which can be defined as the repetition of the same sound in a sentence to enhance the effect of the word and verticality, i.e. the repetition of words at the beginning of sentences, which is another element in creating harmony in pronunciation as seen in the example of ‘The combat vehicles of the infantry, 50 of which were destroyed and 24 taken as trophies, are in our hands today. 17 of the drones destroyed, 198 balls destroyed, 53 tanks destroyed...’ (20.10.2020). Aliyev should be aware of the effect of alliteration on the utterance, that he ends all his speeches with ‘Karabakh belongs to us, Karabakh belongs to Azerbaijan.’

- ‘We saw that a new war was opened against us, we saw that our city of Tovuz and other living mentees were set on fire for no reason in July, our soldiers died, and local citizens were destroyed. We saw that in August, the intelligence group was sent...’ (04.10.2020)

- ‘Long live the Azerbaijani army, long live the people of Azerbaijan.’ (17.10.2020)

- ‘Congratulations Azerbaijan, Congratulations Azerbaijanis of the world’ (08.11.2020)

As can be seen from the above examples, the anaphora is one of the main rhetorical devices used by Aliyev in his speeches. Another rhetorical device that attracts attention in Aliyev’s speeches is epiphora, the opposite of anaphora, which is the repetition of words at the end of sentences. One can say that epiphora is more intense in Aliyev's speeches than anaphora.

- ‘What does it mean to move the parliament of the so-called Nagorno-Karabakh Republic to Shusha? What does it mean for Gabriel to take the new road from Armenia?’

- ‘This is murder! It is public murder.’ (26.10.2020)

- ‘Today, I can say with great pride that Fuzuli is ours, Gabriel is ours, Zangilan is ours, Gubadlı is ours, Aghdam is ours, Lachin is ours, Kelbecer is ours, Shusha is ours, Karabakh is ours, Karabakh is Azerbaijan.’ (10.11.2020)

In general, anaphora and epiphora, which can be defined as repeated words, are often used in Aliyev’s speeches to strengthen the expression, attract the listeners’ attention, and increase the effectiveness of the word to establish harmony in a sentence. In Aliyev’s speeches, contrasts are less frequent than alliterations, anaphora, and epiphora.

- ‘The Azerbaijani military has stood up to its fighters. We have their furs. We have driven their tanks. We have their other weapons. Their goods transport vehicles are in our hands.’ (04.10.2020)

- ‘People were killed by today’s fire. Still, let me say again that we will not claim our rights through innocent citizens but on the battlefield. The blood of our martyrs and those who perished will not remain on the ground.’ (17.10.2020)

- ‘This matter should be resolved, either by war or by peace.’ (26.10.2020)

The contrast is usually made in Aliyev's speeches by talking about us and them or us and the enemy. However, contrast is also created by the use of antonyms such as 'war and peace'.

Another point that can be considered a contradiction in Aliyev's speeches is that while he emphasized his personality and the struggle of the Azerbaijani people, he spoke negatively about Pashinyan and the Armenian state. Exaggeration and similarity in language are the least used rhetorical devices.

Although Ponton's method is not included as a unit of analysis in Aliyev's speeches, another rhetorical device he uses is a metaphor. In his speeches, he refers to the Azerbaijani people and the struggle of Azerbaijan with the metaphor of the 'iron fist', 'people with an iron will' and associates the Armenian state with the expressions 'predators' and 'coyotes'.

Conclusion

In this study, using political discourse analysis to examine the speeches of Azerbaijan's President Ilham Aliyev during the Second Karabakh War, it is clear how Aliyev used rhetorical devices to persuade. The war, which is a political process at the macro level, is not only a battle at the frontline but also at the political level. At the political level, leaders must both win the support of their people and defend the legitimacy of their country on the international stage by explaining their struggle. In this direction, the effective use of rhetorical means to persuade is very important.

Aliyev makes all his speeches at the Presidential Office, except for his speech dated 8 November 2020. Wearing a suit in his speeches, Aliyev addresses the nation with the title of official statesman. Aliyev, who wore a military uniform in his victory speech on November 8, 2020, thus conveying the message that he is always with his people as both the President and the Commander-in-Chief.

In his address to the nation, Aliyev emphasizes his self-confident, honorable, just and determined stance, and uses ethos to reassure the Azerbaijani people, and pathos to reveal their emotional state. It can be said that Aliyev used both words and body language as an important tool to enhance the effect of pathos. While Aliyev reveals pathos with feelings of sadness, hope, honor, happiness, sincerity, compassion; Sometimes he expresses his sadness about the experiences during the war and sometimes his happiness from the victory. Aliyev, who uses his tone of voice and facial expressions according to his emotional state, thus ensures unity between his body language and his discourse. By using logical arguments and historical evidence in all his speeches, he supports the rightness of Azerbaijan in the eyes of the Azerbaijani people and the international community. Thus, logos also contributes to the formation of ethos. In addition, Aliyev, who uses provable arguments in his speeches, thus allows the audience to make logical inferences.

Aliyev intensely uses alliteration by repeating the same sounds in the sentence in order to increase the effect of the word in his speech, and also uses Anaphora and Epiphora intensively by repeating the words to create harmony in utterance. In addition, Aliyev makes his speeches more effective with contrasts, similarities and metaphors. Aliyev, who also uses rhetorical devices to ensure the rhythm/harmony of his speech, supports his speeches with body language by using tools of persuasion and rhetorical devices effectively and appropriately, thus enhancing the impact of his speeches.

This study focuses on the speeches of the President of Azerbaijan Ilham Aliyev during the Second Karabakh War and is limited to 6 speeches delivered by Aliyev between 4 October 2020 and 10 November 2020. The comparative political discourse analysis of Aliyev's and Pashinyan's speeches during the war will also contribute to the literature by showing how heads of state use rhetorical devices to persuade on an important issue such as the war.

Ethical Declaration

In the writing process of the study titled "*Political Discourse Analysis of Aliyev's Address to the Nation Regarding the Second Karabakh War*", there were followed the scientific, ethical and the citation rules; was not made any falsification on the collected data and this study was not sent to any other academic media for evaluation. Since the document review was conducted in this study, there is no need for an ethics committee decision.

References

- Adams, T. D. (2009). Baku oil diplomacy and 'early oil' 1994-1998. *Azerbaijan in Global Politics: Crafting Foreign Policy, Baku, ADA*, 225-257.
- Address of the President of Azerbaijan İlham Aliyev to the Nation. (26.10.2020). Youtube. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2n3nLCVskDo>. Accessed on 12.01.2021.
- Address of the President of Azerbaijan İlham Aliyev to the Nation. (04.10.2020). Youtube. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dqoC1ZOyx1I&t=84s>. Accessed on 12.01.2021.
- Address of the President of Azerbaijan İlham Aliyev to the Nation. (08.11.2020). Youtube. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IPVGVHfeSLw>. Accessed on 12.01.2021.
- Address of the President of Azerbaijan İlham Aliyev to the Nation. (17.10.2020). Youtube. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mIKal1iSeMY>. Accessed on 12.01.2021.
- Address of the President of Azerbaijan İlham Aliyev to the Nation. (20.10.2020). Youtube. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R-R7WFvjtfU>. Accessed on 12.01.2021.
- Address of the President of Azerbaijan İlham Aliyev to the Nation. (10.11.2020). Youtube. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5uj9gQ1xKhw>. Accessed on 12.01.2021.
- Anık, C. (2016). *Siyasal ikna*. İstanbul: Derin Yayınları.
- Aristoteles (2008). *Retorik*. (Çev: M. H. Doğan). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Aslanlı, A. (2001). Tarihten günümüze Karabağ sorunu. *Avrasya Dosyası (Azerbaycan Özel)*, 7(1), 393-430.
- Aslanlı, A. (2013). *Yeni küresel mücadelede Kafkasya ve Karabağ sorunu*. Ekoavrasya Yayınları.
- Borčić, N., Kanizaj, I. & Krsul, S. (2016). Conceptual metaphor in political communication. *Proceedings of the University of Dubrovnik*, 3, 74-94.
- Bozkuş Deveci, Y. (2016). Küresel ve bölgesel gelişmeler ışığında Dağlık Karabağ sorunu. *TYB Akademi*, 6(7), 137-158.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: theory and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Çelgin, G. (2010). *Eski Yunanca-Türkçe sözlük*. İstanbul: Kabcacı Yayınevi.
- de Waal, T. (2018, May 22). Armenia's Revolution and the Karabakh Conflict. *Carnegie Europe*. Retrieved from <https://carnegieeurope.eu/strategieurope/76414>. Accessed on 08.11.2020.
- DeVito, J. A. (1986). *The communication handbook: A dictionary*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Diyarbakırlıoğlu, K. (2020). The Nagorno-Karabakh conflict between Azerbaijan and Armenia from the historical perspective. *International Journal of Social, Political and Economic Research*, 7(2), 415-439.
- Ergun, A. ve Valiyev, A. (2020, November 10). An Account on Karabakh War: Why Now and Then What? Panorama. Retrieved from <https://www.uikpanorama.com/blog/2020/11/09/an-account-on-karabakh-war-why-now-and-then-what>. Accessed on 21.12.2020.
- Eyvazlı, E. (2017). Türk basınında Dağlık Karabağ sorunu: Milliyet, Hürriyet, Sabah gazeteleri örneği. *MUTAD*, IV, 57-74.
- Farrell, K. & Young, M. (2009). The rhetorical situation. In J. Kuypers (Eds.). *Rhetorical criticism: Perspectives in action* (pp. 33-37). Lanham: Lexington Books.
- Gallo, C. (2016). *Ted gibi konuş*. İstanbul: Aganta Kitap.
- Gökçe, M. (2014). İki kardeş devletin ortak sorunu: Karabağ ve Ermeni meselesi. *Yeni Türkiye*, 63, 2687-2698.
- Gürbüz, V. (2008). Dağlık Karabağ sorunu karşısında taraf ülkeler, bölgesel ve küresel güçler. İçinde A. H. Aydın, S. Taş ve S. Adıgüzel (Edt.). *Bölgesel sorunlar ve Türkiye* (ss. 117-129). Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Jowett, G. ve O'Donnell, V. (2017). *Propaganda ve ikna*. (Çev: R. Kahraman, E. Akşar ve Levent Aladağ). İstanbul: Artes Yayınları.
- Kecskemeti, P. (1973). Propaganda. In I. S. Pool, F. W. Frey, W. Schramm & R. McNally (Eds.). *Handbook of communication* (pp. 844-870). Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.
- Khalilov, A. (2008). *Avrupa insan hakları sözleşmesi ışığında Karabağ sorunu* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- Liddell, H. G., Scott, R. ve Jones, H. S. (1996). *A Greek-English lexicon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lilleker, D. (2013). *Siyasal iletişim temel kavramlar*. (Çev: T. Sağlam). İstanbul: TİMAŞ Yayınları.
- Mammadyarov, E. (2009). The foreign policy of Azerbaijan: Affecting factors and strategic priorities. In A. Petersen & F. İsmailzad (Eds.). *Azerbaijan in global politics crafting foreign policy* (pp. 11-25). Baku: Azerbaijan Diplomatic Academy.
- Miller, G. and Burgoon, M. (1973). *New techniques of persuasion*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Özkan, A. (2004). *Siyasal iletişim*. İstanbul: Nesil Yayınları.
- Pashayeva, G. ve Göksel, N. (2011). *The Interplay of the Approaches of Turkey, Russia and the United States to the conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh*. SAM Center for Strategic Studies.
- Perloff, R. (2003). *The Dynamics of persuasion: Communication and attitudes in the 21st Century*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Ponton, D. M. (2016). Movements and meanings: Towards an integrated approach to political discourse analysis. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 20 (4), 122-139.

- Pratkanis, A. ve Aronson, E. (2008). *Propaganda çağrı iktidarın gündelik kullanımı ve suistimali*. (Çev: N. Haliloğlu). İstanbul: Paradigma Yayınları.
- Qualter, T. (1980). Propaganda teorisi ve propagandanın gelişimi (Çev: Ü. Oskay). *AÜSBF Dergisi*, XXXV(1), 255-301.
- Rasizade, A. (2011). Azerbaijan's prospects in Nagorno-Karabakh. *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, 13(2), 215-231.
- Rife, M. C. (2010). Ethos, pathos, logos, kairos: Using a rhetorical heuristic to mediate digital-survey recruitment strategies. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 53(3), 260-277.
- Ross, S. T. (2002). Understanding propaganda: The epistemic merit model and its application to art. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 36(1), 16-30.
- Stanley, J. (2018). *Demokrasilerde propaganda oyunu*. (Çev: B. Karal) İstanbul: The Kitap Yayınları.
- Tokluoğlu, C. (2013). Azerbaijani elite opinion on the resolution of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict (1991 and 2002). *Bilgi*, 64, 317-342.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is Political Discourse Analysis?. In J. Blommaert & C. Bulcean (Eds.). *Political linguistics* (pp. 11-25). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2002). Political Discourse and Ideology. In C. U. Lorda & M. Ribas (Eds). *Analisi Del Discurs Politic* (pp. 15-34). Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra.
- Vaserman, A. ve Ginat, R. (1994). National, territorial or religious conflict? The case of Nagorno-Karabakh. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, 17(4), 345-362.
- Wang, J. (2016). A new political and communication agenda for political discourse analysis: Critical reflections on critical discourse analysis and political discourse analysis. *International Journal of Communication*, 10, 2766-2784.
- Waver, O. (2002). Identity, communities and foreign policy: Discourse analysis as foreign policy theory. In L. Hansen & O. Waver (Eds.). *European integration and national identity: The challenge of the nordic states* (pp. 20-49). London: Routledge.
- Wilson, J. (2015). Political Discourse. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton & D. Schiffrin (Eds). *The Handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 775-794). John Wiley & Sons.
- Yılmaz, R. (2010). Azerbaycan dış siyasetinde bağımsızlık sonrası yıllar ve Karabağ problemi. *Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(1), 69-93.
- Yılmaz, R. (2013). Kafkasya'da çözülemeyen kördüğüm: Dağlık Karabağ sorunu. *Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi Uluslararası Avrasya Strateji Dergisi*, 2(1), 71-90.
- Yiğit, S. ve Gülbiten, G. (2017). Rusya'nın Güney Kafkas dış politikası: Dağlık Karabağ ve Hazar Denizi. *Barış Araştırmaları ve Çatışma Çözümleri Dergisi*, 5(2), 1-30.
- Zor, L. (2018). Karabağ Savaşı'nın Azerbaycan sinemasındaki sunumu: Nabat filmi örneği. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Güzel Sanatlar Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 40, 56-70.

GENİŞ ÖZET

Coğrafi konumu itibarıyla hayati bir öneme sahip olan Kafkasya'da istikrarı etkileyen en önemli konulardan biri ise Dağlık Karabağ sorunudur. Güney Kafkasya'nın bir parçası konumundaki Dağlık (Yukarı) Karabağ, günümüzde Azerbaycan ile Ermenistan arasında tarihsel arka planı çok eskilere dayanan bir sorun olup 1994 yılının Mayıs ayında Birinci Karabağ Savaşı'nın ardından imzalanan ateşkes anlaşmasından sonra önemli bir değişiklik geçirilmeden 25 yıldan uzun bir süre ciddiyetini korumuştur. Komşu ve bölge ülkeler ile Batılı güçlerin konuya yaklaşımları sorunun uzun bir süre çözümsüz kalmasına yol açmıştır. Sovyetler Birliği'nin dağılması ve bağımsızlıklarını ilan eden Azerbaycan ile Ermenistan'ın uluslararası teşkilatlara üye olmaları nedeniyle Karabağ, uluslararası bir sorun haline gelmiştir. Bölgede yerleşmeye ve nüfusunu arttırmaya çalışan Ermenilerin faaliyetleri sebebiyle ekonomik ve toplumsal olarak olumsuz etkilenen Azerbaycan için konu hem iç hem de dış politika açısından oldukça önem ve öncelik arz etmektedir. 12 Temmuz 2020'de Bakü-Tiflis-Ceyhan petrol ve Bakü-Tiflis-Erzurum doğalgaz boru hatları güzergâhı üzerinde yer alan Tovuz'a ateş açan Ermenistan, gerginliği daha da tırmandırmıştır. Eylül 2020'de yeni bir saldırı başlatan Karabağ'daki Ermeni birlikleri Azerbaycan köylerini bombalamaya başlamıştır. Bölgede gerginlik ve çatışmalar çok uzun bir süredir devam etmekle birlikte "44 Gün Savaşı" olarak da adlandırılan İkinci Karabağ Savaşı'nın 27 Eylül 2020 tarihinde başladığı ve Şuşa'nın alındığı 8 Kasım 2020 tarihinde fiilen sona erdiği söylenebilir. Savaşın sonunda imzalanan Moskova Ateşkes Antlaşması (Üçlü Antlaşma) ile Dağlık Karabağ'ın Ermenistan işgalinden arındırılması sağlanmıştır. Bugün gelinen noktada, birincisi 1990'lı yıllarda ve ikincisi de 2020 yılında yaşanan iki savaş sonrasında, cephenin arkasındaki politik söylemin ikna ediciliğinin cephenin önündeki askeri başarı kadar önemli olduğunun anlaşıldığı bir tablo karşımıza çıkmış durumdadır. Bu çalışma, politik söylemdeki ikna maksatlı retoriksel araçların savaş gibi önemli bir konu ile ilgili olarak nasıl kullanıldığını Azerbaycan Cumhurbaşkanı İlham Aliyev'in İkinci Karabağ Savaşı süresince gerçekleştirdiği ulusa sesleniş konuşmaları örneğinde ortaya koymayı amaçlamaktadır. Politik söylemi belirlemek ve analiz etmek için politik öznenin bu söylem tarafından yaratılan anlam yapısı içindeki konumunu inceleyerek dünyayla nasıl ilişki kurduğunu anlamaya

ihtiyaç vardır. Bu iliřki, dil ve söylem yoluyla kurulmakta ve retoriksel aralarla gçlendirilmektedir. Bu erevede, alıřmada İlham Aliyev'in İkinci Karabağ Savařı sırasında yaptıėı ulusa sesleniř konuřmalarının politik söylem analizi yapılmıřtır. Aliyev, 4 Ekim 2020-10 Kasım 2020 tarihleri arasında 6 konuřma yapmıřtır. Toplam 3 saat 20 dakika sren konuřmalar deřifre edildikten sonra model erevesinde tm konuřmalardaki baėlam, ortam, kamera aları, ses ve beden diline ynelik unsurlar tek bir tablo halinde verilmiř, ikna araları ile retorik aralara iliřkin unsurlar ise ayrı ayrı tablolatırılmıřtır. Aliyev, 27 Eyll 2020 tarihinde bařlayan İkinci Karabağ Savařı sırasında srece iliřkin bilgiler vermek, Azerbaycan'ın bařarılarını aktarmak iin ulusa sesleniř konuřmaları yapmıřtır. Bu konuřmaların geneli Cumhurbaşkanlıėı ofisinde, yalnızca 8 Kasım 2020 tarihli konuřması ise bir televizyon stdyosunda gerekleřmiřtir. Btn konuřmalarında ciddi bir yz ifadesine ve ses tonuna sahip olan Aliyev, bylece olayın ciddiyetini yansıtılmaktadır. Aliyev, savařta kurtarılan yerler ile ele geirilen ve tahrip edilen Ermenistan mhimmatları hakkında bilgi verdiėi blmler dıřında konuřmasını doėrudan kameraya bakarak, doėalama yapmıřtır. Aliyev'in konuřmalarında bir ikna unsuru olarak ethosu kullandıėı grlmektedir. Tm konuřmalarında kendinden emin, řerefli, adaletli, kararlı duruřuna vurgular yapmaktadır. Ayrıca uluslararası kuruluřlara karřı Azerbaycan'ın haklılıėını daima dile getirdiėini belirten Aliyev, savař sresince Azerbaycan'ın karřısına ıkan tm zorluklara direndiėini ve tm muhatapları karřısında kararlı durduėunu vurgulamaktadır. Aliyev, konuřmasında duygu durumuna gre ses tonunu aaltıp ykseltmekte, szck ve cmle vurguları ile iinde bulunduėu duyguyu pekiřtirmektedir. znts, mutluluėu, samimiyeti vb. mimiklerine yansımakta, bylece duygu durumunu dinleyiciye geirebilmektedir. Dolayısıyla Aliyev'in konuřması ses tonu, beden dili ve szleri ile ikna sanatının nemli yollarından biri olan pathos aısından bir btnlk gstermektedir. Aliyev'in konuřmaları deėerlendirildiėinde mantıksal argmanların da sıklıkla kullanıldıėı grlmektedir. Aliyev hem uluslararası antlařmalara hem de Ermenistan'ın sz konusu antlařmalara uymayan davranıřlarına vurgu yaparak Azerbaycan'ın haklılıėına ynelik bir söylem geliřtirmektedir. Makro dzeyde bir politik sre olan savař, yalnızca cephede deėil, politik dzlemde de srdrlen bir mcadeledir. Politik dzlemde devlet liderlerinin verdikleri mcadeleyi anlatarak hem halklarının desteėini almaları hem de uluslararası arenada lkelerinin haklılıėını savunmaları gerekmektedir. Bu doėrultuda ikna amalı retoriksel araların etkili kullanımı olduka nemlidir. Aliyev'in konuřmalarında szn etkisini artırmak amacıyla cmle iinde aynı sesin tekrar edilmesi olarak tanımlanabilecek aliterasyonu ve syleyiřte ahenk yaratmanın bir diėer unsuru olan cmle bařlarındaki szck tekrarı anlamına gelen anaforaı yoğun bir biimde kullandıėı dikkat ekmektedir. Azeri halkına verdiėi sayısal ve kurtarılan blgelere iliřkin bilgiler dıřında nceden hazırlanmamıř, doėalama konuřmalar yapan Aliyev, dili etkin ve ikna edici bir biimde kullanarak konuřmanın akıcılıėını saėlamakla birlikte dřnce ve duygularını da aık bir biimde ifade etmektedir. Aliyev ulusa sesleniř konuřmalarında Azerbaycan halkının kendine olan gvenini tazelemekte ethosu, duygu durumunu ortaya koymakta ise pathosu etkili bir biimde kullanılmaktadır. Aliyev'in, pathosun etkisini artırmada hem szckleri hem de beden dilini nemli bir ara olarak kullandıėını sylemek mmkndr. Ses tonunu ve mimiklerini duygu durumuna gre kullanan Aliyev, bylece beden dili ile sylemi arasında bir btnlk saėlamaktadır.