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Language considers a form of social practice in Critical Discourse Analysis, and it is frequently used in political discourse written, verbal and visual including public speeches. This paper examines the Prime Minister of Canada’s press conference speech, held at the House of Commerce on June 8, 2021 (https://www.rev.com/blog, 2021), in the aftermath of a Muslim family’s murder in Ontario’s London. The Three-Dimensional Model of Fairclough has been used to investigate the implicit/explicit power displayed in PM Justin’s speech, as well as the display of power at the textual, discursive, and societal levels, in the context of the speech’s two key themes: anti-Muslim hatred and Islamophobia. The study examines speech using a qualitative approach and addresses power within the discourse as well as the power behind the discourse. The findings show how language reflects political leaders’ ideologies and how social behaviors can shape and be shaped by speech. The Prime Minister skillfully employed language to convey the ideological divides between Muslim communities and the western communities. After drawing the line of demarcation, he urged world leaders to take steps to resolve their differences to achieve global harmony and peace. This study enables the general public to comprehend Justin Trudeau’s position on prevalent intolerance and the ideology of Islamophobia, as well as its effects.

1. Introduction

Language, as a means of communication, reflect a person’s current beliefs and thoughts to others, as well as a cultural, political, religious identity. The language used in a certain setting is referred to as discourse. Discourse is a vital research field because it provides facts on which to work and identify multiple meanings in sociological and psycholinguistic notions. Discourse and discourse analysis are two phrases that are frequently employed in linguistic terminology with ambiguous definitions. In linguistics, discourse refers to any formal or informal conversation that has the potential to be examined in an organized manner. It can be expressed either verbally or in writing. Discourse, according to (Titscher, S.; Meyer, M.; Wodak, R.; & Vetter, E., 2001) and (Bayram, 2010), is an umbrella that encompasses all aspects of meaning in linguistics, sociology, and philosophy, and has multiple dimensions and layers of meaning. Discourse, according to (Cook, 1992), is the use of words in communication. As a result, discourse analysis is an investigation, how fragments of language have become expressive and cohesive. Critical discourse analysis, which connects discourse analysis with other disciplines for full study and valid conclusions, is a step forward and more analytical. CDA encompasses a wide range of topics, including media discourse, public discourse, organizational studies, and political discourse. To carry out the CDA, several researchers have presented several models and ideas. Fairclough has excelled in this area,
providing us with a 3D model (three-dimensional model). Language is seen as a social activity in this concept (Fairclough N. L., 1989).

With an interdisciplinary approach, it adds to the analysis of how text and speech reflect the play of social and political dominance in discourse. The model emphasizes the creation and reception processes of a discourse fragment in a politico-social environment, as represented in the accompanying diagram. (1) Linguistic Description describes the formal linguistic characteristics of the text. (2) Interpretation, in which we try to figure out how the text and the discursive exchange are connected. In the process of text interpretation, text as the ultimate output of the text production process is deemed useful. (3) Explanation, in which we analyze speech and its relationship to social and cultural reality outside the classroom. The CDA paradigm aids discourse analysis in a variety of contexts, including society, religion, profession, and politics. Political discourse is a broader term that encompasses a variety of political discussions that take place in a variety of settings. Political discourse, according to (Schaffner, 1996) can be divided into two categories: functional and thematic. Political discourse is the study of various politicians' or political institutions' written and spoken words at various levels and in various contexts.

The purpose of this paper is to examine Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau’s speech in the House of Commons on June 8, 2019, as part of the CDA. The study tries to explain the characteristics of the Prime Minister’s address in light of the anti-Muslim assassination of four members of a Muslim family. The killing was labeled a “terrorist attack” by PM, who called it islamophobia.

1.1 Research Questions
The following research questions are addressed in this paper:

1. How does Justin Trudeau use language to address the societal practices in Ontario’s London?
2. What are the effects of language used by Justin Trudeau’s address in Ontario’s London?

2. Literature Review
In this paper, various references related to the main topic have been added along with the many variables contained in the study questions. Scholars have sought to weave a solid hypothetical framework into the parts to clarify further opinions. Various theorists’ work has been significantly developed in the wide, interdisciplinary domain of CDA. CDA, according to Van Dijk (1998) its main concern to analyze any discourse in the form written or spoken, using the discursive practices as perspective in a society such as hegemony, dominance, inequality of basic rights, and ethnic discrimination to investigate how these activities are conducted in connection to socioeconomic and political considerations. From a political perspective,

CDA generates unusual links between various social and cultural groups. Discourse analysis is divided into three stages, according to him. The first level entails analyzing the writers’ or speakers' beliefs in the texts or lectures. While the second stage of CDA focuses on how discourse affects society, the third phase of CDA focuses on individuality and practicality. Language selection has an impact on society by influencing the formulation and implementation of a specific theory, ideology, belief, or strategy, which is then exploited to obtain power and dominance in politics, economics, and society. He claims that different portions and groups in society have diverse belief systems, which are represented in language. Thus, the objective of doing a discourse analysis is to identify and comprehend the aforementioned belief systems, as well as to learn how they are articulated and transmitted to the general public. The idea of common sense is established and implanted in the minds of ordinary people through the upper class’s deft use of language in such a dazzling way that ordinary people find it impossible to challenge the dominant class's beliefs and ideologies. (Fairclough N., 2001).

Brown and Yule (Brown, G. and Yule, G, 1985) argue that the way language is employed provides more than just the meanings of objects; it goes far beyond this simple naming theory. The goal of critical discourse analysis is to figure out how and in what context language has been utilized, as well as how it affects society.

According to (Corson, (1995))CDA brought about the association in language and power, language and politics, language and society, and language and identity using linguistic approaches. According to (Chilton, 1996), metaphors play an important role in discourse analysis. Because, according to Chilton, an ideology is conveyed through metaphors. Pragmatism is a result of this style of philosophy.

According to (Dijk, 1991), there is a close link between a leader, politics, and the media since the media plays a significant role in disseminating a politician's political views and beliefs. He goes on to say that the media serves as the political elite’s mouthpiece in enacting their agenda in society. Critical discourse analysis, according to (Liebhart, 2009)), enables understanding of the relationship between language, society, politics, and economy. It tries to strengthen the links between language and power. As a result, language is at the center of CDA since it emphasizes beliefs and identities. It not only seeks to understand the relationship between power and language, but also provides an opportunity for the critique of power structures, including ethnic, economic,
and cultural supremacy. According to (Carroll, 2004), CDA provides multiple viewpoints of text analysis because it provides a theory and its application of employing data for postmodern and sociological text analysis.

van Dijk (1997) investigated the CDA of speeches and debates given in the British parliament. According to him, discussions about racism and favoritism for indigenous peoples foster anti-immigrant sentiments, reinforcing the notion of self and others. According to Van Dijk (1989), CDA is a fascinating subject of study because it allows researchers to uncover the governing elite’s practices, such as how they utilize their positions of power and influence to corrupt societal planning and how they manipulate language to benefit their class. According to Weiss and Wodak (2003), CDA demonstrates how to analyze so-called neutral language manipulating reality in favor of the dominant class in newspapers, parliaments, manuscripts, and reports. Similarly, according to Van Dijk (1993), there are many social classes in a community or society, and they all seek to compete for dominance and resist the dominating group by engaging in a struggle or conflict with one another. CDA is an interdisciplinary body of knowledge that analyses language about history and society, according to (Wodak, 2001). Her literature, according to her, is also formed about social and psychological issues. She claims that there is a close link between text and societal practices. She used her paradigm to Kurt Waldheim’s presidential campaign speeches and debates. Her research discovered that prominent persons have a significant impact on regular people’s talks and conversations. Furthermore, these political figures foster prejudice and hostility among many races and social groups. She also performed studies in Austria on prejudice and hatred. She noted that hatred and prejudice might arise in a variety of settings, including public discourse, media discourse, religious discourse, politics, and economics.

All key figures in critical discourse analysis have reinforced a method and approach to studying a language that can bring out the purpose of the language manipulators, as evidenced by the above review of the literature. According to the experts stated, the major goal of CDA is to expose those who manipulate language and communities for their gain. It also uses words to help those who are victims of this power play and dominance game. As a result, CDA’s mission is extremely positive, and it tries to create positive change for society and the world.

CDA, according to Fairclough (1993), is a sort of discourse analysis that finds unusual relationships between various racial and ethnic groups. It focuses on text and chronological actions demonstrating uneven and ideologically influenced power relations. Through the elite’s hegemonic attitude and ideological language, he examines how power is exercised in modern society.

In discourse analysis, Fairclough (1992) distinguishes three levels. In the first stage, the CDA examines personal data. We can evaluate the speaker’s experience and knowledge by considering his beliefs. Second, what impact do social interactions have on discourse, and third, what does the speaker realize about reality and identity? He believes that lexical and grammatical patterns in a dialogue reveal a speaker’s social origin and identity. He contends that language shapes discourse and that power is exercised as a result of opposing sociopolitical ideas relations.

Fairclough (1992) thinks that people from different social groups have different interpersonal and communicative values, which they communicate through their languages and speech. This reveals the inextricable connection between social and linguistic aspects. The main purpose of CDA is to look at the text through the lens of linguistic social theory. Political and ideological processes are in motion. Language is used for more than only describing objects, according to (Brown, G. and Yule, G. 1985)

In addition to doing things, CDA investigates how people use language in everyday settings and how language reveals their cultural identities in a variety of social and ethnic backgrounds. They believe that the lexical and syntactic elements used in a language reflect the speakers’ various socio-cultural backgrounds. In binary relationships, the focus of critical discourse analysis is on how their language reflects discursive practices.

Language, according to (Halliday, 1978), is a social activity since it allows people to communicate with one another. Communicate in a social situation. Language and society are intricately linked when it comes to dependency. Communication. Language shapes and constructs our identities (text).

(Fairclough, 1995) defines intertextual analysis as the “linguistic study of discourse practice in a socio-cultural context.” In this linguistic study, the text’s lexical, syntactic, grammatical, and vocabulary levels are all assessed. The cohesiveness, coherence, and layout of the text are examined. This study focuses on the text while accounting for all conversational behaviors. He further intertextuality as a trait of any text in which bits of other texts are carried within the texts that are embedded in the text. The passage that was taken from another source has been thoroughly merged into the original. If it rejects or accepts the original text’s concept, he distinguishes between two sorts of intertextuality: Both the phrases “manifest intertextuality” and “constitutive intertextuality” are interchangeable. When quotations are used in the text, the first type is employed. to substantiate and support
the claim. Inverted commas are used to separate quotes in any text. A speech or a paper Visible intertextuality is the name given to this type of intertextuality.

The other is linked to frameworks for discourse that lead to the creation of new texts. This type of content, according to Fairclough, can be analyzed using linguistic analysis. To describe his method of text analysis, (Fairclough N. L., 1989) invented the phrase “critical language research.” His most pressing concern The purpose was to bring attention to discrimination in social interactions and discursive practices that trample on people's rights. With the use of sociocultural lingo, he argues that language is used to obtain and maintain power, hegemony. The text, which is the clothing of people's ideas, is how they exert their power. Language is employed to establish hegemony, authority, and control, according to (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997).

To comprehend the text's meanings, it is necessary to take a historical perspective on discourse. Every work has historical perspectives and conditions that aid in the clarification of meanings within that context. According to (Gee, 1990) and (G, 1980), CDA analyses discourses systematically using a variety of approaches while taking into account socio-political and economic issues. Social semiotics is important in the interpretation of conversation since it is based on social factors in that specific situation.

Discourse analysts try to decipher and analyze the signals sent by politicians in a variety of language forms. Political figures such as Nelson Mandela, Barak Obama, Tayyip Erdogan, Donald Trump, Manmohan Singh, and Nawaz Sharif have all been investigated according to political discourse analysis study. These studies investigated how political leaders around the world used discursive practices such as linguistic devices to express ideological conceptions, resulting in the development of a discourse that suited their goal. The technologies they chose were mostly influenced by the context, as well as social and political factors.

Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau’s speech in the House of Commons on June 8, 2019, touched millions of Muslims & people throughout the world. The current study examines his speech using the Fairclough 3D Model's Textual, Discursive, and Societal levels of discourse. The study considers the mechanisms of communication, inculcation, and universal acceptability to examine power inside speech and the power behind discourse. Social activities can shape and shape the diversity of discourse. The pronoun “I” by the speaker serves an important purpose in the case of power within speech, and by utilizing the pronoun “we,” he obtains the audience’s support and wins their hearts. This study will help Muslims around the globe to comprehend the prevailing issue of islamophobia.

3. Methodology
In this qualitative research, for the textual analysis data was extracted from Justin’s Speech at Ontorio’s London held at the House of Commerce on June 8, 2021 (https://www.rev.com/blog, 2021), in the aftermath of a Muslim family’s murder in Ontario’s London. The Three-Dimensional Model of Fairclough has been used to investigate the implicit/explicit power displayed in PM Justin’s speech, as well as the display of power at the textual, discursive, and societal levels, in the context of the speech’s two key themes: anti-Muslim hatred and Islamophobia. The study examines power within the discourse as well as the power behind the discourse. According to Fairclough every communicative event, according to this concept, has three dimensions: (1) a text (picture, speech, writing, or a combination of these), (2) a discursive activity comprising the consumption and production of texts, and (3) a social practice.

4. Analysis and Discussion
4.1 Textual Analysis
Fairclough’s 3D model's first analytical focus is text. Text analysis encompasses morphology, syntactic, semantic, and sound system analysis, as well as cohesion-organization above the sentence level. Any sentence in a text, according to Fairclough, can be studied in terms of the articulation of these functions, which he has renamed representations, relations, and identities (Fairclough, 1995b). Justin Trudeau's speech contains several textual features. The researcher will attempt to analyze those characteristics in this research.

Vocabulary is an essential component of any work. Words provide a certain representational or conceptual role. They have a distinct ideology. In terms of the current wording, it contains some politically contentious words, such as “our communities,” “killing was no accident,” and “heartbreaking,” among others. These words demonstrate Trudeau’s desire to make Canada a just and unbiased country for all people.

There are examples of re-wordings such as “mourning, grieving, outraged, I chatted with, I shared with, hatred, Islamophobia,” and so on, in addition to politically contentious phrases. The rationale behind this re-wording is because Justin had a firm belief that Canadian society is made up of ethnolinguistic communities such as “French, German, and English,” among others. As a result, the community's role in achieving political unification and security is undeniable. Over-language is a term that refers to an exceptionally high level of wording, frequently involving several terms that are close to synonyms, such as “violence and hatred,” “grief and
sadness,” and so on. Mr. Justin aimed to achieve two goals by using such a vocabulary: to express his preoccupation with many parts of reality and to portray his opinions emphatically.

Justin’s speech does not contain any euphemism expressions. PM Justin did his utmost to express his point simply and straightforwardly, without equivocation. For example, when he lists societal problems, he uses specific words like “terrorist attacks, hatred, and violence.” Not only in his views but also in his language, he is quite loud and clear.

Although it was a speech to the House of Commerce, the sentences were well-structured and arranged syntactically. Words carry the speaker’s viewpoint and have expressive significance. The speaker’s stance is sometimes expressed clearly, and other times it is implied. In the instance of this text, the speaker’s position is clear. Justin Trudeau remarked that “Islamophobia and the horrific violence it brings must end,” demonstrating his desire for a country free of violence and intolerance, where the Muslim population is safe and everyone has an equal chance to live. He appears to be arguing for a liberal and democratic social structure.

The portrayal of one component of an experience in terms of another is known as a metaphor. Different metaphors imply different approaches to problems. The terms “dark path,” “darkness,” “immune,” and other metaphors can be found in the current text. The speaker’s intent with these metaphors is to emphasize the seriousness, importance, and scope of the topics at hand.

Although the positive nature of sentences has been frequently used by the speaker, a significant number of sentences have not been utilized. The speaker does not wish to use a complicated language. Applies an accurate, clear, and direct approach, and the speaker expects the same from his audience. Declarative, interrogative, and imperative communication modes are used by the speaker. The subject comes before the verb in declarative sentences, which are commonly used in events. The speaker or writer is in the position of a giver, while the addressee is in the position of a receiver. There’s a grammatical question sentence that goes like this: “What can be said? When another family’s loved ones are taken from them, when a child is in the hospital, when a community is in mourning.” The speaker is asking for something from the addressee in this sentence. It is a WH inquiry that necessitates a thorough response from the addressee.

The concept of modality is very crucial for relational and expressive values in grammar. The modality is the speaker’s or writer’s authority, which he uses during the discourse. Words like may, might, can, could, should, ought to, and other modal auxiliary verbs are used to convey this authority. Modal verbs such as “can,” “must,” and “will” have been employed frequently in this speech to convey obligation, suggestion, and permission, among other things. These modal verbs are extremely potent because they assert implicit power relations like the ones shown here, which makes relational modality a topic of ideological debate.

In the English language, pronouns such as “we” and “you” have many relational values, and their use in this text has a special relational value. The pronoun “we” has been used a lot, and it comprises the words “we” and “us.”

Speakers, the audience, and the entire country The pronoun “you” has a special relationship significance as well. The word “you” has typically been used to refer to foes or opponents, but here it refers to the addressee’s country. His goal could be to personalize or reach out to them.

4.2 Discourse practices
Discourse practice is the process of text production, diffusion, and consumption (Fairclough, 1995: 2). This makes sense since, according to Eriyanto (2001), a text is created by discursive practices, which define how the text is created. That means that the text producer and the text consumer may both track how discourse activities contribute to the CDA.

Justin was nominated the Leader of the Liberal Party in April 2013. The basic aim of his leadership campaign was to form a novel national liberation movement in Canada. It drew hundreds of thousands of first-time voters in politics. He worked to improve the middle classes and to create strategies for job creation, economic growth, and environmental protection.

We can see from Justin Trudeau’s speech that he focused on Muslims and Islamophobia. He speaks about Muslims and the hatred they face in the West. He even criticizes the current wave of intolerance toward Muslims in Canada and other Western countries. He termed it a terrorist attack inspired by the inculcated mentality of Islamophobia. PM Justin goes on to discuss the ramifications of racism and Islamophobia, emphasizing the importance of putting an end to it at all costs. It has to come to an end. Whether it’s through the security infrastructure initiative, cracking down on online extremism, or destroying far-right hate groups, the United States is making progress. Then, if we looked deeper into the speech, we would see that, either expressly or implicitly, many things he passionately believed would work if the process of making the deal ran well. It is unavoidable to see that he is fully capable of
persuading Muslims all around the world to join his cause. From this vantage point, his good deal-making ability also indicates his dexterity in watching who he is conversing with.

Because discourse practices serve to connect textual and socio-cultural analysis, this pillar cannot be separated from the previous textual analysis. According to the textual analysis, Justin was successful in persuading society to agree with what he said. He successfully exploits the characteristics of a persuasive text by carefully structuring the text using Halliday’s transitivity method. In general, the text is well-constructed as a type of discursive practice.

4.3 Social Analysis
The text is studied in the socio-cultural context in this final stage of Fairclough’s CDA model. The socio-cultural environment revolves around three types of communication: economic, political, and cultural.

Justin, the prime minister, began his speech by extending a welcome and saying hello to everyone. He describes the heinous crime of murder as “sickening and a terrorist attack” on a Canadian Muslim family. He goes on to say that this is a cruel and painful act of violence.

The main issues of Justin Trudeau’s address were hatred of Muslims in Canada, terrorism, and Islamophobia. All of the themes were about Muslims in general, and the departed family in particular.

On June 8, 2021, he spoke at a press conference to discuss the attack in London, Ontario that killed four members of a Muslim household. He eloquently represented the entire country of Canada. When it came to killing, he first used the term “We” to refer to the entire Canadian nation. “We will not be divided by hatred.” He reflected on the prior act of anti-Muslim bigotry and remarked, “What can be said when yet another family’s loved ones have been snatched away when a child is in the hospital when a community is in mourning?”

“All I can say is this, to everyone who is mourning, who is outraged, who is terrified, your neighbors stand with you,” he said. The Prime Minister of Canada rallies his country to support bereaved families who are irritated and fearful. The incident brought back bitter memories of a mosque mass shooting in Quebec City in January 2017 (https://www.rev.com/blog, 2021), which killed six people, and a driving rampage in Toronto in April 2018, which murdered ten people.

“They were all targeted because of their Muslim beliefs,” Trudeau said, vowing to intensify Canada’s fight against far-right racists. “This is taking place right now in Canada. And it needs to come to an end.” He called the assault an act of “Islamophobia,” which has grown in recent years in a country that has long been famed for its tolerance.

Islamophobia was the third major topic he addressed. “it must stop. Whether through the security infrastructure program, by cracking down on online extremism, or by dismantling far-right hate groups” He first stated unequivocally that it is the primary source of division and hatred between Muslims and Westerners. “It must stop,” he says in a statement to the international community. Whether it’s through the security infrastructure, combating online extremism, or dismantling far-right hate groups,” Justin calls for action in three major areas to stop violence against Muslims that leads to hatred and Islamophobia, including security infrastructure, social media that encourages extremism, and the dismantling of hate groups in the Western community.

He stood there as a representative of the Muslim community, rejecting the ideology of Islamophobia and radicalism against Islam and Muslims. He makes the connection between radicalism and terrorist attacks in Western societies.

5. Conclusion
The major goal of this research was to look into the implicit/explicit power show in PM Justin’s speech. To investigate how power is manifested at textual, discursive, and societal levels, the study was guided by Fairclough’s (1995) notion of Critical Discourse Analysis, which serves as the study’s major conceptual foundation.

According to the findings of the current study, the text of Justin’s speech is extremely rich in terms of CDA. The textual analysis reveals that vocabulary items such as wording, re-wording, modality, and others convey Justin’s position on islamophobia as representing the ideology behind anti-Muslim killings and other societal problems in the West. His lexicon implies he sought to preach fairness, equality, and impartiality to the entire Muslim community. According to the grammatical characteristics of his speech, he was quite loud and clear in his phrases. In contrast to today’s politicians, who are frequently unclear in their positions, he said things like “fix the responsibility on agents and patients.” The employment of logical connectors to make the text cohesive and coherent has been revealed by the discourse practice analysis. According to the social analysis of the speech, it was Justin’s informal news conference, and he wanted to engage with the entire nation about a violent and terrorist attack against a Muslim family in London through this media discourse. He also wanted to express his opposition to what he described as a violent and cowardly act of terrorism. Justin’s Trudeau as Prime Minster is depicted throughout the speech.
It can be determined that certain textual and stylistic strategies were utilized frequently in this speech to attain a specific goal. It has all of the requirements that a speech must have to spread ideology in a sophisticated manner. It appears to be well-organized syntactically, with repeated repetitions highlighting the major theme of hatred and Islamophobia, as well as racism. The lexemes are not only well-ordered according to the situation, but they also recapitulate background and indicate the speaker’s relational and expressive values.

It is concluded that power displayed and practiced at the discursive level in terms of inter-discursivity and inter-textuality with the use of language tactics, Justin Trudeau successfully and impressively brings islamophobia to light and highlights the hostility that exists in the west towards Muslims. He persuades the Muslim community to rally behind him, and he succeeds admirably. His discourse illuminates the established societal inequities in a very gentle manner. There are several other variables in this speech, such as social cognition, that might be investigated further. Different CDA methodologies can be used in this speech while keeping the same patterns in mind. The models developed by VanDijk and Wodak can be used to do qualitative research as well.
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