

Proximization in Lyndon B. Johnson's *Report on the Gulf of Tonkin Incident*: A Critical Linguistic Analysis

Hammam Abdelbary Abdelhameed Abdelateef (*)

Abstract

The present study aims to investigate the different aspects of proximization by Piotr Cap in the American presidential speeches on war, seeking to highlight the legitimization of actions. The sample covers Lyndon B. Johnson's Report on the Gulf of Tonkin Incident on the Vietnam War. The study adopts two tools of analysis, i.e. lexico-grammatical choices, and deixis. Results reveal that Johnson made use of the three categories of proximization and they appeared significantly in his speech. However, they were not used similarly. Furthermore, Johnson used deixis heavily but in different percentages. The study concludes that Johnson's use of proximization helped legitimize actions and pass the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. It recommends investigating more aspects of discourse to highlight the de/legitimization strategies in the speeches.

Keywords: CDA, Proximization, Legitimization, Speeches on War, Gulf of Tonkin Incident

1. Introduction

This section provides an introduction to the political context. In addition, it addresses the objectives, significance, and questions of the study. The present study investigates a modern war that has affected the history/situations of the fighting countries and many surrounding countries, as well. It is the Vietnam War. It is investigated because it is American, modern, and has significant effects on Vietnam, in particular, and the world, in general. It took place in a faraway country of which the American people almost know nothing.

Lyndon B. Johnson, America's 36th president (1963-1969), escalated the Vietnam War that began before his term. Nevertheless, Johnson increased the number of American personnel from 16,000 in 1963 to 184,300 by 1965 (Yoder, 2007), and to 548,000 in 1968 (Germany, 2019). The Gulf of Tonkin incident in August 1964 marked a critical

(*) This paper is part of an M.A. thesis entitled : Proximization in the speeches of War by Lyndon B. Johnson and George W. Bush: A Comparative Critical Linguistic Analysis, Supervised by Prof. Bahaa el Deen M. Mazeed – Faculty of Al- Alsun, Sohag University & Dr. Samir Abdel Naeem – Faculty of Arts, Sohag University.

juncture in this war (Bradely, 2009). It helped Johnson pass the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. The incident's speech is investigated.

Thus, the present study seeks to analyze an American presidential speeches by Lyndon B. Johnson on Vietnam War to find out how he de/legitimizes the different players of the war.

1.1. Objectives

The present study is an attempt to investigate the different aspects of proximization in this speech. It illustrates how legitimization is achieved. It also applies proximization theory to American presidents' speeches on wars.

1.2. Questions

The present study raises the following questions:

1. How are the Vietnam War and players depicted linguistically (via the tools and proximization theory)?
2. What proximization strategies does Johnson exploit?
3. How does Johnson attempt to achieve the legitimization of war?

1.3. Significance

The present study attempts to adopt an approach to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), namely proximization theory (introduced by Piotr Cap in many of his studies, such as 2006, 2008, 2010a, b and 2013a, b) to the analysis of a speech delivered on the War on Vietnam to unveil de/legitimization strategies used. Accordingly, it benefits those interested in studying CDA, in general, and war speeches, in particular. Its significance can be summarized in the following points:

1. The study adopts a relatively new theory, i.e. proximization by Cap.
2. It is applied to an important event in the history of the USA and the world, namely the American War on Vietnam.
3. It integrates many tools of analysis, i.e. lexico-grammatical choices, and deixis, and relates them to proximization theory.

2. Theoretical Background

The present section overviews the theoretical framework of the present study. The first section provides a review of CDA. In the second section, proximization theory is addressed. It also covers proximization types and relationship to legitimization. The third section covers the speeches on war and their features. It also covers lexico-grammatical choices and deixis.

2.1. Critical Discourse Analysis

According to Flowerdew and Richardson (2018), CDA is an inter-disciplinary approach to language in use to promote people's perception of the way discourse figures the social processes, structures and change. Fairclough (2018) argues that CDA is a form of critical social analysis and elucidates how discourse is related to other social elements, including, though not limited to, power and ideology. van Dijk (2001) defines it as “a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context” (p.352). It induces and endeavors to manifest the use of power by social institutions on political, cultural, ethical, or gender basis (Asghar, 2013).

CDA is not limited to power in discourse, but it investigates the power behind discourse (Fairclough, 1989). Aghagolzadeh and Bahrami-Khorshid (2009) argue that CDA's main premise is that the form-content relationship is not arbitrary. Instead, it is based on cultural, social, political...etc. principals. According to Machin and Mayer (2012), CDA tackles any text, including but not limited to political speeches, advertisements, and schoolbooks, to expose the (hidden) ideological strategies.

According to Fairclough and Wodak (1997), the following are the basic principles of CDA:

- CDA addresses social problems.
- Power relations are discursive.
- Discourse constitutes society and culture.
- Discourse does ideological work.
- Discourse is historical.
- The link between text and society is mediated.
- Discourse analysis is interpretative and explanatory.
- Discourse is a form of social action (pp. 271- 280).

Biria and Mohammadi (2012) adopted CDA to explore the discursive characteristics, ideologies, and rhetorical devices of the inaugural addresses. They analyzed the second term address of George Bush (2005) and the first term address of Barack Obama (2009). They argued for the rich repertoire of discursive mechanisms the speakers adopt, e.g. positive self and negative other representations. They also reported the deep relationship between language, power, and ideology.

Safro and Agyeiwaa (2013) applied CDA to six speeches from the discourse of Bush and Obama on terrorism, using a qualitative content analytical approach. The study revealed that both presidents projected

terrorism negatively and depicted anti-terrorism positively by selecting emotionally charged vocabulary and expressions.

Dastpak and Taghinezhad (2015) explored the persuasive strategies used in Obama's political speech. They adopted Fairclough's approach to CDA. They analyzed Obama's inaugural address. They concluded that Obama heavily relied on words, such as *country*, *America*, and *we*. He utilized biblical references in many areas. Moreover, he extensively highlighted pragmatism, liberalism, inclusiveness, acceptance of religious and ethnic diversity, and unity.

Darweesh and Muzhir (2016) applied CDA to three speeches delivered by Barack Obama, J. Kerry, and Hillary Clinton on the Syrian crisis to tackle the role of political speeches in reflecting the ideological manipulation at different political, social...etc. levels. They reported that such speeches were not neutral. Rather, they were manipulated to express negative ideology towards the crisis.

Sharififar and Rahimi (2016) investigated Obama's and Rouhani's political speeches at the UN in September 2013 using CDA and Halliday's systematic functional linguistics. They illustrated that Obama and Rouhani gave a significant role to personal pronouns, e.g. 'we', to make sense of intimacy with the audience. The speakers frequently used "will" and "can" to persuade the audience to have faith in the government's ability to overcome the potential difficulties.

2.2. Proximization Theory

Proximization is a somewhat new theory in the field of discourse analysis. It is applied to different texts for various reasons. Kowalski (2018) argues that the basic rationale for using proximization is the speaker's assumption that the recipient might not interpret the speaker's message in line with his/her intentions unless the recipient is given sufficient cues whereby s/he can integrate the concepts presented with his/her cognitive framework.

According to Cap (2013a), *proximization* is a discursive strategy of presenting physically and temporally distant events and states of affairs (including "distant", i.e. adversarial, ideological mind-sets) as directly, increasingly and negatively consequential to the speaker and her addressee (p.3). In other words, proximization involves defining the deictic center of the speaker. Then, the entities and events referred to are located spatially, temporally, and axiologically. It "subsumes a strategic development of set amounts of lexico-grammatical choices, derived from cognitive categories of space, time, and value" (Cap, 2013a, p. 7).

Accordingly, many fields, including pragmatics and CDA, interact. Based on this theory, the THEM entities are presented as gradually encroaching upon the US physical and/or ideological territory (Cap, 2018, p. 6).

Chilton (2004) was the first to introduce the theory (Cap, 2014a). Cap tried to develop proximization into a theory (2006, 2008, 2010a, and 2013a), classifying it into three-main subcategories:

1. Spatial Proximization is a forced construal of the Discourse Space (DS) peripheral entities encroaching physically upon the DS central entities.
2. Temporal Proximization is a forced construal of the envisaged conflict as not only imminent, but also historic and thus needing immediate response and unique preventive measures.
3. Axiological Proximization is a (forced) construal of a gathering ideological clash between the "home values" of the DS central entities (Internal Deictic Center (IDCs)) and the alien and antagonistic (Outside Deictic Center (ODC)) values (Cap, 2014a, p. 191).

Proximization is mainly applied to political discourse by generating legitimization of the interventionist actions taken against the figured external threat (Cap, 2013b, p. 295). It functions legitimately by positioning the symbolic construal of entities' relations within the Discourse Space and converging the "deictic centers" of the producer(s) and the receiver(s) through symbolic discursive shifts (Kopytowska, 2015, p.349).

2.3. Speeches on War

Reyes (2011) argues that politicians usually harness their power to justify their acts in a way that elicits people's support. Accordingly, the persuasive nature of political discourse allows them to persuade their audience that they both share the same goals. Such goals may vary, including financial, religious, political...etc. Zidore (2011) argues that people fight because they are unwilling to show empathy and understanding for their respective 'other'. In order to stop this violence, place oneself in the position occupied by 'others', not necessarily to agree with them' (White, 1998, p.436).

Clausewitz (cited in Ifesinachi, 2018) defines war as "an act of force to compel our enemy to do our will". Primarily, war leaders endeavor to convince the (global) community, in general, and their peoples/supporters, in particular, to wage a war. In other words, they seek the legitimization of the war. The present study shows one of the means that (could) help those leaders gain public support and legitimize their (preventive) actions, namely proximization.

Those leaders employ emotive language by showing a dreadful image of the enemy to confront the threat they represent. This could be achieved by justifying the reasons for war and exploiting persuasive strategies to gain the support of the people (Ifesinachi, 2018, p.124). Therefore, Butt, Lukin and Matthiessen argue, "the central players in prosecuting a war understand that in order to win the war, they must win hearts and minds" (2004, p. 287).

Gray (2007) argues that any war of any kind and period should have the following seven characteristics: "Political, social-cultural, economic, technological, military-strategic, geopolitical and geostrategic, and historical" (p. 3). Therefore, many scholars investigate these different aspects. Some scholars utilize CDA, among many other approaches, to unveil the hidden reasons for waging wars.

Yuravlivker (2006) explored the speech that President Lyndon Johnson delivered on April 7, 1965 entitled "Peace without Conquest", aiming to answer Vietnam critics with "unconditional discussions", but he also reaffirmed his determination not to withdraw. He analyzed the situation leading to the speech, the speech itself, and public reaction. He concluded that although Johnson's speech failed to bring peace to Southeast Asia, it succeeded in mollifying critics enough for the administration to escalate the war.

Rashidi and Souzandehfar (2010) investigated the debates between Republicans and Democrats candidates of the US presidential primaries of 2008 over the continuation of the War in Iraq. They applied van Dijk's (2004) elaboration of the ideological square to six texts; three by each. They concluded that each party uses different strategies such as lexicalization, polarization, and rhetoric to express their attitude towards the continuity of the war.

Hameed and Hassan (2017) investigated a speech by Tony Blair (the former British prime minister) about the Iraq War in 2003. The authors adopted a CDA approach in their analysis to gain a deeper understanding of (Blair's) political discourse. They concluded that Blair's discourse serves an ideological purpose to justify, legitimize, and conceive the international community that Iraq is a real threat and eventually removing Saddam by force is the right decision.

Beshara (2018) investigated an excerpt from George W. Bush's address to a session of the Congress and the American people wherein Bush employed the "war on terror" phrase. He applied CDA, Lacanian psychoanalysis, and other tools. He concluded that Bush's utilization of phrases, such as "war on terror" generates negative-patriotism and situated them within a larger ideological framework. Moreover, these

phrases will continue to be a rhetorical/logical reference in the post-9/11 era.

2.4. Lexico-grammatical Choices

Cap (2013 a) argues that the lexico-grammatical choices play a considerable role in the proximization model. Linguistically, proximization involves the lexical and grammatical deictic choices for several reasons (Cap, 2017a, p.17). Primarily, they index the existing socio-political and ideological distinctions. Moreover, they demonstrate the capacity of the ODC to erase such socio-political and ideological distinctions by forcibly colonizing the IDC territory. Thus, they are utilized in the present study.

2.4.1. Categories of Lexico-grammatical Choices

According to Cap (2013 a), the lexico-grammatical choices help establish the deictic center, the deictic periphery, and impose symbolic construals whereby the peripheral entities cross the distance in discourse space to permeate the deictic (p.9).

Cap (2006, p.60) lists the following (linguistic) categories that motivate the analysis.

- 1) Noun phrases (NPs) conceptualized as elements of the deictic center (IDCs);
- 2) NPs conceptualized as elements outside the deictic center of the DS (ODCs);
- 3) Verb phrases (VPs) of motion and directionality conceptualized together as indicators of movement of ODCs towards the deictic center and vice versa;
- 4) VPs of action conceptualized as indicators of contact between ODCs and IDCs;
- 5) NPs expressing abstract notions conceptualized as anticipations of potential contact between ODCs and IDCs;
- 6) NPs expressing abstract notions conceptualized as effects of actual contact between ODCs and IDCs.

2.5. Deixis

Lenz (2003) argues that deixis does not tend to semantics and pragmatics individually. Rather, it is at their interface. Lyons (1977) defines deixis as "the location and identification of persons, objects,

events, processes and activities being talked about, or referred to, in relation to the spatiotemporal context" (p. 637). The participants and their resulting act of utterance create and maintain deixis. It subsumes those features of language which refer directly to the personal, temporal or locational characteristics of the situation within which an utterance takes place, whose meaning is thus relative to that situation" (Crystal, 2008, p.133). It is a reference created by the interpretation of an expression related to the "extra-linguistic context such as who is speaking, the time or place of speaking, the gestures of the speaker, or the current location in the discourse" (Mazid, 2014, p. 135). To achieve a successful deictic reference, the participants must be aware of the speech event and its constituents (Lenz, 2003).

2.5.1. Types of Deixis

There are many types of deixis. It is sometimes related to time, place, or even discourse (anaphora and cataphora). There are many categories of deixis that could be classified into major ones, including person, space, and time, and minor ones, such as social and discourse (Huang, 2007, pp. 136-175; Levinson, 1983, pp. 54-96; Mazid, 2014, p. 135; Stapleton, 2017, p. 2).

Person deixis: It is concerned with the identification of the interlocutors or participant-roles in a speech event. It usually expresses person, number, and gender. It is commonly expressed by:

- The traditional grammatical category of person, as reflected in personal pronouns and, if relevant, their associated predicate agreements;
- Vocatives: They are NPs that refer to the addressee, but form no part of the arguments of a predicate. They are grouped into two types, i.e. calls, such as Daddy, mom...etc. and addresses, e.g. sir. In other words, they can be encoded in, for example, kinship terms, titles, and proper names, and in combinations of these.
- a. Space deixis: It is concerned with the specification of location in space relative to that of the participants at the time of speaking in a speech event such as "away", "here", "there"...etc.
- b. Time deixis: It is concerned with the encoding of temporal points and spans relative to the time at which an utterance is produced in a speech event, such as "now", "then", "today", "tomorrow", "yesterday"...etc.
- c. Social deixis: It is concerned with the codification of the social status of the speaker, the addressee, or a third person or entity referred to, as well as the social relationships holding between

them. It includes personal pronouns, forms of address, affixes, clitics and particles, and the choice of vocabulary.

- d. Discourse deixis: It is concerned with the use of a linguistic expression within some utterance to point to the current, preceding or following utterances in the same spoken or written discourse. It can be said to refer to propositions. For example "in the last section", "as already mentioned"...etc.

3. Review of the Literature

The literature review of this paper comprises three sections. For example, Cap (2015b) conducted a qualitative-quantitative analysis of the language of the US administration during the War on Iraq, between March 2003 (commencement of the allies' military operations in Iraq) and June 2004 (delegation of select executive powers to the new Iraqi interim government). This study drew upon the proximization theory. It showed how proximization maintains legitimization strategies to redefine the case of the war after the clear loss of the original premise (the alleged presence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq).

Kopytowska (2015) investigated mass media discourse, i.e. CNN news coverage of the Horn of Africa crisis in 2011, from the proximization perspective in order to enhance the newsworthiness of the content. She concluded that proximization helps the journalist represent the distant events, whether spatially, temporally, or axiologically, as relevant to the audience – possibly more than they actually are. Additionally, it triggers emotional reactions in the audience.

Cap (2017a) explored initiating legitimization through proximization. He applied the proximization theory to (extracts) of G.W. Bush's speech at the American Enterprise Institute delivered on February 26th, 2003. The speech that took place only three weeks before striking Iraq by the US and coalition troops was considered a manifesto of the Iraq war. Cap concluded that via utilizing different proximization strategies based on various lexico-grammatical forms (categories), Bush could gain support in this war.

Cap (2017b) analyzed the anti-immigration discourse in Poland. He applied the proximization theory to a corpus of speeches delivered from 1 November 2015 to 31 March 2017 by prominent Polish politicians and statesmen in terms of the anti-immigration discourse. In this paper, Cap showed how the 'emerging', 'growing', 'gathering' threats – physical as well as ideological – are construed by the Polish right-wing government, who thus claim their right to oppose EU immigration agreements and pursue strict anti-immigration measures.

Cap (2018) investigated the discursive patterns of legitimization of anti-immigration policies adopted by the (ruling) Polish right-wing government. He applied the discourse space models, especially proximization theory, to a corpus of (124) addresses, statements, and comments by the most prominent politicians of the conservative Law and Justice Party. He concluded that the discourse-producers utilized the concepts of closeness and remoteness in the service of threat construction and the sanctioning of tough anti-immigration measures. For example, they related the issue of refugee migration into Europe with the problem of global terrorism. Moreover, proximization was utilized to show their reluctance to the idea of the multiethnic and multicultural state in general.

4. Methodology

The following section introduces the methodology of the study. It covers the type of research. Then, it illustrates how data are collected. It ends with the tools section.

4.1. Type of Research

The present study is a qualitative analytical one because it analyzes the types of proximization in Johnson's Report on the Gulf of Tonkin Incident using different tools, namely deixis and lexico-grammatical choices. It also adopts the quantitative approach to show the number as well as the percentage of the types of proximization.

4.2. Data Collection

The data used in the analysis, i.e. Johnson's Report on the Gulf of Tonkin Incident, were accessed online. The data for accessing the speech are added to the reference list.

4.3. Tools

The study adopts lexico-grammatical choices and deixis for analysis. Later, it applies the three categories of proximization to the speech under study.

5. Analysis

In this section, extracts of the speech are analyzed. The following parts are extracted from the speech.

As President and Commander in Chief, it is my duty to the American people to report that renewed hostile actions against United States ships on the high seas in the Gulf of Tonkin have today required me to order the military forces of the United States to take action in reply... The performance of commanders and crews in this engagement is in the highest tradition of the United States Navy. But repeated acts of violence against the Armed

Forces of the United States must be met not only with alert defense, but with positive reply. That reply is being given as I speak to you tonight. Air action is now in execution against gunboats and certain supporting facilities in North Viet-Nam which have been used in these hostile operations... In the larger sense this new act of aggression, aimed directly at our own forces, again brings home to all of us in the United States the importance of the struggle for peace and security in Southeast Asia. Aggression by terror against the peaceful villagers of South Viet-Nam has now been joined by open aggression on the high seas against the United States of America... The determination of all Americans to carry out our full commitment to the people and to the government of South Viet-Nam will be redoubled by this outrage. Yet our response, for the present, will be limited and fitting. We Americans know, although others appear to forget, the risks of spreading conflict. We still seek no wider war... I have instructed the Secretary of State to make this position totally clear to friends and to adversaries and, indeed, to all. I have instructed Ambassador Stevenson to raise this matter immediately and urgently before the Security Council of the United Nations. Finally, I have today met with the leaders of both parties in the Congress of the United States and I have informed them that I shall immediately request the Congress to pass a resolution making it clear that our Government is united in its determination to take all necessary measures in support of freedom and in defense of peace in southeast Asia... I have been given encouraging assurance by these leaders of both parties that such a resolution will be promptly introduced, freely and expeditiously debated, and passed with overwhelming support. And just a few minutes ago I was able to reach Senator Goldwater and I am glad to say that he has expressed his support of the statement that I am making to you tonight... It is a solemn responsibility to have to order even limited military action by forces whose overall strength is as vast and as awesome as those of the United States of America, but it is my considered conviction, shared throughout your Government, that firmness in the right is indispensable today for peace; that firmness will always be measured. Its mission is peace. (Johnson, 1964).

5.1. Lexico-grammatical choices

Table (1): Analysis of the lexico-grammatical choices in Johnson's Speech

Category	Key items
NPs conceptualized as elements of the IDCs	American people, United States ships, military forces of the United States, commanders and crews, the United States Navy, I, me, we, us, the United States, peaceful villagers of South Viet-Nam, all Americans, the people and the government of South Viet-Nam, We Americans, the Secretary of State, friends, the leaders of both parties, the Congress of the United States, our Government, support of freedom, defense of peace, struggle for peace and security
NPs conceptualized as elements of the ODCs	Gunboats, supporting facilities in North Viet-Nam, terror, and adversaries
VPs of motion and directionality conceptualized together as indicators of movement of ODCs towards the deictic center and vice versa	Brings home
VPs of action conceptualized as indicators of contact between ODCs and IDCs	Take action in reply, carry out, and seek
NPs expressing abstract notions conceptualized as anticipations of potential contact between ODCs and IDCs	Acts of violence and limited military action
NPs expressing abstract notions conceptualized as effects of actual contact between ODCs and IDCs.	Engagement, hostile actions, alert defense, positive reply, hostile operations, and air action

The table shows that the elements of the IDC involve lexical items and phrases, such as "*American people, peaceful villagers of South Viet-Nam, We Americans, friends, our Government, support of freedom, defense of peace, and struggle for peace and security*". It is noted that *America's* part, like IDC, involves *we* and *I*, as speakers. It also covers significant items showing the unity of the United States, such as *the Secretary of State, the leaders of both parties, and American people*. Moreover, the friends of the United States are presented as "*peaceful villagers of South Viet-Nam*". In other words, Johnson indicates that the world and the peaceful people are on the side of America and its will.

The ODC elements include lexical items, such as "*gunboats, supporting facilities in North Viet-Nam, terror, and adversaries*". People of North Vietnam are shown as terrorists and adversaries. Moreover, the distance between the IDC and the ODC shrinks because of two processes: (a) the ODC elements are construed as physically affecting the IDC territory (*renewed hostile actions against United States ships on the high seas in the Gulf of Tonkin*); (b) the IDC elements are construed as active (*did actions*) and sometimes as inert (sooner a contact is established with the ODCs) (*the performance of commanders and crews in this engagement is in the highest tradition of the United States Navy*). In other words, they both affect each other.

The VPs of motion and directionality conceptualized together as indicators of movement of ODCs towards the deictic center and vice versa (the third category) are represented with lexical items, e.g. brings home. It shows the actions of the ODC as bringing threat and danger. To express the fourth category, the VPs of the IDC-ODC contact include (*take action in reply, carry out, and seek*). These categories suggest a unidirectional contact. In other words, the IDC affects the ODC.

The NPs expressing potential contact ODC and IDC (fifth category) are suggested by "*acts of violence and limited military action*". The ODC represents "acts of violence" that cause suffering and casualties to the IDC, while the IDC just performs a "*limited military action*" for defense. As a result, in the sixth category, there are "*hostile actions, alert defense, positive reply, hostile operations, and air action*" to the ODC. In order to stop the "*hostile actions and operations*" on the part of the ODC, the IDC utilizes "*positive reply and air action*".

5.2. Deixis

Table (2): Deictic analysis of Johnson's speech

Category		Items
Personal	1 st	My duty, me, I, our, We Americans
	2 nd	You, your Government
	3 rd	Others, them, these leaders, he,
Social		As President and Commander in Chief, Ambassador Stevenson, the leaders of both parties in the Congress, Senator Goldwater
Space		On the high seas in the Gulf of Tonkin, in North Viet-Nam, brings home to all of us, in the United States, in Southeast Asia, against the United States of America
Time		Today, tonight, now, will, just a few minutes ago
discourse		This engagement, and, but, that reply, this new act of aggression, such a resolution, It is a solemn responsibility, that firmness

The table shows that Johnson makes use of the three types of personal deixis. In terms of the 1st person, he uses most of the variants, i.e. "I", "we", "me" ...etc. This shows how much involvement is depicted. In taking actions, Johnson uses "*I ordered*" ...etc., but in the responsibility he employs "we". Furthermore, he extremely relies on "I". Johnson also adopts the second person, but in a less apparent manner. In other words, he uses "you" twice and "your" once to refer to the American government. Regarding the third person, Johnson uses some forms, such as "*others*" in "although others appear to forget" to indicate any nation besides the USA, "*them*" and "*these leaders*" to indicate the leaders of the two American parties in the American Congress, and "*he*" to speak about Goldwater.

Johnson employs the social deixis in this speech. He uses its examples for American people. For example, he refers to himself as "*President and Commander in Chief*". He refers to others using "*senator*", "*the leaders of parties*", and "*ambassador*". He only uses it four times. In terms of the space deixis, Johnson employs many of them to indicate both America and Vietnam. Indicating places in Vietnam or Vietnam itself, for instance, he uses "*on the high seas in the Gulf of Tonkin*", "*in North Vietnam*". He also shows the whole area using "*in Southeast Asia*". He also refers to the USA using "*in the United States*", and "*brings home to all of us*". He even shows the actions "*against the United States of America*".

Johnson expresses time referents in different ways in this speech. To express the present time, he uses "*now*", "*today*", and the present continuous with a temporal referent "*I am making to you tonight*". To indicate the state of the USA in the world, as well as its fight and efforts, Johnson uses the present simple, such as "we still seek no wider war", "its mission is peace" ...etc. Johnson also employs the past simple, e.g. "*just a few minutes ago I was able to reach Senator Goldwater*". He also expresses continuous actions from the past to the present, and even to the future using the present perfect, such as "*aggression by terror against the peaceful villagers of South Viet-Nam has now been joined by open aggression on the high seas against the United States of America*" to illustrate the continuous aggression of the terror of the North Vietnamese. Finally, the future is indicated using (will+ infinitive), e.g. "*will be limited and fitting*", "*that firmness will always be measured*" ...etc.

In terms of discourse deixis, Johnson shows a range of structures to show many past and coming incidents. For example, "*such a resolution*" is used to indicate the resolution he wants the Congress to pass and "*that reply*" suggests the positive reply of the American forces.

To show an addition, he uses "*and*" excessively. On the contrast, to contradict ideas and structure, he deploys "*but*" and "*although*"

To conclude, Johnson relies much on personal pronouns, except for the second person. He employs many structures to show temporal deixis, indicating the past, present, and future. He also addresses the different conflicting spatial parts; America and Vietnam. However, his use of social deixis is the least as it is reported four times only.

5.3. Proximization

Table (3): Proximization analysis of Lyndon B. Johnson's Speech

No.	Example	Type
1.	As President and Commander in Chief, it is my duty to the American people to report that renewed hostile actions against United States ships on the high seas in the Gulf of Tonkin have today required me to order the military forces of the United States to take action in reply	Spatial
2.	But repeated acts of violence against the Armed Forces of the United States must be met not only with alert defense, but with positive reply	Temporal/ axiological
3.	Air action is now in execution against gunboats and certain supporting facilities in North Viet-Nam which have been used in these hostile operations	Temporal/spatial
4.	In the larger sense this new act of aggression, aimed directly at our own forces, again brings home to all of us in the United States the importance of the struggle for peace and security in Southeast Asia.	Axiological
5.	Aggression by terror against the peaceful villagers of South Viet-Nam has now been joined by open aggression on the high seas against the United States of America.	Temporal/spatial/ axiological
6.	I have informed them that I shall immediately request the Congress to pass a resolution making it clear that our Government is united in its determination to take all necessary measures in support of freedom and in defense of peace in southeast Asia	Axiological

The table shows that Johnson uses the different categories of proximization in this speech. When used independently, these categories fulfill certain tasks, i.e. to draw closer mental images about what goes on in the War of Vietnam. However, when integrated, they draw a clearer image. For example, Johnson says, "*Aggression by terror against the peaceful villagers of South Viet-Nam has now been joined by open aggression on the high seas against the United States of America*", arguing that aggression against the peaceful villagers (axiological) has

been joined (temporal) by another on the high seas (spatial) against the USA.

– Temporal proximization

Johnson utilizes temporal proximization with other categories. He uses past and present actions to support his arguments. For example, he employs the present simple to show the determination *to confront the repeated acts of violence against the Armed Forces of the United States*. Johnson also mentions the actions taking place now, saying, "*Air action is now in execution* against gunboats and certain supporting facilities in North Viet-Nam which have been used in these hostile operations".

– Spatial proximization

The table shows that Johnson draws the IDCs using the American people, military forces of the United States, peaceful villagers. He illustrates the ODCs as hostile actions, gunboats and certain supporting facilities in North Viet-Nam, terror, and open aggression. The space between the IDCs and the ODCs is shrinking as the gunboats and *certain supporting facilities in North Viet-Nam* carry aggression against the *peaceful villagers of South Vietnam and the USA*. In this way, he makes what goes on in the Gulf of Tonkin clearer.

– Axiological proximization

Johnson draws a positive image of the IDCs as *our Government is united in its determination, supports freedom, in defense of peace, the struggle for peace and security, and positive reply*. On the contrary, he shows the ODCs as *terror, open aggression, and repeated acts of violence*. In this way, Johnson highlights the positive reply and defense of the USA (IDCs) and the negative image of terror and aggression of the ODCs. Consequently, Johnson can legitimize the actions and pass the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution.

6. Discussion and Findings

In this section, the results of analysis are presented. It is followed by some concluding remarks.

6.1. Lexico-grammatical choices

Table (4): Frequency of lexico-grammatical choices

Category	Number	Percentage
NPs conceptualized as elements of the IDCs	32	66.66%
NPs conceptualized as elements of the ODCs	4	8.33%
VPs of motion and directionality conceptualized together as indicators of movement of ODCs towards the deictic center and vice versa	1	2.083%
VPs of action conceptualized as indicators of contact between ODCs and IDCs	3	6.25%
NPs expressing abstract notions conceptualized as anticipations of potential contact between ODCs and IDCs	2	4.16%
NPs expressing abstract notions conceptualized as effects of actual contact between ODCs and IDCs.	6	12.5%
Total	48	99.98%

Table (4) indicates that the whole categories of lexico-grammatical choices appear in Lyndon B. Johnson's Speech I (48) times with a percentage of (99.98%). The category of the NPs conceptualized as elements of the IDCs is ranked first; it is employed (32) times with a percentage of (66.66%). However, the category of VPs of motion and directionality conceptualized together as indicators of movement of ODCs towards the deictic center and vice versa is ranked the lowest; the speaker deploys it once, with a percentage of (2.083%). The second highest frequency is that of NPs expressing abstract notions conceptualized as effects of actual contact between ODCs and IDCs, which appears (6) times, with a percentage of (12.5%).

In terms of the lexico-grammatical choices themselves, the word "I" is reported the highest, i.e. (10) times with a percentage of (20.83%). The "United States" is ranked second and mentioned twice with a percentage of (4.16%). The other choices are only mentioned once each.

6.2. Deixis

Table (5): Frequency of deixis

Category		Number	Percentage
Personal	1 st	18	16.82%
	2 nd	3	2.80%
	3 rd	7	6.54%
	Total	28	26.16%
Social		4	3.73%
Space		7	6.54%
Time		29	27.10%
Discourse		39	36.45%
Total		107	99.98%

Table (5) shows that deixis is employed (107) times in the speech, with a percentage of (99.98%). The frequency of discourse category ranks the highest; it is used (39) times with a percentage of (36.45%). However, the social category is the least frequent; it is deployed (3) times, with a percentage of (3.37%). Moreover, the category of time, which is used (29) times with a percentage of (27.10%), comes in the second position.

In terms of the subcategories, the 1st person pronouns are ranked first (i.e. 18 times), with a percentage of (16.82%). The 2nd person is reported twice only, with a percentage of (2.80%). Regarding the structures and words, "and" is ranked first and is deployed (17) times, with a percentage of (15.88%). "I", "that", and "the present perfect are ranked second and reported (9) times each, with a percentage of (8.41%).

6.3. Proximization

Table (6): Frequency of proximization

Category	Number	Percentage
Temporal proximization	3	30%
Spatial proximization	3	30%
Axiological proximization	4	40%
Total	10	100%

Table (6) shows that proximization is employed (10) times in this speech, with a percentage of (100%). The frequency of axiological proximization ranks the highest. It is employed (4) times with a percentage of (40%). Furthermore, the frequency of spatial and temporal proximization ranks second. Both are used (3) times with a percentage of (30%) each. It is noted that the frequency of the three categories is not that far. While spatial and temporal proximization are used (3) times each, axiological proximization is used (3) times.

The table illustrates their frequency independently. However, the three are integrated into one example, spatial and temporal proximization are mixed in two examples, and temporal/axiological proximization is mixed in one example. In this way, the speaker can achieve his goal, i.e. legitimization of the actions carried out. He can pass the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution.

Johnson did not employ the different tools equivalently. He did not use proximization categories similarly. He relied on a certain tool/category rather than the other. In this way, he could ensure the vote for his policies. Johnson could gain a ground for further operations in Vietnam, especially after the Gulf of Tonkin incident. In terms of the lexico-grammatical choices, Johnson utilized them effectively. He employed them 48 times.

In terms of deixis, Johnson used them heavily but in different percentages. Deixis was reported 107. The least utilized category was social deixis that appeared (4) times only. Additionally, the second person deixis was not utilized largely. Johnson made use of the three categories of proximization. In this speech, Johnson tended more to axiological proximization. It is noted that his use of temporal and spatial proximization was equivalent. Johnson, whatever the tools he employed, succeeded in legitimizing his actions and gaining the support of the audience. That is, he could gain the support of the Congress and pass the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution.

7. Conclusion

The results of analysis illustrated that Johnson could employ the different aspects of proximization. He also utilized the different aspects of the lexico-grammatical choices and deixis. He heavily relied on the "NPs conceptualized as elements of the IDCs". In this way, he highlighted the importance of the inside vs the outside centers. The space between the IDCs and the ODCs shrank. This way, Johnson drew an IDC-ODC dichotomy to gain the support of the audience. Accordingly, he could gain the support of the audience and pass the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution.

Bibliography

- Aghagolzadeh, F. & Bahrami-Khorshid, S. (2009). Language as a puppet of politics: A study of McCain's and Obama's speech on Iraq war, a CDA approach. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociological Theory*, 2(1), 218-229.
- Asghar, J. (2013). Critical paradigm: A preamble for novice researchers. *Life Science Journal*, 10(4): 3121-3127.
- Beshara, R. (2018). A critical discourse analysis of George W. Bush's 'War on Terror' speech: The rhetoric of (counter)terrorism and the

- logic of Islamophobia. *Journal of Language and Discrimination*, 2(1), 85-112.
- Biria, R. & Mohammadi, A. (2012). The socio pragmatic functions of inaugural speech: A critical discourse analysis approach. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44, 1290-1302.
- Black, J. (2004). *Rethinking military history*. London: Routledge.
- Bradely, M. (2009). *Vietnam at war*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Butt, D., Lukin, A., & Matthiessen, C. (2004). Grammar – The first covert operation of war. *Discourse & Society*, 15(2-3), 267–290.
- Cap, P. (2006). *Legitimation in political discourse: A cross-disciplinary perspective on the modern US war rhetoric*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press.
- Cap, P. (2008). Towards the proximization model of the analysis of legitimization in political discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(1), 17-41
- Cap, P. (2010a). *Legitimation in political discourse: A cross-disciplinary perspective on the modern US war rhetoric* (2nd ed.). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Cap, P. (2010b). Axiological aspects of proximization. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 392-407.
- Cap, P. (2013a). *Proximization: The pragmatics of symbolic distance crossing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cap, P. (2013b). Proximization theory and critical discourse studies: a promising connection. *International Review of Pragmatics*, 5: 292–316.
- Cap, P. (2014a). Expanding CDS methodology by cognitive-pragmatic tools: Proximization theory and public space discourses. In C. Hart & P. Cap. (Eds.), *Contemporary critical discourse studies* (pp. 189-210). London: Bloomsbury.
- Cap, P. (2015b). Crossing symbolic distances in political discourse space: Evaluative rhetoric within the framework of proximization. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 12(3), 313-329.
- Cap, P. (2017a). *The language of fear: Communicating threat in public discourse*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cap, P. (2017b). From ‘cultural unbelonging’ to ‘terrorist risk’: Communicating threat in the Polish anti-immigration discourse. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 15(3):1-18
- Cap, P. (2018). We don’t want any immigrants or terrorists here: The linguistic manufacturing of xenophobia in the post-2015 Poland. *Discourse & Society*, 29(4), 1-19.

- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Crystal, D. (2008). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (6th ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Darweesh, A. & Muzhir, H. (2016). Representation of the Syrian crisis in the American political speeches: A critical discourse analysis. *Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 3(1), 40-48.
- Dastpak, M. & Taghinezhad, A. (2015). Persuasive strategies used in Obama's political speech: A CDA approach based on Fairclough's framework. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 2(6), 13-27.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2018). CDA as dialectical reasoning. In J. Flowerdew & J. Richardson (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of critical discourse studies* (pp. 13-25). Oxon: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. and Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258-284). London: Sage.
- Flowerdew, J. & Richardson, J. (2018). Introduction. In J. Flowerdew & J. Richardson (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of critical discourse studies* (pp. 1-10). New York: Routledge.
- Germany, K. (2019). *Lyndon B. Johnson: Foreign affairs*. Retrieved on May 7, 2019 from <https://millercenter.org/president/lbjohnson/foreign-affairs>.
- Gray, C. (2007). *Fighting talk: Forty maxims on war, peace, and strategy*. USA: Praeger Security International.
- Hameed, M. & Hassan, R. (2017). Rhetoric of discourse: A critical discourse analysis of Tony Blair's speech about Iraq War 2003. *Adab Al-Basrah*, 80, 38-70.
- Huang, Y. (2007). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ifesinachi, G. (2018). Delineating the language features of war speeches. *English Literature and Language Review*, 4(8), 123-130.
- Johnson, L. (1964). *Report on the Gulf of Tonkin Incident*. Retrieved from <https://usa.usembassy.de/etexts/speeches/rhetoric/lbjgulf.htm>.
- Kopytowska, M. (2015). Ideology of "here and now". *Critical Discourse Studies*, 12(3), 345-365. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2015.1013485>.
- Kowalski, G. (2018). Proximization as reception. *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Braşov*, 11(60), 1-13.
- Lenz, F. (2003). Deictic conceptualisation of space, time and person: Introduction. IN: F. Lenz (Ed.). *Deictic conceptualisation of*

- space, time and person*, pp.VII- XIV. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics* (Vol. 2). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Machin, D. & Mayer, A. (2012). *How to do critical discourse analysis*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Mazid, B. M. (2014). *CDA and PDA made simple: language, ideology and power in politics and media*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Rashidi, N. & Souzandehfar, M. (2010). A critical discourse analysis of the debates between Republicans and Democrats over the continuation of war in Iraq. *Journal of Linguistic Intercultural Education*, 3, 55-82.
- Reyes, A. (2011). Strategies of legitimization in political discourse: From words to actions, *Discourse & Society*, 22(6), 791-807.
- Safro, E. & Agyeiwaa, E. (2013). Language at war: A critical discourse analysis of speeches of Bush and Obama on Terrorism. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education*, 3(2), 378-390.
- Sharififar, M. & Rahimi, E. (2016). Critical discourse analysis of political speeches: A case study of Obama's and Rouhani' speeches at UN. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(2), 343-349.
- Stapleton, A. (2017). Deixis in modern linguistics. *Essex Student Research Online*, 9(12), 1-9.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, P. Tanne & H. Hamilton(Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-371). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Yoder, A. (2007). *Brief overview of Vietnam War*. Retrieved on May 5, 2019 from <https://web.archive.org/web/20160803124531/http://www.swarthmore.edu/library/peace/conscientiousobjection/OverviewVietnamWar.htm>.
- Yuravlivker, D. (2006). Peace without conquest: Lyndon Johnson's speech of April 7, 1965. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 36(3), 457-481.