Persuasive Organizational Patterns and Rhetorical Arguments in Donald Trump's Policy Speech on Jerusalem

Ali Salman Hummadi[1], Seriaznita Binti M. Said[2] and Amerrudin Bin A. Manan[3]

Abstract--- The skill of human communication is so crucial in the sense that the most successful and powerful people over the centuries are those who have mastered the ability of persuasive public speaking. Persuasion is the art of persuading people to form preferable social beliefs towards certain issues such as Jerusalem, and, thus, acknowledged through the effective manipulation of various persuasive patterns and arguments. Based on Monroe's (1955) motivated sequence pattern of organizing persuasive message, this article qualitatively analyses Trump's policy speech on Jerusalem to identify its persuasive organizational patterns. The study further investigates Aristotle' modes of argument(forensic, epideictic and deliberative) extending in the speech and their rhetorical functions in realizing those patterns. As an Arab, the researcher, being involved as a researcher participant rather than a passive reader at the research site, identifies the issue within the ambit of social beliefs. The results of the analysis demonstrated that Trump effectively and successfully employed organizational patterns to structure his persuasive discourse. Epideictic argument has been pervasively utilized by the speaker to realize attention, need and visualization steps of the motivated sequence pattern, while deliberative type is adopted to realize, partially, the satisfaction step, and, fully, the action step.

Keywords--- Organizational Patterns, Aristotle's Modes of Arguments, Monroe's Motivated Sequence, Policy Speech, Jerusalem

I. INTRODUCTION

A. *Background on Jerusalem*

Jerusalem is perhaps unique among the oldest cities in the world that is deemed historically and spiritually significant to Muslim, Jewish and Christian people alike. Regardless to the political and territorial issues involved, Jerusalem is religiously significant to all three monotheistic religions, Islam, Judaism and Christianity in terms of the religiously significant events that Jerusalem faced more than 3000-year old history [1].

In the heart of the city, which includes narrow alleys, there are four neighbourhoods: the Muslim, the Jewish and the Christian, and includes some of the holiest places in the world. The Islamic quarter is the largest of the four neighbourhoods, including the Dome of the Rock and the Al-Aqsa Mosque in an area known to Muslims as the Temple Mount. The Al-Aqsa Mosque is the third holiest place in Islam. In Islam, Allah took the Prophet

[1]*Language Academy, University Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia. E-mail: alialanish1977@gmail.com*
[2]*Language Academy, University Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia*
[3]*Language Academy, University Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia*

Muhammad by midnight from Mecca where the Sacred Mosque to the Al-Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem, and then dragged him from the Dome of the Rock to heaven. Muslims visit this holy site throughout the year, and during the month of Ramadan, hundreds of thousands of Muslims pray in the Al-Aqsa Mosque. Inside the Christian Quarter is the Church of the resurrection, which is of particular importance to Christians all over the world. It is located in the place where Christ's death, crucifixion and were witnessed. According to Christian tradition, Christ was crucified in Golgotha, and his tomb is in the church where the site from which he was sent. It is one of the main pilgrimage destinations for millions of Christians around the world who visit the Christian tomb and seek solace and redemption through on-site prayer. In the Jewish Quarter there is the Western Wall or the Wailing Wall, which Jews believe to be the remains of the temple of King Solomon. Jews believe that inside the temple of Solomon is the holiest shrine, the holiest site of the Jews [24,1,28].

As such, the question of Jerusalem is regarded one of the major reasons of contention in the on-going Israeli-Palestinian conflict and certainly one of the reams of quandaries that policymakers face when attempt to solve this lasting conflict. In several negotiations, attempts and efforts exerted to solve the conflict, such as Camp David, but these efforts have been confronted by the fact that to deal with the holy sites, mainly the Temple Mount, was not even prepared for in advance. It had been considered a very sensitive and provocative issue that cannot be put into negotiations until all other problems had been settled and solved [1]. For decades, the United States of America and the international community have failed to officially recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital until a peace agreement could be held between Palestine and Israel, since both sides claim and affirm the city as a capital.

B. Problem Statement

Aristotle defines rhetoric as the potential of finding the available arguments suited to a given situation [9]. Rhetoric is an ability to see the available means of persuasion . As such, rhetoric refers to all use of language which is effective and powerful in persuading, stimulating, or defending in any given situation. Accordingly, this study seeks to study the rhetoric or persuasiveness of Trump's policy speech on Jerusalem in terms of the effective patterns of its content organization and the ways these rhetorical patterns are realized in Aristotle's types of rhetoric or oratory: forensic, epideictic and deliberative.

C. Research Objectives

Producing a policy speech is very identical to creating a persuasive speech. Policy speech is a type of persuasive discourse in terms of the persuasive presentation and the rules needed for constructing persuasive speeches. Accordingly, the present research seeks to (a)identify the persuasive organizational patterns used to organize the persuasive structure of Trump's policy speech on Jerusalem and (b) further investigates the use of Aristotle' modes of argument (forensic, epideictic and deliberative) and their roles in realizing the rhetorical functions of those patterns in Trump's policy speech on Jerusalem.

II.   LITERATURE REVIEW

A.   *Language and Politics*

Chilton and Schäffner (2002) [7] believe that language is considered a central tool to construct social world. Speakers utilize the available resources of language to achieve things and put their plans into practice. They argue that constructing a social world relies on the choice of these discursive resources within specific activities where the resulting discursive actions derive their meanings from the employment of these resources within these activities. Charteris-Black (2011) supports the view presented above when he thinks that the spoken form of language represents the primary method of communication which is used as a gentle art of persuasion and establishing relations because language significantly contributes in forming social beliefs shared between people about what is right and wrong so that alliances can be formed around these beliefs.

The success of particular significant human communicative skills is linked to the effective use of language. Some of these communicative skills which are characterized as language-dependent include the potential to convey and request information about the past and future, govern the future behaviour of addressee, and fulfil different other sorts of speech acts. Even more dependent on the rhetorical use of language are such styles and techniques a stelling stories, instructing people, clarifying things, and creating and organizing arguments. These abilities and skills lie at the heart of politics. However, this does not necessarily mean that "political discourse could not exist without language that the political beliefs that we hold are dependent on particular aspects of the languages we speak" [12].This has also been reiterated and evidenced by Chilton who states that "the doing of politics is predominantly constituted in language" (2004, p. 6). Political public speeches are usually multi-authored texts legitimising the speech maker and persuading followers of his/her beliefs as a shared rhetorical purpose [5]. Making speeches is a vital part of the politician's role in announcing policy and persuading people to agree with it. Aristotle views speeches as "serving to indicate what is useful and what is harmful, and so also what is just and what is unjust" [11]. Aristotle draws the attention to the interrelation between politics and language whereby he considers politics as "action in pursuit of the highest good, based upon decisions, which arise out of deliberation" [11]. According to Aristotle, people deliberate about things which are within the control of our behaviour.

Language is a means of communication, a means of presenting and shaping content and a series of beliefs into rhetorical arguments in a piece of text. Language is inexplicable from the ideas it works to present, andhow language used is more impressive and attractive to scholars and linguists than the ideas themselves (Beard, 2000). By this meaning, Beard agrees with Sornig (1989) [27] as to regard the question of how things in political public speech are said and done is more important and relevant than the message itself regardless to the amount of information conveyed by a spoken unit. What solves the secret of the interrelation between politics and language is rhetoric. Campbell and Jamieson (2008) [4] claim that political processes and rhetoric are closely linked that the appropriate utilization of rhetoric enables presidents and political leaders in persuading addressee of their communicative purposes.

Adopted in different settings and in different forms, public speech turned to be "a most effective but challenging means of information transmission"[29].As a specific type of political discourse, [policy] public speech is

diversified in terms of the communicative intentions their speakers intend to achieve. These intended communicative goals are realized through the application of different organizational pattern of content. No matter how relevant speech materials are to guarantee success. What more important in achieving the rhetorical effectiveness of [policy] public speeches is the way speakers or writers cautiously arrange those materials into a certain organizational pattern or sequence in a way to make their beliefs and claims are easily accepted [the writer's emphasis] [29].

B. *Persuasion and Persuasive Political Speeches*

Persuasion can be defined as "the process of creating, reinforcing, or changing people's beliefs or actions"[16]. Persuasive speeches are presentations delivered by effective speakers to capitalize others by impressing them to think and act in a way different from the usual one, such as changing their attitudes toward past policies[23]. This is endorsed by Mehl (2017, p. 344) [17] who points out that persuasion "is the process of attempting to change or reinforce attitudes, beliefs, values, or behaviour", or to intensify something that already exists[22].The ability to manipulate persuasive arguments in an effective way will benefit speakers in different situations and setting, from community activities to career aspirations. Speaking to persuade audience will make the speaker in the position of an advocate and do his/her efforts to have addressee agree with claims presented and even act on them. Persuasive speaking is characterized to be interactive in the sense that speakers and audience engage in an interactive communicative process. Typically, the goal behind shaping and framing any argument into a persuasive discourse is to defend or refute an idea, to legitimize a decision, to sell a certain view or to motivate people for a specific action. To do that clearly and concisely, persuasive speakers need to appropriate not only the communicative skills of informing but other persuasive skills and arguments that are guaranteed to affect the listeners' attitudes and beliefs [16].

Nelson (2004) [20] emphasizes that the goal of creating persuasive communication is to alterthe subjective claims that the listeners hold towards a particular political policy. Consequently, creating convincing arguments to affect the public's beliefs is crucial to persuasion. Employing rhetorical structures and arguments in an effective manner is a key point to put into practices the interests of political elites when debating policy issues. Lucas (2009) asserts that persuasion is a process that is psychologically based. Persuasive argumentation is brought into being when two or more points of view exist in a given situation. Thus, speakers contend to make their own views overcome others through their persuasive powers. For instance, the speaker supports Social Security reform, but audience do not. The speakers' viewpoints may be completely different from each other, or the difference simply occurs in a degree. What is important and crucial to the existence of persuasion is disagreement. Otherwise, persuasion would not take place.

Although persuasion is commonly processed in every part of our daily life, there are situations when more formal acts of persuasion are crucial. It is dominantly prevalent in the political process [19]. Chilton (2004) [6] defines politics as a struggle for power in which language plays a significant role in communicating the presidents or political leaders' plans and thoughts. Language use, as elaborated by Charteris-Black (2011) involves the appropriate employment of rhetorical devices and tactics aimed at shaping meaning, organizing content, engaging emotions and influencing the argumentative message to make its propositions easily remembered and endorsed by

listeners. Political persuasion can be explored in different genres including presidential campaigns, political speeches, parliamentary discourse, blogs, or Facebook pages, etc. The current study will be dedicated to explore the political persuasion in political speeches, persuasive speeches on questions of policy in particular.

C. *Public Speaking on Questions of Policy*

Public speaking is the process and art of communicating information typically delivered before a large audience[21]. Understanding the mode and philosophy of your listeners, directing speaking goals into particular ends, choosing the appropriate speaking elements that gain your audience's attention and response are the key qualities of delivering effective public speaking. Good public speakers must have the ability to plan and organize their materials to relate to their audience, draw their attention to existing problems and the need to solve them, and revise their materials to develop their speeches[17, 16]. What makes public speaking distinguished is in the way information is conveyed[29]. In public speaking, the information is purposeful and aims at informing or influencing a group of listeners. The art of public speaking is not a new topic. Its long origins can be attributed to classical Greece (approximately 322-490 BC) [21]. Lucas (2009) endorses that throughout history, public speaking has been used as an important instrument of communication. As its name shows, public speaking can be seen as a method of publicly sharing your ideas and claims with other with the aim of influencing them to accept a decision ora claim. He characterizes public speaking as a vital tool of civic engagement. Lucas (2009, p. 5) goes further to describe it as "a form of empowerment" where the power of public speaking makes a difference and influence things and actions people care about very much. As far as political leaders and presidents are concerned, public speaking in general and political public speaking in particular offer them an opportunity to make a difference in things they definitely care about.

One type of persuasive public speech is the question of policy which is delivered with the purpose of making a difference or establishing change from the status quo, or from what is currently done and adopted. A question of policy, a type of persuasive speech, is frequently used in Congress to decide laws, but it is also used daily by people to determine how they ought to behave. A proposition of policy speech may call for people to stop a particular act, or to start one. For instance, some cities in the USA started preventing the use of single plastic bags in grocery stores. A period of time before establishing official public policy on this issue, organizations such as the Surfrider Foundation and the Earth Resource Foundation announced and adopted that people should stop using these bags because they cause damage to marine life. Here, local governments and private organizations initiated their efforts to convince people to stop engaging in a damaging act - shopping with single use plastic bags [25].Policy persuasive speech can be defined as a speech delivered by presidents or politicians in an attempt to persuade an audience to either support or reject a policy or claim[16]. The speaker, in questions of policy speeches, is demanded to advocate for an appropriate course of action. To achieve the communicative intention of a question of policy speech, speakers typically initiate their speeches by describing the status quo. If they argue for a necessity of change, they should first identify the problem existent in the current action or time, and then maximize the danger of problem to guarantee immediate consideration or a future political decision. Once they establish that there is a problem which the audience ought to consider, they can then offer their plans to be viewed as policies. After that, they demonstrate that their proposed policy will have more advantages compared with plans carried out in the current situation[25].These

questions assist speakers to decide the forms of persuasive arguments and structures that are necessary to support a specific policy construction. The speaker, president Trump in the current study, intends, through utilizing rhetoric, to have the plans, announcements or decisions proposed by his speech to become a policy. Questions of policy are different from questions of fact which argue that something exists or does not exist, and questions of value which point out that something is good, bad, or perhaps worthwhile [16]. Pertinent to our study, Trump's speech on Jerusalem is a policy speech or one of the persuasive public speeches that is directed by questions of policy. As such, many tips, techniques and structures have been used to find the best way of legitimizing his policies and persuading followers and general audience of the validity of his plans and claims.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Material

The purpose of this article is to investigate the persuasive organizational patterns and arguments employed by the American President Donald Trump to announce Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and have this political end as a policy. To achieve its goal, this research works on Trump's statement issued on December 6, 2017 retrieved from (https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/statement-resident-trump-jerusalem/). In this specific date, Trump delivered a statement in which he recognizes Jerusalem as the Capital of Israel. In his policy speech, Trump refers that the announcement of Jerusalem as the Capital of Israel marks the beginning of a new approach to conflict between Palestine and Israel. Remarkably, as an Arab origin, the data has been analysed through the lens of a linguistic researcher. Hence, the framework is the crux of the study.

B. Theoretical Framework

To analyse the data and reach the findings, the research adopts Alan Monroe's (1955) design of *the motivated sequence* to explore the persuasive organizational patterns that extend in the text and which are effective in persuading listeners on a question of policy. The study also adopts *Aristotle's three modes of argument or oratory*: forensic or legal rhetoric; epideictic or ceremonial rhetoric; and deliberative or political rhetoric[15]. Thus, the following argument makes clear the fundamental concepts of each of the two approaches and indicates the interaction between them in investigating the data under study.

Monroe's (1955) Design of the Motivated Sequence

In the 1930s, public speaking scholar Alan Monroe designed the motivated sequence pattern for persuasively organizing policy speeches that address immediate actions. The motivated sequence is a very popular and useful method for organizing content that aims at influencing audiences or persuading them to accept a policy or do a particular action. It is an organizational pattern that can be used to structure persuasive speeches and functions to persuade the addressee to react to a need or a problem that is delineated in the policy speech.It has proved to be highly effective in different communicative situations. The effectiveness of this model lies in the natural pattern of human thought this model follows in advising writers and listeners to draw attention, show a need, propose a solution, and then help the writers or listeners to visualize and act on the proposed solution [17,16]. Monroe (1955, p. 310) named five steps to characterize his Motivated Sequence pattern:

1.   **Attention**: the aim of this step is to get the audience's attention to the topic and motivate them to receive the problem. Monroe (1955, p. 321) determines the following methods to achieve the effectiveness of this step: "reference to the subject, reference to the occasion, personal greeting, rhetorical question, startling statement, quotation, humorous anecdote, or illustration". Similar to these, Lucas (2009, p. 340) refers to the following as tools to get the attention of the audience "relating to the audience, showing the importance of the topic, making a startling statement, arousing curiosity or suspense, posing a question, telling a dramatic story, or using visual aids".

2.   **Need**: the function of this step is to state the problem or to develop it. As its name indicates, this step operates in having the audience feel a need for change. This step should demonstrate that there is a serious problem with the existing conditions "in order to convince them that something must be done, felt, or decided" [17]. In this step,speakers present an analysis of what is wrong. It is the process of condemning strategies, of highlighting flaws and failures resulting in following the current situations. After developing the problem and the need for change, audience should show their interest to the problem and the need for change "that they are psychologically primed to hear the *speaker's* solution" [16].

3.   **Satisfaction**: After arousing a sense of need to change, speakers satisfy it through offering their solutions to the problems presented. This step also handles any objections to the solutions. The speakers, here, should explain their proposals through presenting enough details about the plans[17,16]. Monroe states that this "step has the purpose of getting the audience to agree that the belief or action you propose is the correct one, or of getting them to understand the subject you have chosen to explain" (1955, p. 323).

4.   **Visualization**: After offering plans and solutions, speakers should intensify the audience's desire by visualizing the fruition of these plans, beliefs and solution if implemented. Monroe (1955, p. 328) puts this in an excellent manner when he writes that "the visualization step should project the audience into the future so that they are emotionally impressed with an image of future conditions". The key element of the visualization step is to use a vivid picture to show audience how they will benefit if the policy and the proposition are believed or followed, and what bad results will take place if those do not come into force.

5.   **Action**: This step represents a commitment to the policy proposed. Thus, once the listeners are convinced of the advantages and merits of the policy presented to solve the problem, speakers are ready to call for action. In other words, Monroe argues that the function of this step is "translate the desire created in the visualization step into a definitely fixed attitude or belief, or to galvanize it into overt action. Many methods have been suggested to develop the last step in the motivated sequence: challenge or appeal, summary, quotation, illustration, inducement, and personal intention" (1955, p. 330).

Aristotle's Three Modes of Argument or Oratory

In the first book of his work *On Rhetoric*, Aristotle identified three types of argument or oratory [15]. The first one was the epideictic oratory which is defined, according to Campbell and Jamieson (2008), as a form of rhetoric devoted to the process of praising and blaming in ceremonial occasions. In this type of rhetoric, the audiences are invited to assess the performance of speakers in their skills of recalling the past and speculating about the future while keeping the focus on the present. Campbell and Jamieson (2008: 30) also add that recalling a shared past

"becomes an exceptionally important resource for epideictic speeches". Charteris-Black (2011) and Richardson (2007) [26] agree that in this type of rhetoric, the rhet or attempts to have an audience admire someone because of his good works or dislike him because of his bad works. More elaboration and details are also delivered by Dow (1989) [10] when she argues that epideictic type of discourse aims at providing communal understanding in situation where confusing is removed to make some event or object clear and understood to audiences. She (1989) adds that the event keeps confusing and troubling unless it is somehow explained with past experience including universal key values and beliefs. As such, audiences, in this type of discourse, are provided with guidelines assisting them to interpret the event or situation. Condit (1985) characterizes epideictic rhetoric as performing three functions defining/understanding, shaping/sharing of community, and display/entertaining. In illustrating the definition/understanding function attributed to epideictic rhetoric, Bostdorff (2011) [3] argues that epideictic rhetoric draws the audiences' attention to a community's main key values and beliefs to explain the issue and make audiences understand it. In the function of shaping/sharing of community of epideictic rhetoric, members of a certain community are linked together through recounting the community's legacy, shared values and other characters. Condit asserts that when a nation witnesses a crisis such as war, the employment of epideictic argument urges the community to discover what the events means, and "what the community will come to be in the face of the new event" (1985: 289). The third function of epideictic type of discourse is display/entertainment which is defined as the situation in which speakers are invited to display their eloquence through ceremonial discourses. Eloquence is defined by Condit (1985: 290) as "the combination of truth, beauty and power in human speech, and is a unique capacity of humanity". In this specific situation, as argued by Bostdorff (2011), audiences evaluate the eloquence of speakers as evidence of their skill of leadership.

The second type of Aristotle's three types of rhetoric is deliberative or policy advocacy. Deliberative rhetoric is the argumentative form of discourse needed to justify a new policy. Deliberative argument, as presented by Campbell and Jamieson (2008: 48-49) centres on "the issue of expediency; specifically, which policy is best able to address identified problems, which policy will produce more beneficial than harmful consequences, and which is most practical, given available resources". Aristotle characterizes this type of rhetoric as motivating audiences to advocate a particular course of action by providing evidence that the outcomes will be positive or negative[15,13]. In deliberative discourse, argument is a fundamental ingredient whereby those who advocate or reject a certain policy should assert their position towards this policy [14]. Hubanksgoes further to state that deliberative rhetoric should be inherited with two essential components. The first one is that, deliberative rhetoric "must offer some form of counsel on or advocacy for one decision over another", while the second component seeks "to influence an issue of indeterminate outcome"[14]. As such, in doing deliberative rhetoric, the rhetor offers arguments to adopt one policy over another, and the rhetor would argue the case of the policy and its expediency to the audience in an attempt to gain their support and acceptance. Deliberative type of argument, as reported by Kennedy (2007), tackles a significant debatable topic and is directed to a public assembly; it involves issuing decision about the future. In this type of rhetoric, the rhetor seeks to make audience desire a future decision – often a political decision. As such, it prescribes the future through utilizing its means of inducement and dissuasion, and its special topics of the advantages and disadvantages.

The third type is called forensic or judicial rhetoric which is concerned with evaluating past actions such as a crime. In forensic rhetoric, the arguer or the rhetor makes a description of someone's or something's past actions. The rhetor, here, either defends or condemns someone's past actions. So, forensic rhetoric deals with the past and it relies on accusation and defence as the means of achieving its end. Justice and injustice of someone's actions are the special topics of this type of rhetoric. While forensic oratory is widely used in courtrooms, it is also experienced any time in different settings when persons attempt to justify their actions or defend themselves [5, 26].

After elucidating the essential concepts of the eclectic analytical framework, the current study sets out to trace and analyse qualitatively the persuasive organizational patterns of Trump's policy speech through the application of Monroe's (1955) five steps of the motivated sequence pattern. The study also goes further to investigate how Aristotle's types of argument or oratory (deliberative, forensic and epideictic) extend throughout the speech and how they persuasively behave to realize the organizational patterns of Monroe's motivated sequence. The results of the present study will be of great significance for language teachers, learners and practitioners interested in adopting persuasive writing theories to understand writing skills of persuasive public speaking. The study might also be useful for writers and developers of curriculum and courses devoted to teach students and learners of persuasive writing in the field of English for specific purposes.

IV.   DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

This article provides a qualitative deep analysis of only one persuasive public speech directed on a question of policy, delivered by the American President Donald Trump on 6th of December, 2017. The selected speech revolves around, as argued by Trump in his speech policy, a lasting peace agreement between Israel and Palestine that is conditioned by recognizing Jerusalem as the Capital of Israel.

The aim of the paper is twofold. The first is to identify the persuasive organizational patterns of the policy speech under study through adopting Monroe' (1955) steps of the motivated sequence. The second, drawing on Aristotle's modes of argument or oratory [15], is to investigate the rhetorical arguments employed by the speaker in his speech and their rhetorical functions in realizing the motivated sequence patterns of the speech organization.

A.   Persuasive Organizational Patterns

The following excepts shows the analysis of the sample speech through segmenting the speech content into Monroe's steps of the motivated sequence accompanied with commentary on each step and the type of Aristotle' argument used to realize these steps.

"When I came into office, I promised to look at the world's challenges with open eyes and very fresh thinking".

At the beginning, gaining the audience's attention is the speaker's main task. In trump's policy speech, this part is built with three factors of gaining attention. The first is represented by his first sentence by which he relates to the audience through reminding them of his promise, when he assumed his office, to handle the world's challenges with fresh thinking. But mere attention is not enough; the speaker should work to establish his credibility and goodwill of the audience especially when one is debating on a controversial subject [18]. As the speaker completes his first strategy of relating to the audience, he strengthens his credibility and goodwill through utilizing other devices of

gaining attention: startling statement of opinion and startling statement of fact [18] represented by the sentences of the message below.

"We cannot solve our problems by making the same failed assumptions and repeating the same failed strategies of the past. Old challenges demand new approaches".

The speaker more strengthens his credibility and highlights the main idea of his speech by utilizing one of the **Attention** devices *arousing curiosity and suspense* when he openly declares that his announcement today marks a new approach to the relationship between Israel and Palestine [16]. This is clearly shown in the except below.

"My announcement today marks the beginning of a new approach to conflict between Israel and the Palestinians".

The speaker does not confine his speech just to gain attention and establish goodwill, but goes further to lead the minds of the audience naturally through the trajectory of the human thinking into the subject of his speech. In his speech policy, Trumps finalizes the first step with one of the methods of gaining attention represented by reference to the occasion [18] of adopting Jerusalem Embassy Act which states that American embassy is to be relocated to Jerusalem and to recognize that city as the capital of Israel as shown in the excerpt below.

"In 1995, Congress adopted the Jerusalem Embassy Act, urging the federal government to relocate the American embassy to Jerusalem and to recognize that that city - and so importantly - is Israel's capital. This act passed Congress by an overwhelming bipartisan majority and was reaffirmed by a unanimous vote of the Senate only six months ago".

Thus, by closing the attention step, the speaker psychologically prepares his listeners to the second step of the human thinking which is represented by the presentation of the nature of the problem and the need to solve it or to change its situation as shown in the following except.

"Yet, for over 20 years, every previous American president has exercised the law's waiver, refusing to move the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem or to recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital city".

From the very beginning of the second step, the speaker of the message establishes and develops the need for change through presenting a definite and concise statement of the nature of the problem [18]. Trump's messages of the Need step are organized in problem-cause-solution order [16] where he starts the body by identifying the central problem reflected by the previous American presidents' use of the law's waiver to prevent moving the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem or to recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital city. After that, the speaker proceeds in problem-cause-solution order surveying the causes of having the previous presidents issue these waivers. Two of these causes include the idea that recognizing Jerusalem as Israel's capital may impede the process of establishing peace between Israel and Palestine, and the previous presidents' lack of courage. This is clearly explained in the following excerpt.

"Presidents issued these waivers under the belief that delaying the recognition of Jerusalem would advance the cause of peace. Some say they lacked courage, but they made their best judgments based on facts as they understood them at the time".

The speaker, then, moves to the central device of realizing the second step by having the audience unconvinced with the existing conditions in a way to persuade them that a need to change the current procedures is necessary. Framing this message and its meaning is shaped through blaming and condemning the same formula that have been followed more than two decades, and pointing to flaws of repeating the same failed strategies of the past which resulted with no peace agreement as expected by previous American presidents. By this, listeners turn to be dissatisfied with existing conditions and beliefs and are psychologically prepared to hear and accept the proposed policy of the speaker as shown below [18].

"Nevertheless, the record is in. After more than two decades of waivers, we are no closer to a lasting peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians. It would be folly to assume that repeating the exact same formula would now produce a different or better result".

After motivating the audience and having them feel the need to change, Trump satisfies this need through offering his solution to the problem as a policy needed to be carried out. His solution of officially recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel is briefly and clearly stated as the audience is familiar with the solution which is limited just to the process of recalling Jerusalem Embassy Act. Thus, satisfaction step is realized in the following excerpts.

"Therefore, I have determined that it is time to officially recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel".

"While previous presidents have made this a major campaign promise, they failed to deliver. Today, I am delivering".

After offering his solution to be a future policy, the speaker moves to intensify the audience's desire by visualizing the fruition of these decisions and announcements. In this message, Trump is projecting his listeners into a prosperous present and future reflected by the interests this solution produces to the public betterment of the U.S, and the long-overdue agreement of peace between Israel and Palestine as shown below.

"I've judged this course of action to be in the best interests of the United States of America and the pursuit of peace between Israel and the Palestinians. This is a long-overdue step to advance the peace process and to work towards a lasting agreement".

Achieving peace as the central aim of the Visualization step is more visualized and intensified by the speaker by the means of projecting a picture of the positive present and future that the solution will bring, not just to the fighting parties but to the world as a whole. Trump is portraying that achieving peace is conditioned by acknowledging Jerusalem as Israel's capital. This is clearly shown in the examples below.

"Israel is a sovereign nation with the right like every other sovereign nation to determine its own capital. Acknowledging this as a fact is a necessary condition for achieving peace".

In the following messages, Trump is visualizing the benefits that happened as a result of recognizing, under President Truman, the State of Israel. He is moving audience to imagine and connect between the benefits that the past recognition of the State of Israel by the United States had brought to the area and the positive present that will continue if the policy and plan he is announcing are carried out. He counts the benefits and interests of that past

recognition through declaring that Jerusalem currently is the centre of modern Israel government, the home of the Israeli parliament, the Knesset, the Israeli Supreme Court, etc. Trump goes further to announce that being a State with Jerusalem as its capital, Israel and Jerusalem represent the centre of three great religions and the heart of one of the most successful democracies in the world. To intensify more the validity of his claims and the wisdom of the policy that he intends to legitimize, Trump is more picturing the pleasure and freedom of living and worshiping that brought to Jews, Muslims, and Christians, and people of all faiths that Israel worked for as a consequence of recognizing it a State. Thus, Trump is persuading his audience that recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and moving the American Embassy to it will guarantee a lasting peace agreement and a freedom to all faiths to live peacefully and to worship in respect of their beliefs [18]. By legitimizing his policy and solution of the Satisfaction step, Trump is picturing his audience in that positive future actually enjoying the results of his solution that pushes Jerusalem to continue as a place where "Jews pray at the Western Wall, where Christians walk the Stations of the Cross, and where Muslims worship at Al-Aqsa Mosque".

"It was 70 years ago that the United States, under President Truman, recognized the State of Israel. Ever since then, Israel has made its capital in the city of Jerusalem — the capital the Jewish people established in ancient times".

"Today, Jerusalem is the seat of the modern Israeli government. It is the home of the Israeli parliament, the Knesset, as well as the Israeli Supreme Court. It is the location of the official residence of the Prime Minister and the President. It is the headquarters of many government ministries".

"For decades, visiting American presidents, secretaries of state, and military leaders have met their Israeli counterparts in Jerusalem, as I did on my trip to Israel earlier this year".

"Jerusalem is not just the heart of three great religions, but it is now also the heart of one of the most successful democracies in the world. Over the past seven decades, the Israeli people have built a country where Jews, Muslims, and Christians, and people of all faiths are free to live and worship according to their conscience and according to their beliefs".

"Jerusalem is today, and must remain, a place where Jews pray at the Western Wall, where Christians walk the Stations of the Cross, and where Muslims worship at Al-Aqsa Mosque".

Once, the audiences are emotionally moved with an image of the future pleasure and pride, the function that the speaker carries out next is to transfer the desire shaped in the visualization step into a final call for commitments or a call to actions [18]. Although, Trump's statement is a one-point speech, it suggests more than one action and commitment to be carried out immediately or in future. *Summary,* as a method used most frequently to realize the **Action** step, is adopted to recapitulate the main points of the speech in a way to prepare audience to the following actions or commitments as indicated in the following excerpts [18].

"However, through all of these years, presidents representing the United States have declined to officially recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital. In fact, we have declined to acknowledge any Israeli capital at all".

"But today, we finally acknowledge the obvious: that Jerusalem is Israel's capital. This is nothing more, or less, than a recognition of reality. It is also the right thing to do. It's something that has to be done".

The summary of the points is followed by a definite suggestion of the policy or the course of action required to carry out. To mitigate the opponents' objections and critiques, Trump legitimizes the course of action under the authority of Congress which adopted Jerusalem Embassy Act as it is clear in the following excepts.

"That is why, consistent with the Jerusalem Embassy Act, I am also directing the State Department to begin preparation to move the American embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. This will immediately begin the process of hiring architects, engineers, and planners, so that a new embassy, when completed, will be a magnificent tribute to peace".

Since settling a lasting peace agreement between Israel and Palestine is the core and realization of the Visualization step, Trump, in the following messages, is enhancing the visualized aim or belief and more mitigating any other disagreements and opposed viewpoints. He announces that the solution of Jerusalem recognition will more intensify this agreement and have it a great deal to the parties. Neutrality and standing in an equal distance between the conflicting parties is one of the rhetorical devices employed by Trump to support earlier messages of Visualization step and to proceed developing the Action step. This is translated by the United States' support of a two-state solution suitable for the parties involved.

"In making these announcements, I also want to make one point very clear: This decision is not intended, in any way, to reflect a departure from our strong commitment to facilitate a lasting peace agreement. We want an agreement that is a great deal for the Israelis and a great deal for the Palestinians. We are not taking a position of any final status issues, including the specific boundaries of the Israeli sovereignty in Jerusalem, or the resolution of contested borders. Those questions are up to the parties involved".

"The United States remains deeply committed to helping facilitate a peace agreement that is acceptable to both sides. I intend to do everything in my power to help forge such an agreement. Without question, Jerusalem is one of the most sensitive issues in those talks. The United States would support a two-state solution if agreed to by both sides".

The following messages represent a second call for action or commitment achieved by another method of realizing Action step, inducement. Monroe (1955) reveals that inducement represents a quick survey of a few extra causes for taking the action in specific. Thus, the three other messages in the speech are more elaborations of the essence of the Visualization step as they are revolving around the peace project the solution will produce when implemented.

"In the meantime, I call on all parties to maintain the status quo at Jerusalem's holy sites, including the Temple Mount, also known as Haram al-Sharif".

"Above all, our greatest hope is for peace, the universal yearning in every human soul. With today's action, I reaffirm my administration's longstanding commitment to a future of peace and security for the region".

"There will, of course, be disagreement and dissent regarding this announcement. But we are confident that ultimately, as we work through these disagreements, we will arrive at a peace and a place far greater in understanding and cooperation".

"This sacred city should call forth the best in humanity, lifting our sights to what it is possible; not pulling us back and down to the old fights that have become so totally predictable. Peace is never beyond the grasp of those willing to reach".

Another realization of the Action step is presented by the president Trump taken, this time, the form of Appeal as a one of the manners frequently used by speakers as a development to the end of their speeches. Appeal, as explained by Monroe (1955, p. 196) is a definite and more or less emphatic method "to take a specific course of action or to feel or believe in some definite way. Such an appeal should be short and compelling and should contain within it a suggestion of the principal reason presented in the speech for doing as you propose". To justify Trump's call for action, he suggests a short reason by his argument that "Our children should inherit our love, not our conflicts" (Trump, 2017). In the two following messages, Trumps explains the source of hate and conflicts and his administration's endeavors to defeat radicalism of that source as pre-requisite for a long-overdue step to advance the peace project. As such, Trump builds his points of the speech end on the emotional appeal generated calling the Middle East as a source of extremity impeding the peace process to expel violence and claim a bright and beautiful future as shown in the last two messages as indicated in the following excepts.

"So today, we call for calm, for moderation, and for the voices of tolerance to prevail over the purveyors of hate. Our children should inherit our love, not our conflicts".

"I repeat the message I delivered at the historic and extraordinary summit in Saudi Arabia earlier this year: The Middle East is a region rich with culture, spirit, and history. Its people are brilliant, proud, and diverse, vibrant and strong. But the incredible future awaiting this region is held at bay by bloodshed, ignorance, and terror".

"Vice President Pence will travel to the region in the coming days to reaffirm our commitment to work with partners throughout the Middle East to defeat radicalism that threatens the hopes and dreams of future generations".

"It is time for the many who desire peace to expel the extremists from their midst. It is time for all civilized nations, and people, to respond to disagreement with reasoned debate –- not violence.

And it is time for young and moderate voices all across the Middle East to claim for themselves a bright and beautiful future".

In the following message, Trump ends his speech with a final call of action asking the political and religious leaders of the Middle East to join and work for the visualized central objective of fulfilling lasting peace. Trump's ending message takes the form of **Action** step and device of Summary by mentioning briefly two main points in his speech: exchanging old assumptions with open hearts and working together for a beautiful future [18].

"So today, let us rededicate ourselves to a path of mutual understanding and respect. Let us rethink old assumptions and open our hearts and minds to possible and possibilities. And finally, I ask the leaders of the region

— political and religious; Israeli and Palestinian; Jewish and Christian and Muslim — to join us in the noble quest for lasting peace".

B. Aristotle' Rhetorical Arguments

After segmenting and deeply analysing Trump's policy speech into its constitutive organizational patterns, this section is dedicated to discuss Aristotle's modes of argument used and to make clear how they behave in the text to realize Monroe's (1955) steps of the motivated sequence. In order to relate to his audience and arouse their curiosity or suspense which is the realization of the first of Monroe's Motivated sequence pattern, Trump initiates his speech by blaming the failed assumptions and the failed strategies of the past adopted by previous American presidents. He also makes the very use of epideictic argument when he goes further to praise the new approaches as the best way of overcoming the same old challenges. Trump attracts his audiences' attention when he exaggerates praising *his* own announcement by making a startling statement remarked as "My announcement today marks the beginning of a new approach to conflict between Israel and the Palestinians". To bring into being his new understanding that a current policy in dealing with the conflict between Israel and Palestine should be discontinued, Trump resorts to the definition/ understanding function of epideictic rhetoric to put an end to the step of Attention[8]. As this type of function plays a crucial role in issues of declarations, and allows the speaker to make clear an issue in terms of the audiences' key values and beliefs, Trump sets out to define the current problem and provide communal understanding of what has taken place. To do that, Trump paves the way to the new policy by aligning the present situation with past experience through making a reference to a past occasion when "In 1995, Congress adopted the Jerusalem Embassy Act, urging the federal government to relocate the American embassy to Jerusalem and to recognize that that city — and so importantly — is Israel's capital".Through this rhetorical act, Trump was successful in drawing his audiences' attention to an important thesis, and in preparing his audience to more development of the problem, more interpretation, and more understanding.

To state the problem or to develop it as this is the function of the second step of *Need*, Trump attempts to have the audience more understand the situation when he continues in exploiting epideictic rhetoric through defining and identifying the source of problem and through other references to past events. He explains the troubling issue when he states that for over 20 years, previous American presidents refusedto move the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem or to recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital city by exercising the law's waiver. He then goes further to explain that the presidents' behaviours are attributed to their beliefs that "delaying the recognition of Jerusalem would advance the cause of peace". Other reasons are ascribed to the presidents' lack for courage. Trump also provides evidence that the old same strategies did not bring benefit or betterment to the situation between Israel and Palestine when he mentions that "more than two decades of waivers, we are no closer to a lasting peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians. It would be folly to assume that repeating the exact same formula would now produce a different or better result". Thus, once the president has defined the situation and communal understanding by audience is reached, Trump moves to reveal or disclose his new policy, and to bring a new truth out into the open by stating that "that it is time to officially recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel", and that "While previous presidents have made this a major campaign promise, they failed to deliver. Today, I am delivering". Thus, through the use of epideictic rhetoric, Trump is able to frame his delivery of recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel as an

important social action needed as a solution to the harmful current situation as it is embodied in the *Satisfaction* step of Monroe's motivated sequence pattern. Consequently, Trump, by his speech, directs praise to his action and he honors his announcements of recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. By realizing the *Satisfaction* step with epideictic type of oratory, he attempts to have audience admire the present beliefs and emotionally impress them to visualize the merits of the proposed solutions and claims.

That is, as argued by Hubanks (2009), flavoring a certain discourse with epideictic themes does not necessarily preclude it from having a deliberative import. This is completely true and reflected in Trump's effort to visualize the betterment of his proposed policy.Since Monroe's *Visualization* step of the motivated sequence involves projecting the listeners into the positive present and future of the solutions and beliefs offered so that they are cognitively prepared to accept these visions [18], this specific organizational pattern is mostly dominated by epideictic argument which seeks to describe the present, and a deliberative type of argument which is concerned with the future. Since deliberative discourse makes audience desire a future merit of present decision through utilizing its special topics of the advantages and the disadvantages of the policy or solution proposed [26], Trump visualizes that the fruition of the recognition of Jerusalem and moving the American Embassy to this city will be in the best interests of America and the peace program between Israel and Palestine as remarked "I've judged this course of action to be in the best interests of the United States of America and the pursuit of peace between Israel and the Palestinians. This is a long-overdue step to advance the peace process and to work towards a lasting agreement", and "Acknowledging this as a fact is a necessary condition for achieving peace". Dow (1989, p. 294) holds that "crisis rhetoric cannot be viewed as a homogenous type of discourse; rather, it should be analyzed in relation to the different exigencies it responds to and the different functions it performs." Investigation of Trump discourse has often concentrated on the different exigencies from which the rhetoric arises. In other words, as *Visualization* step in Monroe's motivated sequence requires speakers to attract the audiences' support to their proposed policy, this specific step is reflected by different exigent situations ranging between deliberative strategies of gaining the support of the audience to epideictic strategies of praising the new policy. Trump starts this specific step with deliberative rhetoric advising audience that his course of action would be in the best interests of the pursuit of a long-lasting peace between Israel and Palestine. Trump re-emphasizes the present and future advantage of his new policy when he clearly states that "Acknowledging this as a fact is a necessary condition for achieving peace". Deliberative rhetoric is reflected in these examples in terms of Trump's attempt to show the expediency of advocating such a policy. Then, Trump moves to praise the current situation of Israel as a place of a modern Israel government, the centre ofthree great religions, and the centre of one of the most successful democracies in the world which has built a country in which Jews, Muslims, and Christians live together and worship freely according to their own specific beliefs. Trump attracts the audiences' attention that these advantages have occurred as a result of President Truman's recognition of the state of Israel in an attempt to refer that the best will happen if the new policy is advocated. Here, Trump built his epideictic rhetoric on past events, and his deliberative rhetoric in the projection of the future while focusing on the present. Although praise and blame are the tenets of epideictic rhetoric used by Trump to describe the current positive situation of Israel, praise and blame are not only used to define situations, but also to push towards accepting policies [14].Hubanks asserts that to praise or blame implicitly refers to signs of advocating or urging.

Inherent in each example of the praise and blame rhetoric associated with epideictic discourse is the advocacy-based type of discourse associated with deliberative discourse as this is evidenced when Trump writes that Jerusalem must remain a place where people of different religions live and worship freely in a reference to the expediency of advocating the new policy.

Trump finalizes his speech with the *Action* step making the most of the preferable deliberative argument. Because deliberative rhetoric deals with events taking place in future [15] and also focuses on the expediency of a proposed policy or course of action, deliberative type of argument dominantly controls the realization of this specific step though bringing into light that recognizing Jerusalem as Israel's' capital is the right thing to do as this decision will be a magnificent tribute to peace. Trumps makes the very use of deliberative rhetoric when he emphasizes the positive aspect that this decision will bring to Israel and Palestine through arguing that, by this decision, we will arrive at a final peace and an avenue far greater in understanding and cooperation. As this step represents a commitment to the policy proposed and urges speakers to call for actions, actions numerated by the president are characterized as having a performative character as a result of formulating them with deliberative rhetoric.

V.   CONCLUSION

The current study, achieved within the natural pattern of human thinking, has adopted a functional perspective to the analysis of the persuasive organizational patterns and Aristotle's rhetorical arguments in Trump's policy speech on Jerusalem. A close-reading and deep analysis of the speech showed that all of the organizational patterns of Monroe' (1955) motivated sequence have been used to structure the persuasiveness inherited in the speech. The study also concluded that Aristotle's modes of argument or oratory have been rhetorically utilized by the speaker to realize, in effective ways, the communicative intention of each of these steps or patterns.

As for the context of Monroe's five steps of the motivated sequence, the satisfaction step in the current study does not endorse Monroe's (1955) and Lucas' (2009) hypothesis of presenting enough details to support the recommended solution of this specific step. As pointed earlier in the discussion, because of the audience familiarity and knowledge of the recommended solution of Jerusalem recognition which has been adopted by Congress in 1995, Trump merely recalled the Jerusalem Recognition Act to satisfy the solution of the problem recognized in the *Need* step. Of interesting finding from the current study is the *Visualization* step which is more elaborated and sufficiently crafted by the speaker Trump settling lasting peace was its special topic and the way to capitalize audience's beliefs. Similarly, although Trump's statement is a one-pint speech, it called for more than one action or commitment realized by the use of three methods of forming the final step in Monroe's design of the persuasive speech.

In regard to Aristotle's modes of argument, the study revealed that epideictic argument is the most frequent type that was exploited by the speaker to frame the meanings and functions of the Monroe's steps. Although dominated by epideictic rhetoric, the emergence of deliberative strategies, though with little rate, in the Satisfaction Step and Action step in particular is attributed to the exigent situations of the discourse. In response to these exigent situations, deliberative strategies, beside the domination of epideictic ones, appeared in some positions where needed. With its three major functions of epideictic rhetoric, the definition/ understanding is the dominant function that is used widely and repeatedly by the speaker to remove confusion and interpret present situations. Throughout

the speech, the speaker uses epideictic rhetoric for praise and blame associated with addressing the here and now (the present) and references to past events and dates.

REFERENCES

[1]   Amari, C. (2009) *Religious Narratives on Jerusalem: Potential for Moderation in the Tense Relationship between Religion and Politics?* Paper presented at the Conference of Religious Narratives on Jerusalem and Their Role in Peace Building, Jerusalem. Retrieved from https://www.kas.de/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=673202bd-6cad-d46a-fddc-3836244156ea&groupId=252038

[2]   Beard, A. (2000) *The Language of Politics*. London, UK: Routledge.

[3]   Bostdorff, D. M. (2011) Epideictic rhetoric in the service of war: George W. Bush on Iraq and the 60th anniversary of the victory over Japan. *Communication Monographs*, *78*(3), 296-323.

[4]   Campbell, K. K., & Jamieson, K. H. (2008) *Presidents Creating the Presidency: Deeds Done in Words*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[5]   Charteris-Black, J. (2011) *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. New York, US: Springer.

[6]   Chilton, P. (2004) *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London, UK: Routledge.

[7]   Chilton, P., &Schäffner, C. (2002) Introduction: Themes and Principles in the Analysis of Political Discourse. In P. Chilton, & C. Schäffner (Eds.) *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse* (pp. 1-41). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

[8]   Condit, C. M. (1985) The functions of epideictic: The Boston Massacre orations as exemplar. *Communication Quarterly*, *33*(4), 284-298.

[9]   Crowley, S. &Hawhee, D. (2004) *Ancient Rhetorics for Contemporary Students*. New York: US: Longman.

[10]   Dow, B. J. (1989) The function of epideictic and deliberative strategies in presidential crisis rhetoric. *Western Journal of Communication (includes Communication Reports)*, *53*(3), 294-310.

[11]   Fairclough, I., &Fairclough, N. (2013) *Political Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students*. London, UK: Routledge.

[12]   Geis, M. L. (1987) *The Language of Politics*. New York, US: Springer-Verlag.

[13]   Herrick, J. A. (2001). *The History and Theory of Rhetoric: An introduction*. Boston, US: Allyn& Bacon.

[14]   Hubanks, J. (2010) Praise, Blame and Advocacy: An Examination of President George W. Bush's Post-9/11 Discourse and the Rhetorical Genres that Define it. *intersections*, *10*(2), 199-225.

[15]   Kennedy, G.A. Trans. (2007) *Aristotle: On Rhetoric.* Oxford, Uk: Oxford University Press.

[16]   Lucas, S. E. (2009) *The Art of Public Speaking*. New York, US: McGraw-Hill.

[17]   Mehl, M. (2017) *Principles of Communication: Public Speaking*. US: Pearson.

[18]   Monroe, A. H. (1955) *Principles and Types of Speech*. Chicago, US: Scott, Foresman and Company.

[19]   Mutz, D. C., Sniderman, P. M., & Brody, R. A. (Eds.) (1996) *Political Persuasion and Attitude Change*. Ann Arbor, US: University of Michigan Press.

[20]   Nelson, T. E. (2004). Policy Goals, Public Rhetoric, and Political Attitudes. *The Journal of Politics*, 66(2), 581-605.

[21]   Nikitina, A. (2011) *Successful Public Speaking*. Retrieved from https://www.isbtweb.org/fileadmin/user_upload/successful-public-speaking.pdf

[22]   O'Hair, D., & Stewart, R. (1999) *Public Speaking: Challenges and Choices*. Boston, US: Bedford/St. Martin's.

[23]   Osborn, M., & Osborn, S. (1997) *Public speaking* (4th ed.). Boston, US: Houghton Mifflin Company.

[24]   Reiter, Y. & Abu Khalaf, M. (2001) Jerusalem's Religious Significance: Jerusalem in the Faiths of Judaism, Christianity and Islam. *The Palestine-Israel Journal of Politics, Economics and Culture*. Retrieved from http://www.pij.org/details.php?id=169

[25]   Rice, T. S. (2017) *Fundamentals of PublicSpeaking*. Retrieved from https://www.canyons.edu/Offices/library/Documents/Fundamentals%20of%20Public%20Speaking%20V%205.2.3.pdf

[26]   Richardson, J. (2007) *Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis*. New York, US: Palgrave.

[27]   Sornig, K. (1989) Some Remarks on Linguistic Strategies of Persuasion. In R. Wodak (Ed.) *Language, Power and Ideology: Studies in Political Discourse* (pp. 95–113). Amsterdam and Philadlephia: John Benjamins.

[28]   Sulaiman, K. D. O. (2014) Jerusalem as a Uniting Factor for Muslims and Christians: Historical and Scriptural Grounds. *The IAFOR: Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 2. Retrieved from http://iafor.org/archives/journals/iafor-journal-of-arts-and-humanities/10.22492.ijah.2.1.04.pdf

[29]   Wang, C. (2016) A Comparative Genre Analysis of Schematic Structures in Public Speeches of Native and Nonnative English Speakers. *Linguistics and Literature Studies*, 4, 320 - 330.