

HOW DUTERTE STATES HIS VIEW ON THE PHILIPPINES AND OTHER COUNTRIES RELATION: A DISCURSIVE STRATEGY ANALYSIS

Andifa Chaerunnisa & Haru Deliana Dewi

Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia

andifanisa@gmail.com; harudd.dewi7@gmail.com

Abstract: Different types of social or cultural background, combined with a region or social status, go into the making of spoken or written discourse. One of the interesting spoken discourses to discuss is political interview. It often reveals the intention of political leaders' way of speaking. While there are those who are subtle in their way of talking, there are also a few who do not, one of whom is the Philippines' president, Rodrigo Roa Duterte. Known for his outspoken personality, he often states controversial things that influence his country and derive critics from various places. Using van Dijk's (2004) framework, this study analyzes the macro and micro discursive strategies used by Duterte in delivering his views on other countries' relations with the Philippines based on his most-watched English interview with *Russia Today*. The findings revealed that the macro strategies used by Duterte are positive self-presentation, negative other-presentation, and outside polarization. Meanwhile, the mostly micro discursive strategies used are implication, lexicalization, and example/illustration.

Keywords: Critical discourse analysis; discursive strategies; ideology; *Russia Today* interview.

INTRODUCTION

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is one of the most important and inclusive branches of linguistics which first originated in the United Kingdom with the release of *Language and Control*. CDA itself puts the attention on ways of talking, thinking, and emphasizes 'the traces of cultural and ideological meaning in spoken and written texts'

(O'Halloran, 2005). It requires people's awareness to be able to analyze the social change and its effect on people's lives. This awareness is also needed as according to Widdowson (2000), implicit ideologies in texts, and the exercise of power in texts will be unveiled.

As Critical Discourse Analysis has been known for its inclusivity, there is one field that is most fitting for it to be applied, which is politics. Political debates, presidential campaigns, demonstrations, etc. are all the fields of ideological battles. CDA here will analyze written and spoken texts as social practice to find out the discursive sources of dominance, power, and inequality, which are all connected to politics. Van Dijk (2004) also supports this statement by saying that different and opposed groups are always in a high risk to lose in dominance and power. That is why political groups and figures need an organized ideology to compete and finally reach their goals in winning the public consensus and securing the power.

Several studies on critical discourse analysis of political view have been conducted, such as Rashidi and Souzandehfar's (2010). It analyzed how Republican and Democratic candidates of the US presidential primaries of 2008 show opposite view on the American troops' withdrawal from Iraq. This research uses van Dijk's (2004) framework on the macro strategies of 'positive self-presentation' and 'negative other-presentation'. The next research is from Sarfo and Krampa (2013). They found that Bush and Obama represented terrorism negatively while they represented anti-terrorism positively by using terms that highlight their emotions. It used van Dijk's concept of Critical Discourse Analysis, Fairclough, and Rudyk's notion of power as control in conducting the research.

The next research is by Sharndama (2015). He found that the inaugural speech reveals Buhari's support in strengthening Nigeria's foreign relations. Sharndama's research used Norman Furlough's three-dimensional Analytical Models as the theoretical framework. Another research that is similar to Sharndama's is by Abdelaal, Alisood, and Sase (2015). The research showed that Obama used certain vocabularies in convincing his audience about how brutal and

ruthless the Islamic State of Iraq and Levant (ISIL) terrorist group is. The last research is from Darweesh and Muzir (2016) that analyzed how American politician's speeches have been used to show negative opinion on the Syria's political crisis.

Critical discourse analysis about influential leaders all over the world has been conducted, but the analysis of Asian, especially South East Asian leaders, is comparatively small in numbers. Furthermore, these studies mostly did not discuss the social practice of the discourse thoroughly. Therefore, this research will try to fill that gap by analyzing one of the most influential Philippines' presidents, Rodrigo Duterte, using the aforementioned framework, and discussing the social practice of the discourse.

To start, Rodrigo Roa Duterte is the 16th and current President of the Philippines. Taking office at 71 years old in June 2016, he has made many controversial decisions such as extrajudicial killings that have murdered approximately 12,000 of drug dealers, including the innocents. Several countries, including the USA, have expressed their criticism on this campaign. However, Duterte justifies it as a way to wipe out drugs from his country. The Philippines' relations with the United States and other Western countries have also started to worsen due to their criticism on this issue. The Philippines, which was once close to the USA, has shifted its focus mostly to Russia and China. Duterte frequently-expressed rhetoric not only shows his favoritism towards the aforementioned countries but also is a breach of the Washington-Manila alliance.

Duterte shows both his favoritism and dislike in numerous interviews and speeches done in English and Filipino. His resentment towards the US and favoritism to Russia and China started to become well-known in 2016. He said that he is 'not a fan of the Americans' and requested the U.S. forces to leave the Philippines. In contrast, he expressed that he would be happy to join a new order under Russia and China if they created one. His two most most-watched English interviews with Russia Today and Al-Jazeera also showcase this contrasting attitude. The Russia Today interview was conducted at the

exact time when Duterte gets international attention for his personality and policy. This interview is also the most watched English interview of him that garnered about 2,3 million viewers and 16,000 comments on YouTube. This research, then, is conducted to analyze his way to show both his favoritism and dislike of the Philippines' relations with other countries in this interview. It will use van Dijk's (2004) framework of the macro strategies of 'positive self-presentation' and 'negative other-presentation' and other 25 micro strategies he employed. Based on the aforementioned purpose, this research attempts to investigate how Duterte states his view on the Philippines and other countries relation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Van Dijk (2004) introduces a comprehensive framework for political discourse analysis in *Politics, Ideology, and Discourse*. The framework consists of two main discursive strategies of 'positive self-presentation' (semantic macro-strategy of in-group favoritism) and 'negative other-presentation' (semantic macro-strategy of derogation of out-group) or best known as polarization. In expressing these main strategies, four basic strategies known as ideological square are used. The first is called *emphasize positive things about 'us'* which is used to emphasize 'our' good actions. The second is termed as *emphasize negative things about 'them'*, used to enhance 'their or others' bad characteristics. The third strategy is used to mitigate 'our' bad properties, which is called as *de-emphasize negative things about 'us'*. The last strategy is called *de-emphasize positive things about 'them'* which is used to mitigate 'their' good characteristics.

The macro-strategy of positive self-representation and negative other-representation is made possible through other micro discursive strategies or micro ideological discourse structures (see table 1). In some cases, the micro strategies can also be used to positively present the 'other'. Therefore, when it occurs, it is not included in polarization or the macro strategies of 'positive self-presentation' and 'negative

other-presentation'. It is then categorized as 'Outside Polarization Category'.

Table 1 van Dijk's micro discursive strategies

Strategy	Description
Actor description	The way we describe certain members of a society in either a positive or negative way.
Authority	Referring to officials to justify one's claims.
Categorization	Specifying people to different groups.
Comparison	Comparing out-groups negatively and in-groups positively or vice versa.
Consensus	Making generally accepted agreement on certain idea.
Disclaimer	Conveying something in positive attitude and then dismissing it by using certain terms such as 'but' in the following sentence. One example of disclaimer is "I have nothing against X, but...".
Euphemism	The avoidance of negative impression formation.
Evidentiality	Employing hard evidence to defend one's ideas.
Example/Illustration	Giving concrete examples to defend a point or statement made by the speaker.
Hyperbole	A device to amplify meaning.
Implication	Suggesting implicit information indirectly.
Irony	Saying something that actually means the opposite.
Lexicalization	The use of certain words in representing something
Metaphor	Comparing two things that are not alike but have something in common.
National Self-glorification	Dignifying one's country to create positive self-presentation. One example is "Our country is the land of opportunity".
Number Game	Using numbers and data to gain trust.
Polarization	Classifying people belong to 'us' with good characteristics and 'them' with bad characteristics.
Presupposition	An idea that is assumed to be a well-known fact.
Vagueness	Incoherence in expressing idea that creates ambiguity.
Victimization	Telling bad stories of people who do not belong to 'us'

Van Dijk's (2004) framework has been approved to be a comprehensive and effective conceptual framework. It combines essential linguistic, argumentative, rhetorical, semantic, and political strategies at the micro-level of analysis and an ideological dichotomy to reveal the language manipulation which benefits in-group members and disadvantages out-group members at the macro-level of analysis.

Chaerunnisa, A. & Dewi, H.D. (2019). How Duterte States His View on The Philippines and Other Countries Relation: A Discursive Strategy Analysis.

In addition, this framework considers multiple disciplines, such as politics, sociology, and history. Taking all of its advantages into consideration, this research will use Van Dijk's (2004) framework to analyze the corpus.

METHOD

The data used in this study are the transcripts of the interview of the Philippines' president, Rodrigo Roa Duterte, and Maria Finoshina from Russia Today in May 2017. The interview mostly talks about his war on drugs, human rights, and the Philippines' relation with other countries, such as the USA, Russia, and China. However, only the transcript which is related to other countries' relations with the Philippines that will be discussed. The transcript is taken from Russia Today's website.

The study began by collecting the required data for the qualitative analysis on August 5, 2018. For this purpose, the script of the interview of Rodrigo Roa Duterte and Maria Finoshina from Russia Today was collected from the official website of Russia Today. The interview video was also examined to ensure the accuracy based on the script of the talks. To analyze the interview, this research relies on the definitions of discursive devices provided by van Dijk (2004) and several papers where the researchers applied the aforementioned framework. NVivo 12 Pro is also used for linguistic inquiry.

FINDINGS

The findings revealed that the macro discursive strategies used by Duterte are positive self-presentation, negative other-presentation, and outside polarization.

Positive Self-presentation

According to the ideological square, positive self-presentation is achieved by emphasizing positive qualities and understating negative qualities about 'us'. In this study, there are three micro

discursive strategies used by Duterte which are categorized as positive self-presentation: lexicalization, implication, and number game.

Lexicalization

Some instances of lexicalization strategies used by Duterte are as follows.

(L1) *'I have to protect the innocent [...]*

(L2) *'We are an independent country. We will survive; [...] endure; we can go hungry.'*

(L3) *'And out of respect of my friendship with China, I said OK.'*

In L1, Duterte explained his justification on his drug war campaign as his way to protect the non-drug users. He utilized lexicalization as he said he had to protect the innocent and make the Filipinos prosper and live in peace. He did so as he wanted to give an impression of a caring leader by an attempt to protect his country from drugs. In another instance, after stating that the USA should not treat the Philippines as a colony, Duterte continued by positively presenting the Philippines through lexicalization. In (L2), he used the word 'independent', 'survive', 'endure', and 'can' when describing positive qualities the Philippines has. This utterance is categorized as emphasizing of positive qualities about us (the Philippines and Duterte). These contrasting ways of describing can also be categorized as polarization because this strategy classifies people that belong to 'us' to have good qualities and 'them' to have bad qualities.

Lexicalization strategy was also used when Duterte was asked why he did not go to the disputed island as promised before. As in (L3), Duterte responded by explaining that he did not go to the islands because of China's request. He said that China does not want other countries which are involved in the dispute to misunderstand and go there causing a ruckus. He positively presented himself through lexicalization such as 'respect' and 'friendship' when he said that he agreed to fulfill China's wish as he respected their friendship.

Implication

Implication as positive self-presentation was utilized by Duterte when Finoshina, the interviewer, suggested that Duterte might be accused of going easy on China and not fighting hard enough to win the dispute. He said, *'They said arbitral - I went more than that'*. He defended his decision to comply to China's aforementioned wish of not visiting the disputed island. Duterte implied that he tried his best to win the dispute; he did not just fight through the arbitrage.

Number game

Duterte justified his drug war campaign using number game strategy. Here, Duterte said that there are 4 million drug users in the Philippines: *'There are already 4 million [drug users]'*. This strategy is used as a way to show his objectivity and enhance his credibility. It is Duterte's way to emphasize that there are so many drug users in the Philippines and his campaign is needed to overcome this problem

Negative Other-presentation

In the ideological square, negative other-presentation is accomplished by accentuating negative qualities and downplaying negative qualities about 'other'. Micro discursive strategies used by Duterte which are categorized as negative other-presentation are implication, lexicalizations, victimization, example/illustration, evidentiality, presupposition, negative other-representation, and disclaimer. These strategies are mostly used to state the Philippines' relationship with USA.

Implication

The followings are instances of implication strategy used by Duterte.

- (11) *'Justice has to be equal.'*
- (12) *'It cannot be a justice for one, and another set of standards of justice for another [...]'*
- (13) *'They ought not to have said words that would either be in favor or against a candidate [...]'*
- (14) *'What's all that about Trump talking about the ISIS? I can talk to anybody.'*

(15) *'[...] During my term, if I survive the CIA, I still have five years to go...'*

(16) *'They started it, not me.'*

(17) *'It's enough that I respect trump. He is a friend, and he is welcome to come here in November.'*

When Duterte was asked about whether it was hard to avoid civilian casualties in the drug war campaign. He was vague in explaining the situation. Instead of only talking about the situation of drug war in the Philippines, he managed to bring the previous situation in the earlier question as the comparison to support his argument. In (I1) and (I2), he used implication in this utterance. It implied that if America was exempted on what they had done to Iraq, then Duterte should get the exemption too in the drug war situation in the Philippines. The standard of justice has to be the same because justice has to be equal regardless of who and what is involved.

He was asked as well about an event in which he declined the invitation to come to the White House. Here, Duterte tried to explain the reason why he did not come. He said that they (the USA) should not say something that could interfere with the people's choice in voting. When he mentioned as in (I3), he implied that he still remembered how the USA criticizes him and this is one of the reasons why he declined the invitation.

After talking about the election, Duterte talked about the ISIS. He still used implication here. As we all know, the USA has a close bond with the Philippines. America still has a significant influence there, including limiting how the country interacts to other countries. Moreover, if a country does something they do not like, usually there will be bad consequences. By saying *'I can talk to anybody'* as in (I4), Duterte implied that he is not afraid of the consequences and he can do whatever he wishes to do.

In (I5), Finoshina asked whether Duterte was serious when he said he did not want America in the Philippines. Duterte answered that he is serious, but it was the American troops that he did not want in his country. He continued by saying that it (the disappearance of American troops) might happen during his term of presidency if he

survived the CIA. When talking about this, he employed implication and presupposition. CIA (Central Intelligence Agency) is an American spying agency whose task is to collect information in handling foreign affairs. It has the right to perform covert military operations, e.g. killing high value terrorist targets. When Duterte said '*...if I survive the CIA,...*', he implied and presupposed that the CIA indeed can kill a certain target, including him. He does not use explicit expression as he assumed the fact that CIA can kill people is a common sense; hence, it does not need to be specifically asserted.

In (I6), Finoshina referred back to Duterte's statement in which he said he did not want any American troops in the Philippines. She asked whether he was afraid or not being perceived as disrespectful with that statement. She also asked whether it was the message that he intended to send to the USA. Instead of confirming or denying Finoshina's conclusion, Duterte used implication to answer the question. He said that the USA is the one that started disrespecting him and the Philippines by meddling with the country's matter and policy. This answer implies that Duterte's aforementioned statement regarding the American troops is intended to show disrespect to the USA as they have done it first to the Philippines. Furthermore, In (I7), Finoshina asked Duterte about what measure should be done for the Philippines and the USA's relations to improve. He said that it is enough he respects Trump. This answer implies that Duterte does not want the two countries' relations to be as close as it previously was. He thought that being respectful to each other is enough.

Lexicalization

The examples of lexicalization as negative other-presentation strategy are as follows.

(L4) *'When they drop the bomb there, it is so powerful that it also kills others there.'*

(L5) *'[...] They invaded Panama [...]*

(L6) *'They went inside, seized the country, arrested the president, brought him outside the country, placed him in a detention cell in New York. He faced a trial [...] and is convicted.'*

(L7) *'[...] Because the Western world, the EU, and everything - it's all this double talk.'*

(L8) *'Do I have the missiles to launch when they bomb [us]? So what will happen is going to be a massacre.'*

In (L4), Finoshina first asked Duterte about how his war on drugs has caused many civilian casualties. She asked whether it is fair for those victims. Duterte answered that it is fair. His reasoning being it could be accidental. He then continued by comparing his war on drugs to the bombing that the USA did in Iraq. His answer is the example of negative other-presentation, with the 'Other' being Americans. He did so by using lexicalization. By using the term 'kills', Duterte used this negative expression because he wanted to remind that Americans also did something wrong that is punishable by law, which is dropping bombs.

In (L5) and (L6), Finoshina asked Duterte whether the previously mentioned justice issue was the reason why he turned away from the USA. He answered by saying that the USA did not want to acknowledge that they are in the same situation, drugs-related. Duterte's answer is the negative other-presentation, with 'they' referring to the USA. He did so by using lexicalization as he explained how America invaded Panama. By using the term 'invaded', 'seized', and 'arrested', he wanted to remind how Americans invaded Panama and arrested their president because of drugs issue.

In (L7), After hearing what Duterte thought about Trump's behavior in handling the terrorism, Finoshina concluded that the Philippines's relations with the USA would be hard to improve. Duterte did not agree nor disagree with her statement. He responded by saying that he actually did not have any problem with America and he is friends with Trump. He continued to explain that his foreign policy has shifted from pro-western one to working with China and soon with Russia. He then told the reason behind that measure using negative other-presentation, with the 'Other' being Western world, the EU, and everything. He stated that the 'Other' was being deceptive by using lexicalization by using the term 'double talk' to describe what

they do. Double talk itself has a negative connotation. It means deceptive talk which has two possible meanings.

In (L8), Duterte explained the reason behind his decision of complying with China's request not to visit the island. He negatively presented China using lexicalization here. The words being used are 'bomb' and 'massacre'. These rhetorical questions implied that China can do bad and immoral things like bombing and massacre.

Victimization

Victimization strategy used by Duterte could be seen in the following examples.

(V1) *'America invaded Iraq and so many people were killed.'*

(V2) *'They went inside, seized the country, arrested the president, brought him outside the country, placed him in a detention cell in New York. He faced a trial [...] and is convicted.'*

(V3) *'[...] I was severely criticized by America.'*

(V4) *'Why did you invade my country 50 years ago?'*

In (V1), Duterte talked about how the drug war situation is comparable to what USA did in Iraq (the bombing). How Duterte mentioned America invasion in Iraq is an instance of victimization. This technique is employed to appeal to the interviewer and audience's emotions, because it reminds them of the losses the people have had in Iraq. According to Van Dijk (2004), concrete instances have more emotional impacts and easy to be memorized, so they are more convincing.

When Finoshina asked Duterte whether the previously mentioned justice issue was the reason why he turned away from the USA, he answered by saying as in (V2) that the USA did not want to acknowledge that they are in the same situation, drugs-related. He explained how America invaded Panama. Duterte told Americans' bad story of invading a country to appeal to the interviewer and audience's emotions. He described the invasion in detail to convince how bad is what the USA did to Panama.

In (V3), Finoshina asked why he declined the invitation to come to the White House. Here, Duterte tried to explain the situation. He confirmed that he could not come because he was busy. Then, he resorted to tell the deeper reason why he did not come. He said that the invitation came during the busy Philippines' election time, which he participated in. In addition, he was severely criticized by the USA during that election. Duterte used victimization as his strategy as he told America's bad story. He used the phrase 'severely criticized' to emphasize how he was criticized by the USA.

Duterte was asked as well whether he thought he would get people's support in changing the stance of being pro-western to leaning more towards Russia and China. This question was asked as the Philippines is known for its strong historical ties with the USA. Duterte responded by saying as in (V4) that the ties between the two countries were built upon the colonization that the USA did. Duterte implied that these ties are not something to be proud of, as the USA exploited his land. Duterte even asked a rhetorical question asking why they invaded his country. He continued with the negative presentation using victimization when he described that the USA conquered the Philippines and had taken advantages of the land.

Example/Illustration

Another micro discursive strategy used by Duterte as negative other-presentation is example/illustration. The examples are as follows.

- (E1) *'He said, 'Oh, I was expecting your call. You're doing it alright. They are flooding my country with drugs, too...'*
- (E2) *'So, the EU granted us 200 million, and this grant carried with it a condition that this money would be used to improve the human rights [...].'*
- (E3) *'They can even take the president out of his country for him to face trial in another country.'*
- (E4) *'They sat on this land and lived off the fat of the land.'*
- (E5) *'Why would I allow you to treat me as if I am your representative here, as your colonial governor?'*

Finoshina proceeded to ask Duterte about whether he would be 'in peace' with the USA in Trump's administration. Duterte's answer (see EI1) was rather vague, but he implied that he is in good relations with Trump. Even so, he still implied that the USA is a hypocrite for criticizing his war on drugs. Duterte used Example/Illustration in answering this question. Duterte told the story when he gave congratulatory call for Trump. He said that when they were talking about drugs flooding their countries, Trump said he was going to handle it harshly. Duterte stated that 'harsh' was his word, and he was the first one to use it when talking about war on drugs. The fact that Trump said that he was going after the drugs harshly and proceeded to criticize him made Duterte think that the USA is a hypocrite.

In (EI2), he continued to explain that his foreign policy has shifted from pro-western one to working with China and soon with Russia. He then told the reason behind that measure using negative other-presentation, with the 'Other' being Western world, the EU, and everything. He stated that the 'Other' was being deceptive. Duterte then provided the reason why he used that term. He used the strategy example/illustration to mention the instance in which EU gave 200 million to the Philippines. Instead of giving the Philippines the authority how to utilize the money, they gave one condition which states that the money must be used in improving human rights.

When Finoshina asked whether Duterte expected he would get assassinated as he talked about it a lot. He answered that it could happen to him by using example/illustration (see EI3). He illustrated that the CIA has the power in taking any president out of their countries and facing trial in another country, which is called extraordinary rendition. Extraordinary rendition is the illegal capturing of a detainee to be interrogated. Duterte used this example as a way to appeal to the interviewer's and viewers' emotion. This example is to convince that what he said about the CIA is true.

In (EI4), Duterte implied that these ties are not something to be proud of, as it was built upon the colonization that the USA did. He elaborated his justification using example/illustration when he

described that the USA conquered the Philippines and had taken advantages of the land.

In (EI5), Duterte explained about his resentment towards the USA. Using the strategy, he illustrates how he was treated as a 'representative' and 'colonial governor'. In the first glance, representative does not seem to have negative connotation. However, looking at the context, 'representative' here means 'a person who has been chosen to work for someone'. This word definitely made Duterte appear weak and have no control over the country. Lastly, the phrase 'colonial governor' also makes it seem like the Philippines was still a colonized country with Duterte who acts as a mere representative.

Evidentiality

Duterte justified the result of his drug war campaign by comparing it to what the USA did in Iraq. He mentioned 'America invaded Iraq and so many people were killed'. In this utterance, he used evidentiality by reminding people what America has done to Iraq. He presented some evidence to support his opinion that 'there is no fairness' in the response of both cases when in fact it kills many people.

Presupposition

When Duterte stated '*...During my term, if I survive the CIA, I still have five years to go...*', he presupposed that the CIA indeed can kill a certain target, including him. He does not use explicit expression as he assumed the fact that CIA can kill people is a common sense; hence, it does not need to be specifically asserted.

Negative other-representation

After Duterte implied that the CIA can indeed kill him, Finoshina asked whether Duterte expected he would get assassinated as he talked about it a lot. Duterte did not really answer the question, but he proceeded to negatively present the CIA when he said, '*They do it. Does it surprise you?*' in which the pronoun 'it' referred to

assassination. This example is categorized as negative other-representation.

Disclaimer

The use of disclaimer strategy can be found when Finoshina asked Duterte about what measure should be done for the countries' relations to improve. In the previous utterance, Duterte answered that being respectful to the USA is enough. Duterte then proceeded to employ disclaimer. He stated '*...But if I'm talking about arms and defense against ISIS, I'd rather [be] in my preliminary talks with Medvedev and President Putin*'. Disclaimer is presenting something in positive light and then declining it by using certain terms such as 'but' in the following utterance. The positive idea can be seen when he said that Trump is a friend and his arrival is welcomed. He then denied this statement by saying that he would rather talk with Russia about arms and defense against ISIS. Disclaimer briefly saved Duterte's face by him talking positively about the USA, but then he negatively portrayed the USA by comparing them to Russia.

Outside Polarization Category

In this section, the strategy is not used to represent the countries negatively. Therefore, it is not included in polarization or the macro strategies of 'positive self-presentation' and 'negative other-presentation'. The micro discursive strategies classified in outside polarization category include implication, example/illustration, comparison, and lexicalization.

Implication

The instances of implication strategy used by Duterte are as the followings.

(18) '*...And I can always go to China.*'

(19) '*...I'd rather [be] in my preliminary talks with Medvedev and President Putin.*'

(110) '*...The Russians are not only bright; they are generous and help all.*'

In (I8), Duterte talked about arms and defense against ISIS. Contrasting to negatively presenting the USA, Duterte managed to positively present China. He used implication in describing China when he said the utterance. That statement implies that Duterte thinks China is reliable because he can always go to them regarding the arms and defenses against the ISIS. In addition, when Duterte talked about arms and defense against ISIS. He used implication in describing Russia. The phrase 'rather be' as in (I9) shows that Russia is more preferable for Duterte when talking about arms and defense against ISIS. He then continued by saying, 'I hope that we can convert it to something substantial'. The fact that Duterte wanted to turn the talk to be something tangible and important implies that he trusts Russia.

In (I10), Duterte said he would need high-quality arms to fight the ISIS terrorists and avoid civilian casualties. After hearing this statement, Finoshina asked whether he would buy weapons from Russia or not. Duterte answered that he had not decided yet. But he implied he most likely will purchase from Russia. He said that not only is Russia bright, but they are generous and help all. This implies that the USA is not as generous and kind as Russia. If they had the same level of the aforementioned qualities, Duterte would not have compared both countries.

Example/illustration

The use of example/illustration strategy can be found when Duterte said '*Then I said 'I want to drill now, because we want to find...'* And he said '*Please, do not do it.*' And I said '*Why?*' - '*Because instead of being friends we will be enemies, and there might be war*'. In this utterance, Duterte talked about his decision to comply to China's aforementioned wish. He told why he did not go to the disputed island as he was previously promised. He explained the discussion between him and China by using example/illustration. He illustrated how China convinces him not to go to the islands. From this strategy, it can be seen that China wants no conflict happens to both countries' relations.

Comparison

Comparison strategy is used by Duterte when, for instance, Duterte talked about purchasing arms to fight terrorism. He compared both countries by saying that since '*...Russia is brighter than America,*' he would go to Russia. This implies that the USA level is lower than Russia. It is also implied that he probably would purchase the arms from Russia.

Lexicalization

Duterte said he would need high-quality arms to fight them and avoid civilian casualties. After hearing this statement, Finoshina asked whether he would buy weapons from Russia or not. Duterte answered that he had not decided yet. He continued his answer by positively presenting Russia through lexicalization strategy by saying '*...They are more sophisticated, more precise. The Russians are not only bright, they are generous and help all*'. For Russia, he described them as 'brighter', 'more sophisticated', 'more precise', 'generous', and 'help all'.

DISCUSSION

Based on the interview analysis that has been conducted, the USA is being presented negatively the most compared to Russia and China. The discursive strategies that are mostly used are implication, lexicalization, and example/illustration. It might be concluded that Duterte dislikes his country's relations with the USA and tries to distance his country from them. In contrast, he positively views the Philippines' relations with Russia and China. With Russia, it is clear that he wants to form positive relations. As for China, even though both countries are currently in dispute, Duterte still considers China as his ally. He respects China and is careful in handling the issue to maintain their good relations. Besides, he also positively presented himself and the Philippines. Looking thoroughly at the interview, one apparent thing is Duterte continuously presented the USA negatively. Therefore, he applied the polarizing macro strategy of us (the Philippines) versus them (the USA). This strategy is used to reach two goals. The first one

is to break their control in the Philippines and the next is to convince the public to continuously support his war on drugs campaign. Duterte's obvious negative representation of the USA can be seen from his lexical choices and pattern of talk by using NVivo 12 Pro. The most frequently used terms are shown in the following figure.

Duterte's obvious negative presentation of the USA can be seen from his lexical choices and pattern of talk. The most frequently used terms are shown in the following figure.



Figure 1. Most frequently used terms in Duterte's utterances about the USA.

Figure 1 shows that Duterte used mostly negative terms when talking about the USA, such as invaded, colonial, seized, convicted, etc. By using these terms, he associated the country with negative acts that are related to colonialism. He also mentioned the countries which received the said acts, such as Iraq and Panama. Colonialism is no stranger to the Philippines. In fact, the country was colonized by America for 48 years. Duterte's strategy to utilize colonialism in presenting the USA was calculatingly done to reach his goals.

The history between the two countries began in 1898 with the Spanish-American war when the Philippines was still part of the Spanish East Indies ('Philippine-American War,' 2019). It finally ends with the country's independence on July 4, 1946. This period brought many destructions. U.S. forces burned villages, tortured the suspected guerrillas, etc. The colonization, then, affects the Filipinos' way of seeing themselves and the USA even many years after their independence. Doty (1996) discussed the way the USA maintains its colonial power. The first thing the colonial officials did is creating knowledge about them and the Filipinos. This knowledge brought the notion that America is a good-natured teacher to the Philippines, while the Philippines is an uncultivated novice with little understanding of what freedom is (Harris, 2011). Therefore, the Philippines's ability to act independently is denied as it is represented as still in need to be guided by the USA.

The aforementioned representation of the Philippines as incapable of governing themselves still continues until now. Duterte mentioned in the interview how the USA tried to control his government's policies. Their intervention started with the negotiation they made with the Philippines in the early independence period. The country might be independent from the colony, but for trading and military relations, it still follows America's preference. One instance can be seen from how the USA controls its trade and military access in the post-independence period (Hays, 2015). It applied monopolistic control that required the Philippines to import commodities from the USA, even though the newly sovereign country struggled to pay for it. In the political area, the Philippines is also being watched in how they practice the democracy that suits the USA's preference.

The colonization also makes the Filipinos feel a sense of unfinished revolution since America is still trying to control their country. Accordingly, they want to experience what freedom and autonomy really are, without their former colonizer controlling them. This deep-seated longing is utilized by the Philippines' political elites to create the national imaginary that is free of disgrace which was

inflicted by the colonialism. According to Panizza (2005), the elites try to appeal to the mass by promising to accomplish freedom through revolution after 'a journey of sacrifice'. They put emphasis on ingraining dignity and decreasing the feeling of subordination within the Filipinos. It can be seen when Duterte stated as follows in the interview:

'You treat me as if I am your colony still? [...] We are an independent country. [...] This time I want my country treated with dignity.'

Based on his answers above, it can be seen how Duterte positively presented himself and the Philippines, in contrast with how he negatively presented the USA. He illustrated how the USA treats the Philippines as if it were its subordinate or colony. He then continued by stating that the Philippines is an independent country and should to be treated with respect. He also presented himself as the revolutionary who wanted to change the existing condition of unfair treatment from the USA. It was asserted to show that he intended to bring the change or revolution so that the Philippines will be treated as its equal. This intention has been expressed numerous times in his speeches and interviews. This utterance is one instance that shows he dislikes both countries' relations and tries to stop the control and indignity the Philippines gets from them.

According to Webb (2017), the previously promised 'revolution' by the political elites, which comes in the form of breaking the power from the former rule (the USA), actually puts that power for the revolutionary themselves (Duterte). Duterte uses this longing for security and the aforementioned dignity to reach his second goal – gaining the public continuous support for the war on drugs campaign. From the interview, he used several lexicalizations which actually hyperbolizing the magnitude of the drug issue in the Philippines while dismissing any criticism on this campaign.

Duterte skillfully presented himself as a simple provincial mayor who works and protects his people. On the contrary, he

presented the 'other' (the USA), which criticizes his campaign, as destabilizers of his government. He framed the USA on several occasions, including in this interview, as a hypocrite who criticizes a vital campaign for the public's safety. Duterte invalidated their criticism and accused that human rights are used as a disguise to control his policy and maintain its power in the sovereign country.

Duterte's relationship with the war on drugs goes way back since the early 1990s when he was a mayor of Davao City. He portrayed drugs as a threat and the biggest problem for the Philippines' security. Thus, his number-one approach in reaching public security was going after the drug dealers. At that time, this campaign gained praises from the citizens and business leaders. Since then, he was admired for his 'tough on crime' persona and managed to be reelected six times as a mayor. Then during the 2016 presidential election campaign, he stated that the country was on the verge of being a 'narco-state'. This statement is not true as narco-statization happens when a state controls and protects drug trafficking activities (Quimpo, 2017). Duterte then made a promise of national prosperity with the fighting of criminality, war on drugs being his priority. Not long after his inauguration, he started his plan for the national scale of war on drugs. This campaign is ruthless as 12,000 have died according to reports (January 2019). Several countries and human rights organizations have expressed their criticism on this campaign, particularly towards the extra-judicial killings. He has been described as the 'serial-killer president'. Moreover, human rights groups also warned him about the possibility of him being charged and arrested by the International Criminal Court (ICC) for the killings. He ignored the warning as he gets the support from the Filipinos.

Their support on the war on drugs can be seen from several reports. The Social Weather Stations' (SWS) survey of June 2018 stated that 78 percent of the Filipinos support Duterte's war on drugs and are satisfied with the results. It stated that the public believed the campaign has not only succeeded in wiping out drugs from many areas but has also contributed in decreasing the level of criminality across the

country. This survey then concludes that the public considers the drug war effective despite the ongoing criticism from several places, including the USA. As the Filipinos have been struggling with high rates of criminality, their support towards the campaign is a justification of the killings as the price for their sense of safety and security (Quimpo, 2017).

However, from the same survey, about 78 percent of them were afraid that one of their families or relatives would be a victim of the extra-judicial killings. Other surveys also indicate similar fear starts to rise among the public. This result can affect the continuation of the campaign, which Duterte got his popular appeal from. If their fear overpowers their desire for security, the chance is they will no longer support this campaign (Lamchek, 2017). To prevent this from happening, he has made a continuous effort of positively presenting his campaign and negatively presenting those who criticize it, including the USA. This measure is done to ensure this campaign will last until his presidency is over, as he stated numerous times.

Based on the analysis above, several things can be inferred. He utilized the polarizing macro strategy of 'us' (the Philippines) versus 'them' (the USA). The continuous negative presentation Duterte made for the USA in this interview shows he is against their relations with the Philippines. Added with the positive self-presentation, it is his way to break the Philippines free from their control and convince the public to continuously support the war on drugs campaign.

The results of this research are similar to other research, such as those conducted by Rashidi and Souzandehfar (2010), Sarfo and Krampa (2013), and Darweesh and Muzhir (2016). It was proven that the discursive strategies employed by the politicians are used to enhance, diminish, shun, or worsen an issue. According to Cap (2008), the political figures' main goal is to seek justification for their actions. This research revealed how the discursive strategies are used to justify his view and reach the aforementioned goals.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of the interview transcript using van Dijk's (2004) framework unveiled that Duterte sees other countries' relations with the Philippines differently. For the USA, he is against their relations with his country, whereas for China and Russia he expressed his wish to form great relations with both countries. In justifying his opinion, Duterte employed both positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. However, for the most part, he negatively presented the USA and positively presented China and Russia. The most used discursive strategies in presenting the USA negatively are implication, lexicalization, and example/illustration. In this interview, he also positively represented himself and the Philippines. Therefore, he applied the polarizing macro strategy of 'us' (the Philippines) versus 'them' (the USA). Aside from using it to justify his view, the presentation is also used as his effort to stop their control in the Philippines and his appeal to make the public support his war on drugs campaign continuously.

As any research has its limitations, this research is no exception. This research would have been more comprehensive if it used more than one text to find out Duterte's other approach in expressing his view on the said countries' relations. Due to the limited scope of this research, future research can be conducted to investigate how manipulation is exercised in discourse to gain and maintain power – as further discussion is needed to make the public more aware of its form of practice.

REFERENCES

- Abdelaal, N. M., Alisood, A. M., & Sase, A. S. (2015). Investigating Obama's Ideology in his Speech on Islamic State of Iraq and Levant (ISIL). *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research* Volume 2(7), 228-246.
- Cap, P. (2008). Towards the proximization model of the analysis of legitimization in political discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40, 17-41.

- Darweesh, A. D., & Muzhir, H. D. (2016). Representation of the Syrian Crisis in the American Political Speeches: A Critical Discourse Analysis. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 3(1), 40-48.
- Doty, R. L. (1996). *Imperial Encounters: The Politics of Representation in North-South Relations*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Harris, S.K. (2011). *God's Arbiters: Americans and the Philippines, 1898-1902*. Oxford: New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hays, J. (2015). *Independence for the Philippines After World War II*. Retrieved from http://factsanddetails.com/southeast-asia/Philippines/sub5_6b/entry-3842.html
- Jenkins, S. (1954). *American Economic Policy toward the Philippines*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Lamchek, J. (2017). A Mandate for Mass Killings? Public Support for Duterte's War on Drugs, in Curato, N. (ed.), *A Duterte Reader: Critical Essays on Rodrigo Duterte's Early Presidency*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 199–218.
- New World Encyclopedia (2019). *Philippine-American War*. Retrieved from https://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Philippine-American_War
- Panizza, F. (2005). 'Introduction: Populism and the Mirror of Democracy.' In F. Panizza (Ed.) *Populism and the Mirror of Democracy*, 1-31. London: New York: Verso.
- O'Halloran, K.A. (2005). Mystification and social agent absences: A critical discourse analysis using evolutionary psychology. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, 1945–1964.
- Quimpo, N. G. (2017). Duterte's 'war on drugs': the securitization of illegal drugs and the return of national boss rule. In N. Curato (Ed.), *A Duterte reader: critical essays on Rodrigo Duterte's early presidency*, pp. 145-166. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Rashidi, N., & Souzandehfar, M. (2010). A Critical Discourse Analysis of The Debates Between Republicans and Democrats Over the

Chaerunnisa, A. & Dewi, H.D. (2019). How Duterte States His View on The Philippines and Other Countries Relation: A Discursive Strategy Analysis.

Continuation of War in Iraq. *The Journal of Linguistic and Intercultural Education* (3), 55-82.

Russia Today. (May 22, 2017). 'They want me to fight China. It's gonna be a massacre!' - Duterte to RT (Full Interview) [Video file].

Retrieved August 5, 2018, from

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rHjICmdyesY&t=1s>

Russia Today. (May 22, 2017). 'US, EU meddle in other countries & kill people under guise of human rights concerns' - Duterte. Retrieved August 5, 2018, from <https://www.rt.com/shows/rt-interview/389163-philippines-duterte-interview/>

Sarfo, E., & Krampa, E. A. (2013). Language at War: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Speeches of Bush and Obama on Terrorism. *International Journal of Social Science and Education*, 3(2), 378-390.

Sharndama, E. C. (2015). Political Discourse: A Critical Discourse Analysis of President Muhammadu Buhari's Inaugural Speech. *European Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, 3(3), 9-21.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2004). Politics, Ideology, and Discourse. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 728-740.

Web, A. (2017). Hide the looking glass: Duterte and the legacy of American imperialism. In N. Curato (Ed.), *A Duterte reader: critical essays on Rodrigo Duterte's early presidency* (pp. 127 - 144). Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

Widdowson, H. (2000). Critical Practices: On Representation and the Interpretation of Text. In: S. Sarangi & Malcolm Coulthard (Eds.), *Discourse and social life*. Harlow: Pearson Education.