

Fictitious Pragmatic Presupposition in Pompeo's China Policy Address: A Critical Discourse Analysis

Shengmeng Tu*

Shanghai Normal University, Shanghai, China

*bec19970902@163.com

Abstract

Politics and language are intimately intertwined, and politicians excel at using language tactics and techniques to achieve certain political purposes. Fictitious pragmatic presupposition is a special phenomenon of pragmatic presupposition, which transfers non-mutual knowledge that is disputed, unacceptable or, at least, unknown to one party of the communication. This paper aims to provide a critical discourse analysis of fictitious pragmatic presupposition in the speech delivered by Mike Pompeo at the Nixon Library, July 23, 2020. This approach makes it possible to expose the purposes and the realization of fictitious pragmatic presupposition as well as the underlying ideologies embedded in the speech.

Keywords

Fictitious Pragmatic Presupposition; CDA; Political Discourse; Ideology.

1. Introduction

On July 23, 2020, the US Secretary of State, Mike Pompeo, made an address at the Nixon Library, California. The speech is the fourth set of remarks in a series of China policy speeches that National Security Advisor Robert O'Brien, FBI Director Chris Wray, and the Attorney General Barr have delivered. Over the past few years, there have been some conflicts between China and the US. The speech, in which Pompeo completely denied and criticized China's domestic and foreign affairs, obviously escalates the tension between Sino-US relations. It is even regarded as the declaration of 'New Cold War' between China and America [1]. The address Pompeo chose, the Nixon Library, is particularly of ironic sense. As is known to all, in 1972, US former President Nixon visited China, achieving the normalization of Sino-US relations, and thus changed the situation of the Cold War. Almost 50 years later, Pompeo announced at the Nixon Library that the strategy of engagement with China initiated by President Nixon had failed. Nixon opened the door to China, and now Pompeo wants to close the door. Pompeo's remarks demonstrate that his special role and status in the turning point of the US policy towards China. Therefore, the speech is of vital important, not only instantiating characteristics of political discourse in general and of American political speeches in particular, but also revealing certain American ideologies and attitudes towards China.

The study of political discourse from the perspective of linguistics emerged in the 1970s with the development of Critical Linguistics (CL) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), which can be traced back to the work of Habermas, of Foucault, of postmodernists practitioners. Recent decades have witnessed the booming development of researches on political discourse. Lakoff claims that politics is language and language is politics (2). Chilton and Schäffner note that "It is surely the case that politics cannot be conducted without language, and it is probably the case that the use of language in the constitution of social groups leads to what we call 'politics' in a broad sense (3). They further assert that "politics does not exist without the use of language. It is true that other behaviors are involved: for instance, physical coercion. But the doing of

politics is predominantly constituted in language” (4). It is widely acknowledged that politics is closely linked with language. Hence, political speech, an eloquent oral form of political discourse is surely the case.

Although there have been some new developments in CDA research at home and abroad (5), the language mechanisms covered by CDA mainly depend on System Functional Linguistics, such as transitivity, classification, and modality etc., while the corresponding cognitive and pragmatic mechanisms, such as metaphors and presuppositions, are not paid enough attention (6). Presupposition has always been a hot topic in linguistics, particularly in semantics and pragmatics. Recent scholars (7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12) have proved the feasibility of presupposition as a CDA tool, but fictitious pragmatic presupposition, a supernormal phenomenon of presupposition, which transfers non-mutual knowledge that is disputed, unacceptable or, at least, unknown to one party of the communication has received fewer attention. Therefore, this study, within the framework of CDA will explore the purposes of Pompoe’s use of fictitious pragmatic presupposition in the speech, the realization of these purposes through fictitious pragmatic presupposition, and the underlying ideologies in the discourse.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

CDA is an approach to the analysis of discourse which views language as a social practice and is interested in the ways that ideologies and power relations are expressed through language. CDA may be traced back to Gramsci, Habermas, and Althusser and to the work of Foucault on discourse (13). The adjective ‘critical’ is associated with the Frankfurt school of philosophy, and it means both ‘self-reflexive’ and ‘socio-historically-situated’. Self-reflexivity and socio-historical situatedness, in addition to the concern with power, control, and ideology, are the defining characteristics of CDA (14).

Unlike many other forms of linguistics analysis, CDA is not only concerned with words on pages but also involves examining social context. The approach was first developed by Fairclough, who adopted a three-dimensional framework, i.e., description-interpretation- explanation, to analysis (15). Other approaches to CDA have been proposed, of which all tend to combining text analysis with wider social context. Reisigl and Wodak’s Discourse-Historical Approach uses argumentation theory (16), whereas van Leeuwen focuses on social actor representation (17, 18). Van Dijk’s Socio-Cognitive Approach to CDA employs a three-part model of memory (19), while Partington (20) and Baker (21) have suggested an approach to CDA which utilizes corpus linguistic methods to identify large-scale patterns. All of these approaches to CDA have in common the concern with ‘the partially linguistic character of social and cultural processes and structures’ (13), with ‘power in discourse’ and ‘power over discourse’, and also power through discourse, how discourse ‘constitutes’ society and culture and how it is ‘constituted’ by them. Because of its inherent concern with power and control, CDA has given special attention to political discourse, which serves as a theoretical foundation for the present study.

2.2. Presupposition

‘Presupposition’ has been the object of heated theoretical debate in the field of semantics and pragmatics during the 1970s and early 1980s. For traditional semantics, presupposition has presented itself as a problem of formal logic. The meaning of a sentence is its truth conditions, that is, the conditions under which it is true. In this sense, the truth condition of a sentence’s presupposition remains constant even under negation. For example, both “The King of France is bald” and “The King of France is not bald” presuppose that “France has a King”. By contrast, pragmatician’s accounts are more compatible with an understanding of discourse as cognitively bound social practice.

Table 1. 13 main presupposition triggers

No.	Categories	Representatives words and constructions	Examples
1	Definite descriptions	proper n.; third person n.; n. modified by another n. of possessive cases.	John saw/didn't see the man with hat. >>There exists a man with hat.
2	Factive verbs	Regret; realize; know; be glad/sad that; etc.	Martha regret/didn't regret drinking John's home brew. >>Martha drank John's home brew.
3	Implicative verbs	Manage; happen; forget; avoid; etc.	John managed/didn't manage to open the door. >>John tried to open the door.
4	Change of state verbs	Stop; turn; begin; continue; start; finish; carry on; etc.	John stopped/didn't stop beating his wife. >>John had been beating his wife.
5	Iterative and adjuncts	Again; anymore; return; another time; come back; restore; repeat; for the -nth time; etc.	The flying saucer came/didn't come again. >>The flying saucer came before.
6	Verbs of judging	Accuse; criticize; blame; charge; etc.	Agatha accused/didn't accuse Ian of plagiarism. >>Plagiarism is bad.
7	Temporal clauses	Temporal clauses constructors: before; while; after; since; during; whenever, etc.	Before Strawson was born, Frege noticed /didn't notice presupposition. >>Strawson was born.
8	Cleft sentences	It-cleft sentences; Pseudo-cleft sentences	It was/wasn't Henry that kissed her. >>Someone kissed her.
9	Implicit clefts with stressed constituents	Heavy stress on a constituent	Linguistics was/wasn't invented by CHOMSKY. >>Someone invented linguistics.
10	Comparisons and contrasts	Marked by stress, by particles like too, back, in return, or by comparison constructions.	Mary called Adolph a male Chauvinist, and then HE insulted HER back. >>For Mary to Adolph a male Chauvinist would be to insult him.
11	Non-restrictive Relative clauses		The Proto-Harrapans, who flourished 2800-2650 B.C, were/were not great temple builders. >> The Proto-Harrapans flourished 2800-2650 B.C.
12	Counterfactual conditions	Subjunctive mood	If Hannibal had only twelve more elephants, the Romance language would/would not this day exist. >>Hannibal didn't have twelve more elephants.
13	Questions	Yes/no questions; alternative questions; wh-questions	Is there a professor of linguistics in MIT? >>Either there is professor of linguistics in MIT or there isn't.

They postulate meaning as deriving from speakers and context, and are more consistent with approaches linking 'presupposition' to appropriacy (22) or shared knowledge among interlocutors (23). Moreover, many scholars identify 'presupposition triggers', some lexical items and syntactic constructions through which presuppositions are introduced. For instance,

Levinson summarizes 13 main presupposition triggers (24). These presupposition triggers will contribute to the identification of presuppositions in Pompeo's speech.

Currently presupposition is also evoked as a useful category for CDA, linked to the ideology underlying discourse. Presupposition is a "very useful concept" in CDA because they can point to speakers' or writers' commonsense assumptions, beliefs, and attitudes that are taken as given. Analysis of presupposition allows discourse analyst to identify implicit meanings in texts (25). It should be noted that presuppositions are effective ways to manipulate people since they are often difficult to challenge. Manipulative presuppositions postulate interpreting subjects with particular prior textual experiences and assumptions, and in doing so they contribute to the ideological constitution of subjects (7).

2.3. Fictitious Pragmatic Presupposition

Presuppositions are propositions which are taken by the producer of the discourse as already established or 'given'. But sometimes the producer may present a proposition established by himself dishonestly and insincerely. "It (presupposition) allows people to make implicit assumptions about things being true that may not be true at all. By presupposing q, instead of actually asserting q explicitly, speakers may want to hide or downplay the fact that q may be fictitious or at least questionable" (26). This would cause the generation of a special kind of pragmatic presupposition, that is, fictitious pragmatic presupposition. Unlike normal pragmatic presupposition, fictitious pragmatic presupposition transfers non-mutual knowledge between the two parties of the communication, which means the knowledge transferred are controversial, unacceptable or, at least, unknown to one party. Generally speaking, there are two forms in fictitious pragmatics presupposition: one is taking the fictitious message as the background information in an implicit way; the other is directly expressed in the sentence, that is to say, turning the fictitious information to the presupposed information of the following sentence (27).

There are different classifications of fictitious pragmatic presupposition in terms of different standards. According to the speakers' intention, it can be divided into subjective pragmatic presupposition and objective pragmatic presupposition. Objective fictitious presupposition is made by the speaker unintentionally, which can be called 'presupposition error', whereas subjective fictitious pragmatic presupposition, also named 'presupposition lie', is deliberately made by the speaker, with certain ideological purposes. From the perspective of rhetorical function, fictitious pragmatic presuppositions can be divided into negative fictitious pragmatic presuppositions and positive fictitious pragmatic presuppositions. Negative fictitious pragmatic presupposition has no positive rhetorical effect, while positive fictitious pragmatic presupposition has positive rhetorical effect. In communication activities, objective fictitious pragmatic presuppositions are often done unintentionally, which, in essence, is a kind of presupposition misplacement and therefore has no positive rhetorical effect. Thus, it can be called negative fictitious pragmatics. Subjective fictitious pragmatic presuppositions are deliberate. They are essentially a rhetorical strategy and have a positive rhetorical effect and therefore can be called positive fictitious pragmatic presuppositions (10). The focus of this study is subjective (positive) fictitious pragmatic presupposition, which is frequently appeared in Pompeo's 23/7/2020 speech. For the sake of convenience, all the fictitious pragmatic presuppositions discussed are actually subjective (positive) in nature.

3. Methodology

Based on the theories of fictitious pragmatic presupposition, this study attempts to explore the use of the fictitious pragmatic presupposition in the address delivered by Mike Pompeo at the Nixon Library, July 23, 2020. The analysis of the fictitious pragmatic presupposition is predominantly qualitative and descriptive, together with some quantitative methods when

necessary. Specifically, a number of major fictitious pragmatic presuppositions in the speech are firstly identified. Then, on the basis of that, the purposes of the use of fictitious pragmatic presupposition and the realization through the use of fictitious pragmatics presupposition are analyzed in detail. Finally, in light of CDA, this fictitious pragmatic presupposition will be discussed within the social context to unveil the underlying ideologies embedded in the discourse. Not all presuppositions in the speech are listed since it is neither possible nor necessary to analyze all the presuppositions one by one. Therefore, the focus of this study is on some representatives of fictitious pragmatic presuppositions in the speech.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Purposes of Fictitious Pragmatic Presupposition in Pompeo's Address

After the initial analysis, it is found that fictitious pragmatic presuppositions, which tends not to be the truth, are frequently occurred in Pompeo's speech. The use of fictitious pragmatic presuppositions is out of certain purposes. Specifically, the purposes are misleading the addressee, defaming the Communist Party of China (abbreviated as CCP by Pompeo in the speech), and fabricating 'China Threat'.

4.1.1. Misleading the Addressee

Fictitious pragmatic presupposition is often employed in the speech to distort the facts and smear the image of Chinese government. For those who don't know the fact, it would be strongly deceptive and cause misleading.

Example 1

"It was to explain the different facets of America's relationship with China, the massive imbalances in that relationship that have built up over decades, and the Chinese Communist Party's designs for hegemony."

The definite description of "the different facets of American's relationship" "the massive imbalance" and "the Chinese Communist Party's design for hegemony" presuppose that there are great difference and imbalance between Sino-American relations and that the Communist Party of China is going to dominate the world. It is true that there exists some difference between China and America, but it cannot be ignored that China and American share enormous common interests and that great achievements have been made over the past decades. What's more, China has always been pursuing peaceful development. It had never sought hegemony in the past and will not do so in the future. Therefore, Pompeo's remark is completely wrong and distorting the fact, the purpose of which is to mislead the addressee.

Example 2

"As time went on, American policymakers increasingly presumed that as China became more prosperous, it would open up, it would become freer at home, and indeed present less of a threat abroad, it would be friendlier."

The implicative verb 'presume' and the subjunctive mood indicates that as China became more prosperous, China did not open up, did not become freer and friendlier, but instead presented more threat, which is definitely distorting the fact. The truth is since the founding of People Republic of China in 1949, especially since the carry-out of the Reform and Opening up policy in 1978, China has become more and more open to the world and has always appeared as a friendly and kind country on the international stage. As a result, investors and companies around the whole world rush to start their business in China. Through the use of fictitious pragmatics presupposition, those who do not know the fact might be misled by Pompeo's deceptive words.

4.1.2. Defaming the Communist Party of China

In Pompeo's speech, fictitious pragmatic presupposition is frequently appeared to make groundless accusations of the Communist Party of China. By doing so, the purpose of defaming the Communist Party of China is achieved.

Example 3

"We gave the Chinese Communist Party and the regime itself special economic treatment, only to see the CCP insist on silence over its human rights abuses as the price of admission for Western companies entering China."

In the above example, fictitious pragmatic presupposition is triggered by the change-of-state verb 'insist on', which presupposes that there exist human rights abuses in China and the CCP only allows Western companies that ignore China's human rights abuses to enter its market. Such accusation is completely groundless and unjustifiable.

First, people in China all equally enjoy human rights and human rights abuses are firmly banned. What's more, Chinese government warmly welcome companies from all over the world to enter Chinese market without any additional conditions. Hence, Pompeo's accusation is absolutely defamation of the Communist Party of China.

Example 4

"We know that the People's Liberation Army is not a normal army, too. Its purpose is to uphold the absolute rule of the Chinese Communist Party elites and expand a Chinese empire, not to protect the Chinese people."

Fictitious pragmatic presupposition is triggered by the implicit clefts 'is to..' 'not to..'. Pompeo accused People's Liberation Army (PLA) of being the tool to uphold the rule of the CCP elites rather than the Chinese people, which is opposite to the truth. The fact is that the PLA have always taken protecting the ordinary Chinese people as their duty. In the past, the PLA dedicated themselves to driving out foreign invaders and reactionaries, thus helping all the Chinese people free from suppression. Today, as long as the Chinese people are suffered from hardships, such as flood, pandemic, the PLA will always be the first to the front, protecting the Chinese people. Therefore, the speech is purposely smearing the PLA and the Communist Party of China.

4.1.3. Fabricating 'China Threat'

Recent years has witnessed the rapid development of China as well as the unceasingly voice of 'China Threat' spread by some Western countries with ulterior motives. Pompeo's speech is no exception. He spared no efforts to fabricate 'China Threat' in the speech regardless of the fact.

Example 5

"And now my goal today is to put it all together for the American people and detail what the China threat means for our economy, for our liberty, and indeed for the future of free democracies around the world."

The definite description of 'the China threat' is directly expressed in the sentence, turning the fictitious message to the presupposed information of the following content. Pompeo fabricates that China is exploiting American economy, liberty, and world democracies, indicating that China poses a threat to the whole world. Such remarks are not true because China has always been held on to the path of peaceful development. Xi Jinping, the General Secretary of China, has promised that China will never seek hegemony even if it grows stronger. Thus, the pragmatic presupposition 'the China threat' is fictitious.

Example 6

"Not every nation will approach China in the same way, nor should they. Every nation will have to come to its own understanding of how to protect its own sovereignty, how to protect its own

economic prosperity, and how to protect its ideals from the tentacles of the Chinese Communist Party.”

The presupposition above is triggered by the implicative verb ‘protect’, implying that China has posed a threat to other countries’ sovereignty, economic prosperity, and ideals. Pompeo sparing no efforts to hype up the ‘China threat’ to the whole world is made up with viciousness. The purpose is to isolate China from other countries, and to maintain America the status as the world’s only super country. It is not China but America, that threatens the world peace. The recent chaos in Afghanistan has proved that America is actually the biggest trouble to the world peace.

4.2. Realization of Fictitious Pragmatic Presupposition in Pompeo’s Address

The fictitious pragmatic presupposition employed by Pompeo to realize his certain purposes can be divided into three types, i.e., distorting the truth, making groundless accusation, and drawing false analogy. None of these three types of fictitious pragmatic presupposition are in accordance with the reality, but rather made up by Pompeo with unilateral thoughts.

4.2.1. Distorting the Truth

Among the fictitious pragmatic presuppositions in Pompeo’s address, one of the most frequently used falls into the type of distorting the truth. The speech artfully presupposes something that is inconsistent with the fact for the purpose of leading the audience into the wrong direction.

Example 7

“But today -- today we’re all still wearing masks and watching the pandemic’s body count rise because the CCP failed in its promises to the world.”

“Just think how much better off the world would be -- not to mention the people inside of China -- if we had been able to hear from the doctors in Wuhan and they’d been allowed to raise the alarm about the outbreak of a new and novel virus.”

In the Example 7, Pompeo tried to shirk the responsibility of preventing the pandemic to the CCP. Although it is true that the local Chinese government did not take prompt actions when the pandemic appeared in Wuhan at the end of 2019. However, the CCP now has controlled the spread of the pandemic at all costs. The responsible attitude of the CCP is in sharp contrast with America government, who gives priority to economy rather than human life. It is also very ironic that Pompeo made this speech on the day when the number of confirmed infections of Covid 19 in America exceeded 4 million. The Secretary of State, like the president and other officials, refused to take any responsibility for the America becoming the worst-occupied country of this terrible pandemic. Instead, he unashamedly asserted that it was the CCP’s failure to its promises to the world that led the Americans to the dilemma. Furthermore, it is found that earlier than 2019, there were confirmed infections in Europe and America, proving that the original source of the pandemic is not in Wuhan. Thus, Pompeo implicitly took the fictitious message as the background information, which is extremely spiteful.

Example 8

“But I call on every leader of every nation to start by doing what America has done to simply insist on reciprocity, to insist on transparency and accountability from the Chinese Communist Party.”

“And the State Department -- at every level, all across the world -- has engaged with our Chinese counterparts simply to demand fairness and reciprocity.”

The implicative verb ‘insist on’ and the change-of-state verb ‘demand’ presuppose that the Communist Party of China is not accountable and transparent, and that doing business with China is not reciprocal and fair. What Pompeo said is absolutely not true. China, as a member of the UN Security Council, has always been responsible and disciplined. Since entering WTO in 2001, China has increasingly established fair and reciprocal business relations with numerous

countries, particularly with America. It is inevitably that there are some trade frictions, but the great achievement made by the two big countries is the hard evidence to refute Pompeo's remarks.

Example 9

"And we've created a Space Force to help deter China from aggression on that final frontier."

The fictitious pragmatic presupposition in the Example 9 is triggered by the change-of-state verb 'deter', the verb implying that China has been aggressive in space. The fact is after World War II, it is the Soviet Union and the America that started arms race, vying for the dominance in space. In 1961, Soviet astronaut Yuri Gagarin was the first to enter space, followed by American astronaut Shepard. A few years later, Amsterdam, also from America, became the first man landing on the moon. With the collapse of the Soviet Union, America has become more aggressive in space. Therefore, Pompeo is like the thief shouting 'stop thief', which is a typical example of fictitious pragmatic presupposition that distorts the truth.

4.2.2. Making Groundless Accusations

In Pompeo's speech, fictitious pragmatic presupposition is used by making groundless accusations of the Communist Party of China. When making such accusation, the purpose is clear, that is, to defame the Chinese government. The following are some typical examples.

Example 10

"I've met with Uyghurs and ethnic Kazakhs who escaped Xinjiang's concentration camps."

The change-of-state verb 'escape' presupposes that there exists concentration camps in Xinjiang, China. It is known that concentration camps are places where prisoners are held. The most notorious concentration camps are those of German Nazi during the World War II, in which Nazi carried out genocidal massacres of Jews. China is not German Nazi, and Uyghurs and Kazakhs are not Jews. All ethnic groups enjoy equal rights in China. This presupposition is definitely fictitious and the accusation from Pompeo is groundless and execrable.

Example 11

"We know too, we know too that not all Chinese students and employees are just normal students and workers that are coming here to make a little bit of money and to garner themselves some knowledge. Too many of them come here to steal our intellectual property and to take this back to their country."

The word 'know' is a factive verb, presupposing that the following information introduced by the word is true, that is, China sent many students and employees to steal American intellectual property and knowledge. Such groundless accusation on Chinese government is unreasonable. As the center of technology and knowledge, America has attracted countless students and companies all over the world, including those from China, with the desire to learn in the world's top universities and research centers. Why America only accuse Chinese students and employees of stealing intellectual property? The motivation of Pompeo's charge is quite vicious and more often than not is to achieve his ulterior purposes.

Example 12

"In a speech last week, he (Attorney General Barr) said that "The ultimate ambition of China's rulers isn't to trade with the United States. It is to raid the United States."

The presupposition in the Example 12 is triggered by the cleft construction 'isn't to. is to.' Here Pompeo quoted the speech of Attorney General Barr, indicating that the Communist Party of China is going to 'raid' the United States. The accusation is absolutely ridiculous and nonsense. It is widely known that China has held on the path of peaceful development. China had never invaded any country in the past and will not do that in the future. The pragmatic presupposition thus is fictitious and extremely wrong.

4.2.3. Drawing False Analogy

Some of the fictitious pragmatic presuppositions in the speech are arising from drawing false analogy between two subjects. It is worth noting that this type of fictitious pragmatic presupposition is expressed in an implicit way, that is, it transfers fictitious information implicit.

Example 13

“As President Trump has made very clear, we need a strategy that protects the American economy, and indeed our way of life. The free world must triumph over this new tyranny (China).”

The quote draws an analogy between ‘free world’ and ‘new tyranny’, and the implicative world ‘protect’ implies that the ‘new tyranny’ China poses a threat to the American economy and American way of life. The truth is China advocates common, comprehensive, cooperative and sustainable security, and stands ready to work in concert with all parties to build a harmonious world. Therefore, this pragmatic presupposition is completely fictitious. Through making such fictitious pragmatic presupposition, Pompeo tried to place China in the opposite side of the world.

Example 14

“We marginalized our friends in Taiwan, which later blossomed into a vigorous democracy.”

The Example 14 is also a false analogy drawn between China mainland and Taiwan. As is known to all, Taiwan has always been an inalienable part of China’s territory since ancient times. Pompeo’s remarks not only try to split Taiwan from China, which is extremely wrong, but also indicate that China is not a democratic country through presupposing the ‘vigorous democracy’ in Taiwan. The analogy between China mainland and Taiwan is fundamentally wrong. It is clear that the speech is making a fictitious pragmatic presupposition with execrable purpose.

Example 15

“President Reagan said that he dealt with the Soviet Union on the basis of ‘trust but verify’. When it comes to the CCP, I say we must distrust and verify.”

“I have faith because the CCP is repeating some of the same mistakes that the Soviet Union made -- alienating potential allies, breaking trust at home and abroad, rejecting property rights and predictable rule of law.”

Another example is demonstrated the Example 15, in which Pompeo made a vicious analogy between the Communist Party of China and the Soviet Union. In addition, the iterative verb ‘repeat’ implies that China is making the mistakes of ‘alienating potential allies, breaking trust at home and abroad, rejecting property rights and predictable rule of law’. It is known to all that the decades after the World War II have seen the Cold War between the Soviet Union and the U.S. In drawing the analogy, Pompeo presupposed the false message that China is the second Soviet Union. However, unlike the Soviet Union, China, the disciplined and responsible country, is deeply integrated into the global economy and building friendly ties with many countries. Hence, Pompeo is actually fabricating ‘China threat’ through the fictitious pragmatic presupposition.

4.3. Ideology Embedded in Political Discourse

Language is one way that ideologies are constructed, maintained and challenged. Fairclough notes that it is not possible to ‘read off’ ideologies from texts because ‘meanings are produced through interpretations of texts’ (7). Van Dijk also claims that there is a close relationship between discourse, ideology and politics, and in the sense, politics is usually discursive as well as ideological, and ideologies are largely produced by text and talk. In the speech delivered by Pompeo, the use of fictitious pragmatic presupposition is part of the ‘ideological square’ because such device can be used “to indirectly emphasize our good properties and their bad ones” (28). The above analysis reveals the ideology and stance underlying the speech, which belongs to a genre of American political speeches that often represent idealism (9).

On the basis of Fairclough's three-dimensional theory, the following analysis is unfolded in terms of lexical choices of the text, the discursive practice, and the social discourse. First, the lexical choices of Pompeo's address take on some derogatory connotations. For example, the Communist Party of China always ties with the negative words like 'supremacy', 'dominance', 'hegemony'. Such choice of words indicate that China is a rising power that will pose a threat to the world, which contributes to the fabrication of the 'China threat'. For those who do not know the truth, their ideologies and cognition are certainly influenced. Then in terms of the discursive practice, intertextuality is also a typical characteristic of the speech. For instance, Pompeo quoted the remarks of Attorney General Barr "China is to raid the America", revealing his own stance since the speaker only quotes those whose ideology is consistent with his own to support his opinion. Lastly, in the dimensional of social practice, the discourse of the Secretary of the State of represents the attitudes and ideologies of the American government, so the national ideologies are inevitably contained in the fictitious pragmatic presuppositions. America exaggerates the trade conflict with China, and attributes that to the ideological conflict. The constant analogy between China and the Soviet Union implies that America may intent to start a New Cold War.

5. Conclusion

The study analyzes the fictitious pragmatics presuppositions in the speech delivered by Pompeo on July 23, 2020, at the Nixon Library. It is found that fictitious pragmatic presupposition is frequently employed in the speech for the purpose of misleading the addressee, defaming the Communist Party of China, and fabricating 'China Threat'. In order to achieve the ulterior purposes, Pompeo often distorts the fact to mislead the address into the wrong direction. Groundless accusations are also made to smear Chinese government and the Communist Party of China. Furthermore, the speech spares no efforts to draw false analogy between China and the Soviet Union, aiming to fabricate 'China Threat', which is extremely vicious and malicious.

From the perspective of CDA, it is discovered that the lexical choices of Pompeo's address takes on some derogatory connotations to make groundless accusations of the Communist Party of China. Moreover, Pompeo often quotes the remarks of some authoritative officials whose stance and ideology are consistent with his to support the speech. What's more, the discourse of the Secretary of the State of represents the attitudes and ideologies of the American government, so the national ideologies are inevitably contained in the fictitious pragmatic presuppositions. The speech exaggerates the trade conflict with China, and attributes that to the ideological conflict. The constant analogy between China and the Soviet Union implies that America may intent to start a New Cold War.

References

- [1] X.J. Sun: Pompeo's New Cold War Speech and the Delusion of 'Victory Without Fighting' (China Business Journal, China 2020), p.1-3. (In Chinese).
- [2] R. Lakoff: Talking Power: The Politics of Language (Basic books, the US 1990).
- [3] P. Chilton and C. Schäffner: Discourse and Politics in T. Van Dijk (ed). Discourse as Social Interaction (Sage Publications, the UK 1997), p.207.
- [4] P. Chilton and C. Schäffner: Politics as Text and Talk: Analytical Approaches to Political Discourse (Benjamins, Netherlands 2003), p.3.
- [5] Y.B. Zhi: The Latest Development of Critical Discourse Analysis, Foreign Language and their Teaching, (2007) No.3, p.27-32. (In Chinese).
- [6] Y.L. Yan: Critical Discourse Analysis Based on Presupposition, Shangdong Foreign Language Teaching, (2007) No.6, p.32-37. (In Chinese).

- [7] N. Fairclough: *Discourse and Social Change* (Polity Press, the UK 1992).
- [8] N. Fairclough: *Analyzing Discourse* (Routledge, the UK 2003).
- [9] B. M. Mazid: Presuppositions and Strategic Functions in Bush's 20/9/2001 Speech, *Journal of Language and Politics*, Vol. 6(2007) No.3, p.351-375.
- [10] Y.B. Zhi: A Critical Analysis of Fictitious Pragmatic Presupposition in Political Discourse, *Social Scientist*, (2011)No.9, p.154-158. (In Chinese).
- [11] Y.B. Zhi: A Critical Analysis of Nominalized Pragmatic Presupposition in Political Discourse, *Social Scientist*, (2013)No.9, p. 141-147. (In Chinese).
- [12] A. Polyzou: Presupposition in Discourse, *Critical Discourse Studies*, Vol.12(2015)No.2, p.123-138.
- [13] N. Fairclough and R. Wodak: *Critical Discourse Analysis* in T. Van Dijk (ed.) *Discourse as Social Interaction* (Sage Publications, the UK 1997).
- [14] R. Fowler, G., Hodge, G., Kress and T. Trew: *Language and Control* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, the UK 1979), p.180.
- [15] N. Fairclough: *Language and Power* (Longman, the UK 1989).
- [16] M. Reisigl and R. Wodak: *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of Racism and Antisemitism* (Routledge, the UK 2001).
- [17] T. Van Leeuwen: The Representation of Social Actors in C. Caldas-Coulthard and M. Coulthard (eds), *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis* (Routledge, the UK 1996).
- [18] T. Van Leeuwen: Representing Social Action, *Discourse and Society*, Vol.6(1997)No.1, p.81-106.
- [19] T. A. Van Dijk: *Discourse and Context: A Socio-cognitive Approach* (Cambridge University Press, the UK 2008).
- [20] A. Partington: Corpora and Discourse, A Most Congruous Beast in A. Partington, J. Morley and L. Haarman (eds) *Corpora and Discourse* (Peter Lang, Switzerland 2004).
- [21] P. Baker: *Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis* (Continuum, the UK 2006).
- [22] P. F. Strawson: On referring. In R. J. Stainton: *Perspectives in the Philosophy of Language* (Broadview Press, the UK 1950).
- [23] R. Stalnaker: Pragmatic Presuppositions in M. Munitz and P. Unger (eds). *Semantics and Philosophy*. (New York University Press, the UN 1974).
- [24] S. M. Levinson: *Pragmatics* (Cambridge university Press, the UK 1983).
- [25] P. Baker and S. Ellece: *Key Terms in Discourse Analysis* (Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, China 2016). (In Chinese).
- [26] T. A. Van Dijk: *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach* (Sage, the UK 1998).
- [27] Y. Zhang: *The Study on Fictitious Pragmatic Presupposition* (MS., Qufu Normal University, China 2006). (In Chinese).
- [28] T. A. Van Dijk: Ideological discourse analysis (New Courant, the UK 1995), p.135-161.