King Abdullah II Anti-Terrorism Ideology: A Critical Discourse Analysis Perspective

Sami K. Khawaldeh (Corresponding Author)

E-mail: samikhawaldeh@yahoo.com

Wafa abu Hatab

Zarqa University, Jordan

E-mail: wafatab@gmail.com

Abstract

The present paper investigates Anti-terrorism Ideology (ATI) in King Abdullah II of Jordan political discourse following a critical discourse methodology and focusing on three speeches delivered in 2015. The socio-cognitive approach is adopted as an analytical framework to decipher the underlying ideological attitudes and meanings that are encoded in these speeches. The study revealed that semantic aspects including lexical choices, repetition, and presupposition have been employed to construct (ATI) that aimed at creating a negative mental image of terrorists and a positive image of Islam.

Keywords: Anti-terrorism ideology, Critical discourse analysis, King Abdulla II, Socio-cognitive approach

1. Introduction

Critical discourse analysis (CDA, henceforth) is a multifold framework with various approaches that examine the underlying relationship between language and society. It studies the ways discourse structures and properties influence social practices, cognition, and structures. The actual emergence of CDA dates back to the early of the 1990s (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). For Fairclough (1989), language is a social practice that has impacts on societal structures and members of social groups. In general, CDA can be considered as an interdisciplinary field since it gets benefits from all sciences in order to uncover the hidden agendas in discourses. Thus, CDA includes several models introduced by remarkable linguists such as Van Dijik, Wodak, and Fairclough. Fairclough (2013) confirms that CDA does not unify a theoretical method since it adopts a multiple theoretical framework with various perspectives.

CDA focuses on studying power relations, social inequality, racism, and the other underlying ideologies in discourse. Alongside, CDA attempts to figure out how power abuse, social inequality, and underlying ideologies are (re)produced and enacted within discourse structures. It has earned the attention of several innovative scholars such as Van Dijik, Wodak, and Fairclough who study discourse from different perspectives. Fairclough (1989) presents the social theory (three-dimensional approach) to CDA that is grounded on three levels of analysis: (1) description of the text which studies the formal properties of the discourse (text analysis) like the linguistic features, vocabulary, grammar, and cohesion on the micro and macro levels, (2) the discursive analysis that investigates the relationship between text and the interaction, for example intertextuality and productivity, and (3) the socio-cultural process analysis which studies the relationship between discourse and the social context or reality.

Van Dijik (1993) introduces the socio-cognitive approach to CDA that presents cognition as an interface between discourse and society where discourse can only be interpreted and understood through cognition. Understanding the relationship between cognition and discourse is a fundamental basis of this approach which focuses on the way discourse affects society and vice versa. It adopts a comprehensive methodology that incorporates semantic micro and macro-analysis that investigates the local and global propositions and meanings, the analysis of context and the linguistic forms. What makes Van Dijik's approach distinctive from other CDA's approaches is the cognitive interface that mediates between discourse and society as well as its psychological aspect which relates discourse to people's mental models.

Wodak's (1997, 2001, and 2009) historical approach to CDA relates discourse to the historical contexts, events, and norms structuring discourse as a form of accumulative knowledge and memories in relevance to time and place. Such an approach is based on the assumption that analyzing the linguistic features of discourse is not adequate for discourse comprehension and interpretation since all relevant contextual components are necessary to CDA to come up with the social, political, and ideological functions of discourse. Wodak emphasizes the essential role of extralinguistic factors that have contributions to the meanings of discourse. These factors comprise society, culture, ideologies, political components, and

the relationship between discourses. This approach has been adopted to scrutinize many social phenomena such as sexism, racism, and anti-Semitism. Wodak (2001) points out that the main distinctive features of this approach are its attempt to gather all the relevant background information and socio-political contexts along with textual co-text of utterances and then take them into account at the interpretation of discourse. According to Wodak, the context implies a wide range of factors that could shape the meanings and the functions of discourse.

1.1 Discourse and Ideology

As a core concept in CDA, ideology has been approached by many scholars concerned with the social and socio-cognitive studies. Fairclough (1995), for example, points out that ideology resides in the text; it is represented in the discourse through the structure of language, linguistic forms, and styles. For Van Dijik (2006), ideology is the "axiomatic" base of the social representations that are common among individuals and social groups. Furthermore, Ideology is viewed by Van Dijik (2011) as people's mental representations as well as the fundamental ideas that are shared by members of social groups. Such ideas influence the way we perceive the world and comprehend the social events and situations around us. Ideology controls the way people talk and think as well as their attitudes towards social reality. Thus, the ideological nature we have organizes our discourse structure.

Van Dijik (2002,2006) state that ideology is both "cognitive and social". Accordingly, the relationship between ideology and discourse is mediated by social cognition. It is not merely social functions but also political functions in the sense that the political discourses and practices are ideologically produced and understood. Sexist and racist ideologies, for instance, could be acquired and expressed through discourse, and in turn, social and political discourses are ideologically organized and shaped by the ideological components. CDA theorizes several multidisciplinary analytical frameworks for investigating and uncovering the underlying ideologies particularly in political discourses and social interactions. Discourse is part of the social practices that is based on social knowledge, beliefs, and values. It also shapes and controls the social cognition with several discursive strategies like persuasion and manipulation. It could change the cultural, social, mental representations of the societies. Social events and phenomena are discursively controlled by discourses**.**

1.2 Political Discourse (PD)

The term "discourse" has been defined by many scholars from different perspectives. For Fairclough (1989, 1979) and Wodak (1997, 2002), discourse is a process of social interactions or practices. It is the use of language in social and political environments. In this respect, discourse has social and political functions whether written or spoken, and discourse varies according to the domain it is used in. Consequently, it can be classified into religious, political, literary, medical discourse ….etc. Generally speaking, political discourse is a sort of discourse that is used by politicians or related to politics. The term "politics" is central in the

field of political discourse analysis, and a lot of scholars frame their arguments of political discourse analysis according to it. Political discourse is discourse genre that represents the political actors and domain. It is mostly associated with the politicians' interests and targets in term of expressing and enacting power relations and domination over social actors. It is worth mentioning that political discourse has certain characteristics or properties that make it distinct from the other social types of discourse. Commonly, political discourse is ideological discourse in the sense that it is used to (re)produce desirable political ideologies among societal actors. Thus, manipulation, ideological polarizations, persuasion, authorization, emphasizing and deemphasizing agency, legitimizing power, and naturalization are the most prominent strategies manifested in political discourse. Accordingly, politicians utilize discourse structures and the linguistic properties to fulfil their political goals and appeals to be more persuasive and acceptable when they deliver their speeches in order to support their political stands. The most prominent linguistic features in political discourse are the rhetoric features like metaphor, hyperbole, simile, and euphemism. They are used to implicitly convey certain facts and meanings in an acceptable manner. Syntactic structures like passive and active structures, nominalization, cleft sentence, pronouns, foregrounding, and backgrounding do play a significant role in the political discourse production and comprehension. They are used to emphasize and deemphasize certain negative/positive meanings of certain social groups, organizations, and events in the recipients' mind. Furthermore, semantic levels and structures are highly exploited by politicians to state and confirm their agendas and claims. For instance, the choice of lexical terms, topics, presupposition, repetition, implicature, synonyms, antonyms, and references are powerful devices that enable politicians to purposefully shape and frame the recipients' knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, and convictions about the communicative situations.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

The concept "terrorism" has become popular after the advent of September 11 finding its way in research conducted from critical discourse analysis perspective as well as other approached focusing on how anti-terrorism ideology is constructed. Thus, the present study exploits the main principles and goals of CDA in order to investigate and analyze the way semantic devices are employed by King Abdullah II to construct anti-terrorism ideologies in his speeches. It aims to analyze King Abdullah II's speeches from socio-cognitive perspective focusing on anti-terrorism ideologies underlying his speeches. What adds to the value of the current work is that there is a small number of CDA studies that have been carried out on Arab politicians in general and anti-terrorism discourse in particular. Most of the CDA studies conducted on Arab politicians' discourses were mainly oriented to investigate the linguistic and structural properties of discourse without touching the underlying profound issues like anti-terrorism ideology. Furthermore, the present study is expected to provide an accurate analysis and interpretation of the underlying meanings and messages of King Abdullah II's speeches.

1.4 Aim of the Study

The primary aim of the present study is to examine how anti-terrorism ideology is encoded in King Abdullah II's speeches investigating how semantic aspects language can be employed to build an anti-terrorism socio- cognitive image. Additionally, this study investigates to which extent the manifestations of ideology are important to influence peoples' understanding, attitudes, and actions toward social events and terrorism.

Thus, the study tries to answer the following questions:

1. What semantic devices are employed by King Abdullah II to construct anti-terrorism ideology?

2. How is the anti-terrorism ideology constructed and produced in King Abdullah II's speeches?

2. Literature Review

The main developments of CDA can be traced to the early 1990s when the pioneering figures, Van Dijik, Fairclough and Wodak had set up the main principles of CDA. CDA was at the beginning used as a theoretical framework to study the relationship between language, discourse, and gender. Other later works of CDA were conducted by Wodak and Van Dijik who investigated the reproduction of racism and anti-Semitism in discourse. Recently, CDA has excessively witnessed a development by a number of scholars who have provided it with powerful and systematic methods to tackle more complex social issues such as social inequality, power relations, dominance, and ideology (Van Dijik, 2011).

Many discourse studies have adopted CDA as a methodological research model of analysis for scrutinizing various types of written and spoken texts like political, media, religious, and educational discourses. Van Dijik (1995) pointed out the major goals and principles of CDA with an attempt to figure out the actual role of language in society. He sketched a theoretical perspective of CDA and explained how social power, dominance, and inequality are enacted and legitimated by discourse proposing the concept of "mind control". This concept is defined in terms of power enactment as "preferential access to, and control over discourse and its proprieties are forms of the direct enactment of social or institutional power" (Van Dijik, 1995.p21). Moreover, Van Dijik assumes that language is a powerful means that can control people's mind and consequently control their actions influencing their mental model of the social and communicative events. Additionally, language can manipulate peoples' cognitive processes such as thinking, believing, and perceiving in order to impose preferable comprehension and interpretation of discourse. Moreover, when language users can control people's minds via several strategies such as persuasion, manipulation, and other discursive practices, then they can control their actions

In his study "discourse semantics and ideology, Van Dijik (1995) examined the relationship between the semantic structures of discourse and the underlying ideologies. He investigated topic, lexicalization, propositional structure, macrostructure level, and local coherence of some extracts taken from editorials and opinion-editorial articles that appeared in the New York Times and the Washington Post in 1993 focusing on the semantic devices and their ideological implications. The study revealed that discourse production and comprehension is

based on the underlying ideologies manifested in the semantic properties that express opinions, attitudes, and mental representations of the event or situations in the discourse.

Fairclough (1995) discussed the relationship between discourse and ideology, in an attempt to identify the location of ideology in discourse. He confirmed that ideology invests language in two ways, i.e., its structures' properties, and its events' properties. Regarding language's properties, the order of structures, vocabularies, discursive practices, and linguistic features are all shaped in relevance to the ideological natures. Events also influence the structure of discourses as well as the discoursal practices by virtue of the constraints of social conventions, norms, and history (Fairclough, 1995: 71). Wodak (2001) treated discourse as an analytical category which includes underlying ideological assumptions. He confirmed that ideology is one of the important aspects of discourse by which unequal power relations are maintained and enacted.

Sarfo & Krampa (2013) conducted a CDA analysis of Bush's and Obama's speeches on fighting terrorism. They adopted a qualitative analytical approach drawing on Van Dijik's and Fairclough's perspectives of CDA, especially "mind control" and "context control". The approach was mainly adopted to explore how the two presidents (Obama and Bush) undertook terrorism and anti-terrorism ideology in their speeches. The examined data were six speeches of Bush and Obama. The results revealed that various linguistic forms such as vocabulary selection, phrases, and sentence structures used to construct and project anti-terrorism ideology and power relations among social groups. Terrorism was negatively portrayed, whereas anti-terrorism was positively depicted.

Bughio (2014) conducted a CDA of the political speech of Benazir Bhutto (the former prime minister of Pakistan from 1988-1990 and 1993-1996) in the election campaign on 27 December 2007. The researcher adopted the socio-cognitive approach presented by Van Dijik (1993) in order to show how linguistic features employed in the political discourse are used to reproduce ideologies, and how discourse is used to control people's mind. This study concluded that the speaker employed linguistic strategies such as rhetoric, hedging, mitigating devices, repetition, historical distortion, emotional attachment, and contradiction to control people's mind and influence power relations.

Recently, Ike-Nwafor (2016) carried out a CDA study to disclose power relations, dominance as well as ideologies embedded in the political speeches of the gubernatorial candidates in south-western Nigeria 2007-2014. The study aimed at exploring how power relations are sustained and reproduced in campaign speeches. Additionally, the ideological assumptions are examined to uncover the hidden meanings and connotations. Eight speeches from gubernatorial campaign in South-Western zone were selected and analyzed using multi-analytical models of CDA namely, Van Dijik's (1993) socio-cognitive approach, Fairclough's (2001) members' resources, and basic ideas from Halliday's system of mood and modality. The study found that language was employed as a tool to reproduce asymmetrical power relations and supremacy through the use of lexical items and imperatives. The candidates use discourse structures and metaphor of religion, time, sports, violence and animal innovations as a method to ideologically persuade the public with their positive

self-representation and negative representation of the others. The researcher recommended that both the producer and consumer of text should be aware of the concealed ideology behind the text.

Surveying the previous literature indicates that a considerable number of CDA studies have been implemented for a variety of purposes. Taking the fact that CDA is a widespread approach with multiple perspectives which can be adopted to achieve several research objectives, the present study has specific objectives. The current paper is a CDA study aims to investigate the semantic devices employed by King Abdullah II's to decipher the anti-terrorism ideological assumptions.

In a nutshell, this study specifically sheds the light on the powerful relationship between language and ideology. It is conducted on a remarkable figure's (King Abdullah II of Jordan) who has a significant contribution in encountering the international threat of terrorists via disclosing their brutal acts, plan, and ideologies in his speeches. Alongside, King Abdullah II endeavors in his speeches to represent the real image of Islam which is distorted by the extremists and terrorists. Furthermore, the present study is the first of its kind in Jordan that addresses the anti-terrorism ideology as encoded in King Abdullah II's speeches. Other studies like Al-Haq & Al-Sleibi (2015) that examined King Abdullah II's speeches have mainly focused on the linguistic aspects, strategies, and abilities that are employed in his speeches. Therefore, the present study focuses on the social and ideological values and functions that are resided in King Abdullah II's speeches. In contrast to the textual and structural linguistic analysis adopted in other studies, the current study tries to explore the psychological influences and aspects of language use on the social actors, structures, and events. It is a comprehensive study in the sense that it provides social and ideological explanations through examining the internal semantic structures of discourse in relation to the cognitive impacts and the mental representations of the communicative events and situations. Thus, and in light of the socio-cognitive approach, the present study aims to uncover the semantic devices used by King Abdullah II and show how they are cognitively employed to construct ATI in his speeches that are delivered in 2015.

3. Methodology

3.1 Data collection

The sample of the current study consisted of three speeches by King Abdullah II delivered in 2015. One speech was delivered on May 14th, "At the ceremony of the International Charlemagne Prize of Aachen to honor European Parliament President Martin SchulzIt". The second speech was delivered on September 25th, "At the Plenary Session of the 70th General Assembly of the United Nations in New York." The third speech was delivered on March 10th, "Before the European Parliament". The speeches were taken from the official website of King Abdullah II of Jordan. The choice of these speeches is motivated by their relevance to the main objectives of the present paper. They apparently revolve around terrorism and the urgent need for global cooperation. Thus, such speeches could meet the main objectives of the current study which is conducted to uncover the anti-terrorism ideology that is embedded within King Abdullah II's speech.

3.2 Data Analysis

CDA is a broad discipline with multi-approaches and models employed to study the political and social functions of language. In carrying out this study, the socio-cognitive approach proposed by Van Dijik (1993, 1997) is adopted. Such an approach to CDA is purposefully chosen because it offers transparent psychological explanations of language uses and functions which are not provided by the other approaches. Socio-cognitive approach presents a satisfactory illustration of the significant role of the personal and social mental representations of the social events and situations. Furthermore, It investigates the contributions of the cognitive processes like thinking, believing, planning, and perceiving that operate in the short term memory (working memory) in the process of discourse production and comprehension, and how these cognitive processes are manifested in the long term memory and subconscious mind as stable and fixed mental models and ideologies seeking to reveal how discourse is used in order to (re)produce and construct social relations, certain ideological assumptions, beliefs, and power relations. Van Dijik presents his approach in the form of a triangle that connects discourse, cognition, and society. This makes socio-cognitive approach the most appropriate one for ideological discourse analysis studies in general and the present study in particular since it investigates how King Abdullah II's anti-terrorism ideology is constructed in his three speeches through the semantic devices.

Since words are powerful means that can construct specific knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, and ideologies in society, the analysis starts with scrutinizing the semantic micro-structure level. This level requires a descriptive and explanative analysis of the lexical choices, phrases, sentences, and propositions in order to figure out the underlying semantic meanings. Such meanings are explained in term of the mental representations, knowledge, and ideologies. In other words, the semantic structure is analyzed in relation to the cognitive structure. Such an analysis is expected to helps us understand how the use of specific words, expressions, and structures could fulfill certain ideological purposes. The analysis of the semantic component is also interpreted with respect to the social context and political background. Furthermore, repetition and presupposition are critically analyzed to figure out their role and influence at constructing ATI.

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1 Microstructure level

Ideology could be implicitly expressed and constructed within discourse through several linguistic structures and forms. Discourse as a form of social practice works as ideological means that may construct and reproduce social beliefs, power relations, and political stands among society. Speakers can use discourse to portray positive and negative connotation of social groups via the overall structures of discourse to affect people's perception and interpretation of reality. Van Dijik (1993) has proposed an ideological framework to CDA believing that ideology requires a cognitive structure that mediates between discourse and society. Relatively, people produce and comprehend discourse in terms of their mental representations and sociocultural beliefs. Ideology might be implemented in discourse through the use of linguistic structures, lexical terms, syntactic structures, and rhetoric figures.

These linguistic forms provide ideological meanings of social actors and identify group's relations. The ideological analysis under Van Dijik's approach entails relating discourse to cognition in order to account for the underlying meanings and agendas in discourses. In this regard, the analysis of the following speeches will focus on how the use of lexical terms, presupposition, repetition, metaphor, syntax, serves to propagate ATI ideologies in King Abdullah II's speeches.

Analysis is conducted on the microstructure level to examine the underlying ideologies that reside in the meanings of discourse via the use of words, phrases, sentences, and propositions. The analysis is oriented toward the anti-terrorism ideology that King Abdullah II tries to construct through his speeches. Consider the following examples taken from King Abdullah II's speech at the Plenary Session of the 70th General Assembly of the United Nations in New York in 2015.

4.1.1 "I am here representing Jordan, and as a <u>God-fearing, God-loving</u> human being. I am here as a father who wants his children, like yours, to live in a compassionate and more <u>peaceful world</u>"

Obviously, King Abdullah II selects words that are expected to express the fundamental values and principles of all Jordanians, Arabs and Muslims. The choice of the lexical terms such as "God-fearing, God-loving, compassionate, peaceful world" reflects a positive self-representation of Jordanians and Muslims in general. Additionally, these words "God-fearing and God-Loving" are the controlling rules for Muslims' actions, beliefs, and plans. Implicitly, King Abdullah II wants to refute terrorists' claims who kill people and justify their bloody acts by loving and fearing God. Definitely, who fears and loves Allah will not kill the innocent since sincere love and fear of Allah are marked in contributing to the world peace, and this is the main goal of Islam. Such lexical terms cognitively provoke the mental representations of the international audience to recall their background knowledge and beliefs to assess the current situation and event that King Abdullah II talks about. The above example shows how King Abdullah II semantically employs the linguistic devices by selecting words and phrases that effectively affect the audience's mind. He also uses certain semantic structures such as the collocations of "God-fearing, God-loving, peaceful world" to help the audience create a positive association between Islam and positive values and norms.

After creating a mental representation in the audience's mind of the real Muslims, King Abdullah II in the following example warns the world against the threats of the dangerous groups on world future. The use of the word "threat" arouses listeners' attention to the extreme danger of these groups. Mentally, the connotative influences of the words "serious threat" on the audience are very effective. They trigger international hate and aversion to that group which is described negatively by lexical terms that are understood by most people in the worlds. The use of the Arabic term "Khawarej" carries an ideological indications since this term is used in Arabic as an attribute for those who misrepresent and mistake Islam. Thus, the term "khawarej" suggests that Islam considers them as an out-group of Islam refusing their acts, beliefs, and ideologies. This term is coined to describe those who do not follow the right track of Islam. King Abdullah II deliberately uses the Arabic word then provides the

English equivalent "outlaw gangs" to convey an important message to the audience who has experienced the outlaw gangs and known how dangerous and bloody they are. Thus, the audience will capture the negative descriptions of that group easily and know that Arabs and Muslims do condemn terrorists' acts since, Islam rejects "khawarej" and condemns their actions and principles in the same way the world rejects the "outlaw gangs". King Abdullah II prepares audience' minds to create a mental image of terrorists and their crimes via recalling what they have known about the "outlaw gangs". In other words, the audiences' cognitive processes operate on catching the underlying meanings of King Abdullah II's discourse via using their background knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs of the "outlaw gangs". The targets of terrorists are illustrated in the words "kill cooperation", "religious differences". Employing these negative words to describe terrorists' actions and goals conveys the underlying ideology of the speaker. The word "kill" expresses an evil and bloody action which is refused by the entire world. Definitely, what comes to mind after hearing the negative descriptions of terrorists is that this group uses Islam as a mask. They are outlaw gangs and do not belong to Islam.

4.1.2 "Such a future is under serious threat from the khawarej, the outlaws of Islam that operate globally today. They target religious differences, hoping to kill cooperation and compassion among the billions of people, of all faiths and communities, who live side-by-side in our many countries. These outlaw gangs use suspicion and ignorance to expand their own power"

King Abdullah II uses the word "forces" to refer to terrorists in the example below for ideological reasons. First, the word "forces" is used in plural to reveal that terrorists are an organized cell with multiple hands and agents. Such a description of terrorists conveys a warning letter to the world to seriously consider the threat of these forces on humanity. Second, the word "forces" creates an image of a physical military power that threatens people all over the world. Third, the word "forces" has a powerful impact on the audiences' cognition that is provoked to recall negative experiences of immoral and criminal acts of these forces.

4.1.3 "All of us here are united by our conviction that these forces must be defeated"

The interrogative force the following example carries serves as a warning to the entire world against terrorists' mass murder, kidnapping, and slavery. Such a question puts the audience in a position to choose a life with mass murder, public beheadings, and slavery or a peaceful one. Furthermore, King Abdullah II selects words with negative associations to depict the miserable future of the world in the existence of terrorists. These propositional meanings address peoples' mental models of the life of slavery and mass murder. Ideologically, King Abdullah II would like to stimulate the audience to create a mental image of the dreadful situation if terrorists have not been defeated. The ideological purposes of the use of "slavery, mass murder, kidnapping" are motivated by the common knowledge and social experiences of people about these evil acts. People know well the painful life in the existence of mass murder and slavery through their real experiences, reading books or stories about these situations or watching movies. King Abdullah II intends to project terrorists negatively by

using words that influence peoples' feelings and cognitions. He touches the mental representations of what the audience has acquired and works on shaping, shifting, and updating these mental representations to construct ATI in peoples' minds.

4.1.4 "Can we tolerate a future where mass murder, public beheadings, kidnapping and slavery are common practices?"

Various Semantic devices are employed by King Abdullah II to create international awareness of the hazard of terrorists through which he effectively describes the brutality of terrorists. The use of the term "ideologies" in the example below suggests profound remarks about the danger of terrorists who are guided by radical ideologies. King Abdullah II would like to make it clear that encountering and fighting ideologies of terrorists are not easy since ideologies are the fixed and rooted mental systems stored in peoples' subconscious mind. In this respect, fighting terrorism does not merely require physical force in term of military force; rather it needs a cognitive force based on psychological knowledge. In other words, fighting terrorism entails constructing anti-terrorism ideologies which can protect people from following radical beliefs, attitudes, and opinions. Additionally, the words "hatred, violence, kill" are used to construct a negative mental representation of terrorists. Lastly, the term "fuel" communicates ideological indications. It shows that the ideologies of extremists are represented as a rich source and supporter for Islamophobia. The term "fuel" carries a dangerous connotation of power and energy that are negatively used to create and support Islamophobia.

4.1.5 "Ideologies of hatred and violence kill co-existence and fuel Islamophobia. Such divisions simply play into the hands of violent extremists. They erode the contributions of good citizens – the vast, vast majority of Europe's Muslims"

Example 5.1.6 below sheds the light on the immorality of terrorists who do not respect borders. This proposition indicates that terrorists are brutal and could target any region in the world. Moreover, the proposition "respect no border" suggests that terrorists give themselves the free hand to impose hegemony over people regardless of the social, cultural, regional, and religious considerations. Obviously, King Abdullah II emphasizes the negative aggressive image of terrorists to enhance the audiences' feelings and emotions against terrorism. Additionally, the terms "no border" reveal that no one might be safe from the evil acts of terrorists since they could target any area in the world. Such meanings arouse feelings of fear, anxiety and hatred of terrorist. From psychological point of view, creating feelings of fear of an event or situation is a powerful means to construct a mental model of that event in the subconscious mind or the episodic memory. King Abdullah II intends to help the audience establishes a negative mental model of the terrorists.

4.1.6 "Terrorists respect no borders. Our defence must be equally international and focused. In this, the EU plays a central role. President Schulz has called for a global partnership against terrorism"

In the following example various semantic options are resorted to. First, the word "challenges" provides a descriptive image of the communicative event in term of a mental

model of the painful situation. The audiences' cognitive processes are activated to create mental processes of discourse understanding and comprehension. In this regard, the audience makes use of their old knowledge, beliefs, and experience in order to obtain a comprehensive interpretation of the discourse. Obviously, King Abdullah II relates the challenges to the assaults that face the entire world by terrorists in order to trigger the audiences' attention to seriously consider the contemporary cruel circumstances that the world have. The term "challenges" effectively influences the audiences' feelings, opinions, and attitudes to perceive that facing terrorists is not an easy task and thus, it needs a global cooperation. Additionally, the propositions "ruthless ambition, the motive is not faith" communicate underlying meanings. Terrorists are depicted as bloody and brutal groups who have no mercy and compassion. Terrorist are not motivated by religious interests and they have no faith. They use Islam as a mask to justify their unhuman acts. The motive of terrorists is "power". Moreover, the use of the term "power" indicates that terrorists are very dangerous and requires more powerful opponents to be confronted.

4.1.7 "Today, these <u>challenges</u> have special importance. <u>Our world faces an assault by terrorists</u> with <u>ruthless ambition</u>. <u>The motive is not faith</u>, it is power; <u>power</u> pursued by ripping countries and communities apart in sectarian conflicts, and inflicting suffering across the world"

King Abdullah II uses the terms "savage murder, Daesh" to paint a repulsive mental image of "Daesh" as illustrated in the example below. The word "savage" carries a negative frightening connotation that describes terrorists as extremely violent and severe people who act like fierce animals. The terms "murder" suggests that terrorists intentionally plan to kill people seeking pleasure and excitement in the bloody killing of the innocents. The terms "savage murder" depicts terrorists as premeditated killers. King Abdullah II uses the word "murder" not the word "killing" because the word "murder" reveals the exaggerative mental image of killing conducted by "Daesh". It is worth mentioning that King Abdullah II refers to the event of murdering the Jordanian pilot to convey various messages. First, "Daesh" is not an Islamic group since they brutally murdered the Jordanian Muslim pilot. Second, Jordan fights "Daesh" and refuses all their acts, norms, and values. Third, King Abdullah II tries to activate the audiences' mental model of the frightening murder scene of the Jordanian pilot who was burned alive by terrorists'. This scene attracts the world's eyes to the brutality of "Daesh making use of people's background knowledge and experience of the malicious acts of terrorists and constructing a new vicious mental image of them in order to (re)produce an ATI.

4.1.8 "The <u>savage murder by Daesh</u> of <u>Jordan's hero pilot</u> outraged all Jordanians, and <u>horrified the world</u>"

4.2 Presupposition

Presupposition is considered as a semantic device that carries ideological functions in discourse. Semantically, it communicates facts and events as they are taken true by the speakers and hearers. Presupposition can be employed in discourse by speakers or writers to implicitly deliver certain meanings that are supposed to be accepted by the recipients as for

granted truths and knowledge. Ideologically, presupposition evokes recipients to make inferences and conclusions that are not asserted explicitly. Moreover, presupposition cognitively formulates negative or positive attitudes about social groups and events. Consider the use of presupposition in the following examples taken from the speech at the Plenary Session of the 70th General Assembly of the United Nations in New York in 2015.

It is well noted that presupposition is used by King Abdullah II to implicitly deliver his message. In example (4.2 1) the use of the phrase "serious threat" presupposes that there is actual danger caused by terrorists. The words "serious threat" is understood by hearers as that "threat" by terrorists is a common shared knowledge and fact. The words "serious threat" here activates the cognitive processes of the audience to recall their mental models about terrorists. Vividly, describing terrorists as "outlaw of Islam" presupposes that they are not a true representation of Islam. They are outlaws and Islam does not approve their attitudes, actions, and norms. Terrorists are projected negatively by presupposed propositions.

4.2.1 "Such a future is under serious threat from the khawarej, the outlaws of Islam that operate globally today

In example (4.2.2) below, the statement "the free hand they grant themselves to …" presupposes a noncontroversial fact of deceitful and spurious conviction of extremists who give themselves the right to commit their bloody crimes by the word of God. King Abdullah II assumes that the audience has background knowledge of extremists and their spurious claims in which they justify their evil acts by the name of God. King Abdullah II aims to tell the world that neither Islam nor the other religions accept and allow the evil acts of terrorists. Moreover, the main goals and aims of terrorists are presupposed by the use of "to distort the word of God" "to justify the most atrocious crimes". The presuppositions here carry ideological purposes. King Abdullah II means to make it clear in the audiences' mind that terrorists' threat and brutal crimes have been experienced by most of the world. Such social backgrounds about terrorists influence the context models of the audience and make them construct a schematic structure of terrorists in their episodic memory in a form of knowledge, attitudes, and ideology against terrorists.

4.2.2 "Worse still is the free hand they grant themselves to distort the word of God to justify the most atrocious crimes"

In the following example, King Abdullah II draws audience's attention to the evil acts and actions of extremists using the phrase "hate expressed by extremists". He presupposes that hate is expressed, it is not hidden since terrorists are neither shy nor afraid to express their hate. The audience has experienced that hate and known this painful fact. Besides, the presupposition "hate expressed" conveys underlying meanings in which "hate" destroys humanities and encourages killing innocents. Moreover, violence, fear, and anger are understood as well-known phenomena and results that are caused by terrorists. Obviously, all this negative portrayal of terrorist and their evil acts build an ATI in audience episodic memory in the form of a mental representation.

4.2.3 "Most people may think they have nothing to do with the hate expressed by extremists. But our world is also threatened when violence, fear and anger dominate our discourse, whether in school lessons or weekly sermons or international affairs".

Example four might be interpreted in terms of a unifying relationship between the speaker and the audience. This presupposition implies that the speaker wants to make a strong partnership with the audience to establish a powerful unity to fight terrorists. Consequently, the speaker presupposed that he and the audience agree on the necessity of defeating extremists and that their unity is well established using the pronoun 'us'. These concepts and meanings are taken as an uncontroversial truth. In other words, Kind Abdullah II implicitly expresses his ideological positions by using presupposition to assert facts that join him and the audience in one group who will fight the out-group (extremists). Another ideological remark yielded from the use of presupposition in this example is the description of terrorists as a "force" that communicates underlying meanings. Terrorists are a strong group and thus there must be a powerful international cooperation in order to defeat and combat it. All these meanings enhance the audience feelings and cognitive processes to build a fixed mental model in their subconscious mind of the danger and horror of terrorists.

4.2.4 "All of us here <u>are united by our conviction</u> that <u>these forces</u> must be defeated"

Showing how extremists express their ideas and beliefs is presupposed in the following example in which the advanced media is used by extremists to spread their ideas and beliefs. This presupposition that is made here is that what is shown in media about extremists does not reflect their true reality. They try to display a positive image of themselves and their goals to attract people by misleading them. They claim that they are real Muslims who plan to inhibit corruption and injustice. They manipulate peoples' mind to portray themselves as freedom fighters. King Abdullah II triggers audiences' attention by using the presupposition "broadband and social media be monopolized" to imply that the social media is exploited and oriented by extremists to spread their poison, beliefs, and ideology among societies stating that the danger of extremism is an uncontroversial fact. From socio-cognitive perspective, the influence of asserting these facts implicitly by using presupposition gives rise to changing and updating audience's attitudes, opinions, and thoughts about terrorists. They are mentally activated to rethink and perceive the reality of extremists. These mental processes are finally formulated as a static and fixed hateful mental model of extremists.

4.2.5 "It is one of the greatest ironies of our time that extremist voices <u>use advanced media to propagate ignorant ideas</u>! We must not let our screens, airwaves, <u>broadband and social media be monopolized</u> by those who <u>pose the greatest danger to our world</u>

King Abdullah II presupposes that the conflict is still ongoing, the battle we fight is an ideological battle not physical one, and Israeli conflict is the core issue that should be addressed in war against terrorism. He presents the presupposed meanings as part of the audiences' background knowledge since they know the contemporary conflict which definitely will lead the world toward more violence, hate, and terror. The presupposition of the phrase "ideological battle" confirms a dangerous fact that the world faces an ideological war against the ideologies of terrorists. King Abdullah II assumes that the ideological fight

against radical ideologies is a part of the audience's schemata. It requires a mental cognitive awareness in term of uncovering the terrorists' attitudes, values, beliefs, and norms to the entire world. Additionally, "the ideological battle" demands more reinforcement of the world with anti-terrorism attitudes, principles, beliefs, and conventions. Furthermore, the battle against radical ideologies increases the audiences' fear of the spread of terrorists'' poisonous ideas and beliefs that from a serious threat to the entire world. Another presupposition is derived from referring to the ongoing conflict between Palestine and Israel as an obstacle for establishing peace.

4.2.6 "It is time to think about the future, and how this ongoing conflict will breed further hate, violence and terror across the world. How can we fight the ideological battle, if we do not chart the way forward towards Palestinian-Israeli peace?"

4.3 Repetition

Repetition is a semantic device that is used in discourse to assert certain meanings. Repeating words, expressions, and propositions cognitively has ideological implications and affects audiences' mental models. From a cognitive perspective, repetition of words, sentences, and propositions many times arouses the cognitive processes in the short-term memory of hearses/readers to understand and interpret the connotative and denotative meanings in discourse. Consequently, the hearers or the readers are enhanced to construct certain cognitive structures in their episodic memory that is part of the long-term memory (Van Dijik, 1995). What is stored in the long-term memory then is a very powerful resource for the process of production, understanding, and comprehension. Hearers and readers will interpret and perceive discourse according to their mental models of the events and situations. Thus, when speakers or writers use the same words and expressions many times in discourse, they intend to deliver underlying meanings in order to influence hearers' and readers' attitudes, beliefs, and ideologies. King Abdullah II uses repetition as a semantic device on the level of words and expressions for the sake of drawing audience's attention to his intended messages. Consider the following examples that are taken at the Plenary Session of the 70th General Assembly of the United Nations in New York in 2015.

King Abdullah II frequent use of the expressions "God-fearing, God-loving" is an indication of his attempt to pin down and confirm particular underlying meanings about his beliefs and ideology as a Muslim in audiences' mind. The repetitive expressions in the following example reveal that King Abdullah II builds his beliefs and attitudes on the love and fear of God. These propositions enhance the inclusive relationship between King Abdullah II and the audience since God-love and God-fear are the primary values and principles of all religions: Islam, Christianity, and Judaism. Mentally, the cognitive processes in audience' minds as thinking, believing and interpreting start to operate in the working memory in order to understand the overall meanings of the topic. The audience is stimulated via repetition to construct a mental representation of Islam and its values, attitudes, and norms that revolve around Love and fear of God. They will use their past and ongoing experience of Islam and start to update and modify their knowledge about it. Moreover, Islam here is presented as the religion of mercy and love which absolutely prohibits extremists' acts and beliefs. What can

be inferred from the following example is that King Abdullah II intends to build a transparent mental image in audiences' mind of the real Islam and how it is completely different from extremists'' portrayal.

4.3.1 "I am here representing Jordan, and as a <u>God-fearing, God-loving</u> human being,………………worse still is the free hand they grant themselves to distort the <u>word of God</u> to justify the most atrocious crimes……………,I saw a roadside sign that said '<u>Fear God'</u>.

As clearly illustrated by the following example, King Abdullah II uses words with very negative associations to refer to terrorists such as "extremists, outlaw gangs, and khawarij" to depict them as evil and criminals. These words reveal horrifying and warning connotations that activate the audiences' feelings and perception of the awful activities of extremists. Repeating the word "extremists" play an effective role in shaping and changing the audiences' attitudes and knowledge in terms of a negative mental model of extremists. Relatively, mental model constructs an ATI in audiences' mind.

Since the word "khawarij" is an Arabic word which might not be understood properly by the audience, king Abdullah II provides its equivalent in order to powerfully communicate with audiences' mind since the word "outlaw gangs" is part of the audiences' lexicon associated with evil and dangerous acts of those groups. Repeating the words "khawarij and outlaw gangs" reveals a negative description of those groups in form of activating the audiences' background knowledge of the outlaw gangs and associating them with the word "khawarij". Projecting extremists negatively and Islam positively through the repetition is a means that is employed by King Abdullah II to construct anti-terrorism ideology. This ideology is expressed and constructed by drawing audiences' attention to the negative attitudes, beliefs, and aims of extremists as well as showing their immoral actions towards innocents.

4.3.2 "Most people may think they have nothing to do with the hate expressed by extremists,……………It is one of the greatest ironies of our time that <u>extremist</u> voices use advanced media to propagate ignorant ideas!,……………………………… <u>Extremists</u> rely on the apathy of moderates,……………………………Such a future is under serious threat from <u>the khawarej</u>,……………When we examine the motives of <u>these outlaws,</u> <u>the khawarej</u>– and indeed, the motives <u>of extremists</u> on all sides,……………………These outlaw gangs use suspicion and ignorance to expand their own power,……………………Today's outlaw gangs are nothing but a drop in the ocean" .

In example (4.3. 3), repetition of the words "global division, global, international, our world" communicates underlying meanings. That is the entire world is under the threat of radicalization, terrorism, and extremism. King Abdullah II warns the audience against the danger of terrorists who are targeting the peace and security of the entire world. In addition, Palestinian and Israelite conflict is considered a global threat that supports terrorism and creates global division. Thus, King Abdullah II implicitly insists on the need for an international cooperation in order to defeat terrorism and extremism and find a solution for the Palestinian Israeli conflict. Repeating the propositions "our world, international, and global" in relation with terrorism and global division is a powerful means to construct and

confirm a negative mental model of terrorists. It could also be interpreted as a call for an international unity to establish a strong force against terrorism. The audience is motivated to think of and perceive terrorists as a brutal and bloody enemy who targets every country in the world.

4.3.3 "Finally, let me say a word about the long confrontation between Palestinians and Israelis. No single crisis creates more <u>global division</u> and radicalization,.......At the same time, the danger of extremism must be seen for what it is: <u>global,</u>...... Our defence must be equally <u>international and focused,</u>.......We must not let our screens, airwaves, broadband and social media be monopolized by those who pose the greatest danger to <u>our world"</u> (retrieved from the formal website of King Abdullah II).

In the example below, King Abdullah II emphasizes the positive values of Islam and other religions via repeating words, synonyms, phrases, and propositions that are based on love, mercy, moderation, and tolerance. Obviously, King Abdullah II addresses the shared values and principles that gather and unify him with the audience through the following repetitive forms: "Muslim country, with a deeply rooted Christian community, respect for human dignity, tolerance and moderation, global interfaith dialogue, respect and caring for others, commands mercy, peace and tolerance". All the repetitive words, phrases, and propositions carry a positive image of Islam as well as other religions. King Abdullah II intends to confirm that he and the audience have common and shared, unifying, and interplay principles and relationship. Additionally, the repetitive propositions implicitly draw the audiences' attention to the evil acts of terrorists which are against tolerance, moderation, mercy, and peace. Therefore, the ideological points that could be inferred from the above example come in a form of enhancing the relationship between the speaker and the audience, reflecting a positive image of the true Islam and its respect and harmony with other religions, and depicting mental representations of terrorists as enemies to the humanity, moderation, Islam and other religions. Through using repetition, King Abdullah II could activate the audiences' cognitive processes in the short term memory in order to change and modify their old knowledge, beliefs, attitudes about Islam and terrorists. They are encouraged to construct positive mental representations, models, and ideologies of Islam and a negative mental model and ideology of terrorists as their real enemy.

4.3.4 "Jordan is a <u>Muslim country, with a deeply rooted Christian</u> community. We count respect for human <u>dignity among our deepest national values of tolerance and moderation......</u>,. Our country has led a <u>global interfaith dialogue,</u>......I and countless other Muslims, have been taught from our earliest years that our religion demanded <u>respect and caring for others,</u>......Our faith, like yours, <u>commands mercy, peace and tolerance"</u> (retrieved from the formal website of King Abdullah II).

5. Conclusion

The results of the current study suggest that King Abdullah II anti-terrorism ideology is constructed through the use of several semantic devices. Critical analysis of King Abdullah II's discourses comes up with the conclusion that the choice of the lexical items and propositions, presupposition, and repetition are deliberately used in order to affect recipients'

cognition and perception of the terrorists' acts These semantic devices could trigger audiences' attention to the underlying meanings of the discourse that revolve around portraying a positive and real image of Islam along with showing the negative and bloody image of terrorists and extremists. Correspondingly, the study revealed that anti- terrorism ideology is constructed and expressed mentally through activating the cognitive processes of the audience to perceive terrorists as a serious threat and enemy. Thus, the audiences' mental model of terrorists is shaped and formulated negatively by depicting terrorists as killers and criminals who must be defeated.

References

Al-Haq, F. A. A., & Al-Sleibi, N. M. (2015). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Three Speeches of King Abdullah II. *US-China Foreign Language, 13*(5), 317-332. https://doi.org/10.17265/1539-8080/2015.05.001

Bughio, F. A. (2014). Critical Analysis of Political Discourse: A Study of Benazir Bhutto's Last Speech. *Baluchistan Journal of Linguistics*, *2*, 79-95. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. New York: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. New York: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2001). Critical Discourse Analysis as a Method in Social Scientific Research. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis, 5*, 121-138. Retrieved from https://books.google.iq

Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*, (2nd Edition). Routledge.

Ike-Nwafor, N. G. (2016). *Critical Discourse Analysis of Selected Political Campaign Speeches of Gubernatorial Candidates in South-Western Nigeria 2007-2014.* (Doctoral Dissertation), University of Nigeria. Retrieved from https://scholar.google.com

Sarfo, E., & Krampa, E. A. (2013). Language at War: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Speeches of Bush and Obama on Terrorism. *International J. Soc. Sci. & Education, 3*(2), 378-390. Retrieved from http://www.ijsse.com

Van Dijik, T. A. (1993). Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse and Society, 4*(2), 249-283.

Van Dijik, T. A. (1995). Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis. *Language and Peace, 10*, 47-142. Retrieved from https://www.taylorfrancis.com

Van Dijik, T. A. (2002). Political Discourse and Ideology. *Analisi del discurs politic*, 15-34. http://www.discourses.org

Van Dijik, T. A. (2006). Discourse, Context and Cognition**.** *Discourse studies, 8*(1), 159-177. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445606059565

Van Dijik, T. A. (Ed.). (2011). *Discourse Studies: A multidisciplinary Introduction*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Van Dijik, T. A. (Ed.). (2011). The Study of Discourse. In: Van Dijik, T.A. (Ed). *Discourse Studies: A multidisciplinary Introduction*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Wodak, R. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis and the Study of Doctor-patient Interaction. *The Construction of Professional Discourse*, 19, 173-200. Retrieved from https://books.google.iq

Wodak, R. and Michael, M. (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis.* In: Wodak, R. and Michael, M. (eds.), London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Wodak, R. (2002). Aspects of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Linguistik, 36*(10), 5-31. Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2009). Methods for critical discourse analysis. Sage.

The official website of King Abdullah II. Retrieved from https://kingabdullah.jo/ar

Copyrights