THE SEMANTIC MACROSTRUCTURES AND LEXICALIZATIONS IN OSAMA BIN LADEN'S SPEECH OF INCITEMENT

Sawsan Kareem Al-Saaidi[1], Ambigapathy Pandian[2], Ghayth K. Shaker Al-Shaibani[3]

English Section, School of Languages, Literacies and Translation
Universiti Sains Malaysia(USM), MALAYSIA.

[1]white2006bird@yahoo.com, [2]ambiga@usm.my, [3]ghayth.k@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This article investigates the semantic macrostructures and lexicalizations in Osama bin Laden's discourse of incitement which encourages his followers to commit terrorist attacks. The researchers examine bin Laden's speech directed to the Iraqi people before the USA led invasion in 2003. Van Dijk's two theories of Semantic Macrostructures (1980) and Ideological Square (1998a) along with Wodak's (2001; 2009) discourse-historical approach are integrated to constitute the theoretical framework. The selected speech is analysed at three levels of analysis: linguistic, ideological and intertextual. These analytical levels focus on the analysis of bin Laden's discourse of incitement in terms of semantic macro- and micro-structures and ideology. At the macro-level of analysis, the themes in the selected speech are analysed and at the micro-level of analysis, the lexical structures are examined. The findings reveal that the ideological dichotomy of US vs. THEM in the selected speech is underscored via the semantic macrostructures and lexicalizations. The intertextual analysis helps consolidate the linguistic and ideological analyses.

Keywords: Al-Qaeda, Osama bin Laden, critical discourse analysis, ideology, semantic macrostructures, lexicalization

INTRODUCTION

The propagation of socio-political consensus is a crucial prerequisite to the undertaking of political violence in the form of terrorism, and this is not possible without language (Jackson, 2005). In order for leaders to successfully launch violent political operations which may endanger the lives of the public and group members, they have to garner social group support, weaken the arguments of the opponents, and more importantly to persuade their followers and community that such an undertaking is indispensable. This can be done in a way which appears to be unquestionable through constructing a painstaking structured and convincing public discourse in which leaders might create a form of reality to legitimise the adoption of violence and thus making it seem acceptable (Jackson, 2005; Soriano, 2011). Such convincing discourse is utilised to persuade people that they live in a world where enemies take their lives, threaten their life style and freedom (Jackson, 2005). Within this constructed reality, the enemy plots to oppress, dominate and to strip people of their rights while freedom fighters defend their homelands and save the innocents' lives. This is generally partnered with provocations of a clear juxtaposition of good and bad acts represented by freedom fighters on one side and oppressors on the other (Jackson, 2005; Schmid, 2014). In this view, the language of the leaders can affect people's thoughts and beliefs and consequently violence ensues as a reasonable reaction to such a situation; thus it can be seen by many people as the only right action to do (Jones &Peccei, 2004; Jackson, 2005).Consequently, through the use of the strategic employment of particular words and expressions, Jackson (2005) argued that political language is founded and structured to shape people's perceptions of the world. Crenshaw (1995, p.7) noted that "political language affects the perceptions of protagonists and audiences, and such an effect acquires a greater urgency

in the drama of terrorism". In this sense, the language of terrorism does not only affect perception, but also it affects cognition - the way of thinking, particularly the making of strategic choices and functions. As such, terrorism is constituted through the interplay of language and practice (Jackson, 2005). Therefore, getting into the substantive details of the political language helps reflect the constant ideology which instigate violence and thus constructing a whole new world for the public. To this end, the researchers have found out that bin Laden's discourse of incitement using critical discourse analysis is scarce and this is what the researchers intend to do because cognitive and critical approaches to discourse and language can be combined (van Dijk, 2003, 2009; Reisigl & Wodak, 2009). Therefore, van Dijk (2003; 2004) called for integrating cognitive, social and political aspects in order to gain a better insight to the construction and production of discourse.

Bin Laden's speech,*To the People of Iraq*, was delivered after the autumn of 2002 when the United States of America seconded by its alley Britain were preparing to invade Iraq to overthrow the Ba'athist regime. Five weeks before the assault was launched, bin Laden's speech on 11 February 2003 consisting of a sixteen minute-long audiotape was broadcast by the Arabic channel, al-Jazeera. Bin Laden condemned in advance the invasion of Iraq and predicted that the assault will be combined with massive air strikes and a non-stop propaganda campaign. Therefore, he encouraged the Iraqis to resist by recounting in detail the defensive tactics that enabled him and his fellow-fighters to survive the heavy bombing of their redoubts in Tora Bora Mountains in December 2001 in Afghanistan. In addition, he stressed and called on Iraqis to carry out the martyrdom operations which have the capacity to inflict unprecedented harm on the enemy.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

This article addresses the following objectives:

1.   To examine the semantic macrostructures in bin Laden's selected speech

2.   To uncover the lexical structures deployed by bin Laden in his selected speech

3.   To reveal the ideology in bin Laden's selected speech

LITERATURE REVIEW

The term *discourse* has been widely defined by scholars such as Brown and Yule (1983);Fairclough (1989) and van Dijk (1997) who viewed discourse as a form of *language in use*. Fairclough (1995) contended that discourse – language use in text and talk – is a form of *social practice*. Discourse, as a socially consequential practice, can also bring about important issues of power whereby power as a social phenomenon and continuously requires legitimacy; language is the milieu of legitimation (Jackson, 2005; Hodges & Nilep, 2007). Therefore, scholars such as Fairclough (1992), van Dijk (1997; 2001), and Wodak (2001) contended that discourse is not only a social practice, but also a political practice. Therefore, discourse can establish and change power relations in any community or group. As a consequence, discourse of terrorism which is prevalent in bin Laden's speeches, for example, does not merely reflect an event that takes place in the world, but also it constitutes its socio-political reality.

The researchers undertake a review of the literature pertaining to bin Laden's speeches to underpin the current research. Chilton (2004), for example, has studied the language of bin Laden from the prism of cognitive linguistics of political action as a verbal action through the performance of speech acts, concentrating on how actors represent a given reality. Additionally, Osama bin Laden's language has received a considerable attention from other

scholars such as Leudar, Marsland and Nekvapil (2004),Bhatia (2007) and Garbelman (2007) comparable with the language set by Bush II from a critical discourse analysis perspective focusing on the content of the contrastive pair *Us* vs. *Them*. Specifically, scholars such as Chilton (2004) and Bhatia (2007) have analysed bin Laden's persuasive language. They provided some insights into the use of linguistic persuasion in discourse; nevertheless they rarely linked the cognitive processes of persuasion to the wider discourse context in terms of socio-political contexts of the audience (El-Najjar, 2012).

Muqit (2012) analysed bin Laden's speech *The Wind of Faith* delivered onOctober 7, 2001 focusing on the ideology and power relations. He examined the discursive practice in which ideology and power relations are embedded including the use of pronouns. To do so, he employed Fairclough's (1989) three dimensional approach with Halliday's Systematic Functional Linguistics to explore the ideology and power relations within the social practice. In Taylor's (2013) analysis of the discursive techniques employed by bin Laden, she focused on three keynote speeches made by bin Laden on 7 October 2001, 30 October 2004 and 19 January 2006 positioning them in a chronological order to characterise the particular modes of persuasion they exhibited. The common theme of justification from bin Laden for his war of terror threaded through each of the three speeches examined. Taylor used the Three Stages of Rhetorical Criticism approach developed by Campbell and Burkholder in the analysis of these three speeches. In addition, Schmid (2014) studied al-Qaeda's narrative which nourishes its followers with satisfying portrayal of reality of the world in which they live and the role that they have to do. Despite Schmid's discussion of al-Qaeda's narrative ideologically by explaining the important elements such as a basic grievance, a vision of the good society, and suicide/martyrdom operations which instigate Al-Qaeda's followers to join jihad, he did not pay attention to the linguistic aspects of the discourse.

The findings from earlier studies have highlighted the study of discourse of bin Laden in relation to ideology, society, culture and language. Therefore, the analysis of bin Laden's discourse of incitement at political, historical, linguistic and ideological levels with respect to the persuasion of his followers to commit violent acts has not been studied. Thus, this article employs a multidisciplinary approach designed to fill the hiatus in the existing literature.

THEROETICAL FRAMEWORK

The researchers have employed three theories: van Dijk's (1980) Semantic Macrostructures, van Dijk's (1998a) Ideological Square and Wodak's (2001; 2009) Discourse–Historical Approach. Thus, the following discussion elucidates the fundamental concepts of each of the three theories, and subsequently develops a theoretical framework as proposed by al-Shaibani (2011) that constitutes and integrates elements of linguistics, cognitive function and societal aspects.

Van Dijk's (1980) Semantic Macrostructures Theory

Van Dijk's theory recognizes political discourse as a socio-cultural, cognitive, and linguistic phenomenon. This approach is important because it can illuminate cognition involved in political discourse offering an examination of how it is understood and analysed at the structural and textual levels (van Dijk, 1988). Hence, van Dijk's theory provides an extensive analysis of the political discourse at various linguistic and textual levels along with the analysis at the production and comprehension levels.Van Dijk's analysis is of twofold: macro-and micro-level analyses.

Macro-Level Analysis

At the macro-level analysis, thematic structures are examined. Macrostructure is the theoretical notion used to systematise and make explicit the notion of themes of a discourse. Such themes exemplify the gist or essential information of a discourse, i.e. the global meaning of a discourse. This implies that macrostructures in discourse are semantic objects. Accordingly, these semantic structures defining texts, action, and cognition are given in terms of propositions which are defined as the conceptual meaning structure in a clause (van Dijk, 1980; Brown &Yule, 1983). Therefore, propositions as van Dijk (1988,p.31) defined are "the smallest independent meanings constructs of language and thought…. typically expressed by single sentences or clauses". This definition indicates that proposition cannot be isolated words to denote a concept but it integrates into other propositions expressed by clauses and sentences. For example, a single concept expressed by a lexical word such as *terrorist* is not a proposition because it necessitates reference to the meaning of the sentence in which it occurs. There is a difference between the proposition *He is a terrorist* and its denial *He is not a terrorist* although they both consist of the concept of terrorist, and thus both can be considered as expressions of opinions (van Dijk, 1998b).

Language users can derive the semantic macrostructures from a text using a variety of linguistic and cognitive rules and strategies (van Dijk&Kintsch, 1983). This is so because macropropositions are implicit, and thus these rules are required to separate the microstructure from the global macro framework of the communication. There are three rules to derive semantic macrostructures: generalisation, deletion, and construction. The first macro-rule is *generalisation* that is one of the primary macro-rules in which related minor topics are replaced with a superordinate idea. A second key macro-rule is that of *deletion* whereby the information of inconsequential and irrelevant propositions is deleted. As a third macro-rule, *construction* is the result of the first two rules which leads to construct a new macroproposition (van Dijk, 1980).

Micro-Level Analysis

At the microstructure level, lexical structures are examined due to their relevance and importance in the political discourse analysis. Word selection can enhance the style of a discourse, and a study of the language used can deliver a text or speech that is directly targeted to appeal to an audience, simply through the careful selection of words and modes of expression (Thorne, 1997). In political discourse, lexical structure operates as a vital tool in strategic positioning; therefore, the careful choice of words in any communication is a key tactic in reinforcing that strategy. The words chosen play a central role in determining identity and framing any given situation which, in turn, gives a special meaning to actions, objects and subjects involved (Sun, 2007).

The vocabulary selected to express ideas, concepts and meanings is addressed in the semantic and linguistic analysis.Their selection may be formulated by context depending on setting, goals, and participants besides the knowledge and ideologies of the dominant leaders and their groups. Chilton (2004, p.203) suggested that "the tendency in much political discourse is towards antonymous lexical choices, and other lexical choices that must lead to hearers making mental models that are binary in character". The creation of negative associations with out-group elements can be achieved through an emphasis on shortcomings and faults of that group; whereas focus can be placed on only the positive traits and behaviours of the in-group (Chilton, 2004). Thus, lexicalization is an important device for the linguistic analysis of the present study because word choice represents ideologically controlled discourse meanings (van Dijk, 1995).

Van Dijk's (1998a) Theory of Ideological Square

Van Dijk's (1998a) theory of ideology is used to indicate the notion of *ideological Square.* The word Square refers to four dimensions that can elucidate and validate the existence of societal inequality and polarisation. The ideological Square includes:

1) Express/emphasize information that is positive about us.

2) Express/emphasize information that is negative about them.

3) Suppress/de-emphasize information that is positive about them.

4) Suppress/de-emphasize information that is negative about us.

These moves constitute the *ideological Square* which plays a particular role in the contextual strategy reflecting a crucial property of ideology and focusing on participants as social groups (van Dijk, 1997). In terms of political discourse, van Dijk (1998a, p.69) contended that this polarisation offers straightforward and helpful clarifications. The conflicting groups, for example, typically identify themselves in terms of a "polarisation schema defined by the opposition between Us and Them". This is so because the use of polarisation in political discourse necessitates evaluations. Therefore, politically and ideologically based opinions and attitudes can be used to describe politicians, organizations and public figures (van Dijk, 1997). Thus, the researchers probe to what extent the Ideological Square is relevant for political discourse with relation to lexical structures.

Wodak's (2001; 2009) Discourse–Historical Approach

The discourse-historical approach (DHA) is a hermeneutic and interpretative approach in studying discourse. Due to the fact that this approach mixes cognition, linguistics and history, the DHA is generally referred to as a triangulatory approach. This requires that various conceptual and methodological viewpoints from a number of different disciplines are adopted to examine discursive phenomena (Wodak et al., 2009).This approach is interdisciplinary and methodologically diverse. It has been claimed that the DHA and its combination of political, organizational and historical texts and topics is an effort to bring together the largest amount of information possible from the historical information, original sources and backdrop to social and political areas in which can be found the imprint of discursive phenomena (Weiss &Wodak, 2003). It is not intended that CDA be replaced by DHA. Instead, DHA is intended to be a different type of CDA in which triangulation at contextual and linguistic levels can be realised. On the linguistic level, DHA examines three specific aspects that appear in language as explained by Reisigl and Wodak (2009). These aspects include the specific contents or topics of a specific discourse, discursive strategies, and the linguistic means (as types) and the specific, context-dependent linguistic realizations (as tokens).

There are two key characteristics of the DHA. First, it studies various public spaces and intertextual and interdiscursive relationships. Second, it examines the focus on historical information allows for the importance of the recreation of particular contexts, and how this works to connect discourses and texts both intertextually and interdiscursively over time (Reisigl&Wodak, 2009). Thus, the researchers attempt to use these cues in order to ascertain the appropriateness of the DHA in the political discourse analysis.

METHODOLOGY AND DATA ANALYSIS

This paper provides a rather deep analysis of only one speech entitled *To the People of Iraq* delivered by bin Laden and broadcast in 2003 prior to the Iraq war which occurred in the same year. The selected speech revolves around the preparation of USA to invade Iraq and the proclamation of jihad. The selected speech was collected from a recognised source that is

of Lawrence's (2005) book *Messages to the World: The Statements of Osama Bin Laden* (p, 179-185) and it is not attached to this paper due to space constraints. Lawrence (2005) emphasised that bin Laden's transcript used in his book had been previously confirmed as official and genuine by specialists and officials, all of whom had conducted an in-depth analysis of the information. Thus, this book is fundamental to the study, as it provides a collection of bin Laden's transcripts all from different time periods and are translated from Arabic into English by only one translator, James Howarth. The first and the third authors are proficient in Arabic language, and they have examined the original version of bin Laden's speech and validated the translation of the selected speech. This procedure has been done because some translators may inject their own subjectivity into the texts they translate. The selected speech is analysed according to the proposed theoretical framework as in the subsequent sections.

Macro-Level Analysis

Bin Laden's speech revolves around many macropropositions which can be inferred from the text as seen in the table below.

Table 1. Derivation of Macropropositions

Sentence No.	Initial Macropropositions
1&2	Praising God's (Allah) mercy and blessings
3	The US and its allies preparation for war to occupy Iraq and to install a stooge government to follow its masters in Washington and Tel Aviv to pave the way for the establishment of Greater Israel.
4,5,6&7	Important values to be emphasised in this situation of waging this unjust war by America and its allies such as sincerity of will and fighting for only one God (Allah).
8	Bin Laden motivated for jihad.
9,10&11	Man must seek repentance and obey Allah's orders when joining battle.
12	America and its enormous propaganda machine depend on psychological warfare.
13	America also depends on intense air strikes.
14	These troops are deceived by the lies and tyranny of their government to participate in this unjust war.
16	They merely fight for capitalists, takers of usury, and arms and oil merchants, including the criminal gang in the White House.
17	The disguised trenches are the effective means to neutralise the enemy's air force as did in the battle of Tora Bora.
18	In that battle, the forces of faith triumphed over all the evil forces of materialism by remaining true to their principles.
19&20	Bin Laden recounted the facts behind that battle saying that the numbers of the troops are 3.000 mujahidin.
21	Those troops dug 100 trenches to avoid the heavy causalities from the bombing.
22	The intensive bombardment of the American campaign.
23&24	The US air strikes continued for less than a month with very heavy bombing especially after the American command's declaration, Ayman al-Zawahiri, was still in Tora Bora.

25,26 &27	The planes poured down their fire in order to destroy Afghanistan.
28,29 &30	An elaborate military operation was planned which included deployment of the CIA-US Special Operations Forces team to guide non-stop heavy air strikes during 72 hours.
31,32 &33	Al-Qaeda fighters pushed the US forces back in defeat carrying their dead and injured.
34	The battle is not equal because the supreme power equipped with modern types of military capabilities in opposition to a small group of mujahidin in their trenches within one square mile at temperatures as low as ten degrees below zero.
35&36	The casualties of al-Qaeda in the battle.
37	Bin Laden believed that these global evil forces could not even achieve their objective over one square mile against a small; therefore they will not be expect to triumph over the entire Islamic world.
38	Muslims will triumph as long as they stay true to their religion and insist on waging jihad for it.
39	Bin Laden prohibited Iraqis not to be frighten by the US propaganda about its types of bombs.
40,41, 42,43& 44	The American bombs have no significant effect in trenches and forests, as they require clear targets. The use of trenches is of great benefit to ensure the total exhaustion of the enemy's bomb supply.
45&46	Bin Laden insisted on the urban and street warfare where the US can suffer heavy and costly human losses.
47	Bin Laden emphasised the importance of martyrdom operations to inflict unprecedented harm on America and Israel.
48&49	Bin Laden warned the hypocrites in Iraq and Arab rulers who have supported America in their war against Muslims in Iraq.
50	True Muslims must motivate and mobilise the Ummah to liberate themselves from their enslavement to these oppressive ruling regimes who are supported by America.
51	The areas that in need of liberation are Jordan, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, andYemen.
52,53, 54&55	The US war is directed primarily against the people of Islam, regardless of whether the socialist party, or Saddam, remains in power or not. Muslims in general and in Iraq in particular must prepare themselves for jihad against this unjust campaign. This is their prescribed duty.
56&57	Fighting with socialist party members is not allowed as Muslims' belief and banner must be for God (Allah) sake bur no harm to cooperate the socialists and al-Qaeda's troops in Iraq.
58&59	The socialists are infidels, wherever they may be, whether in Baghdad or Aden.
60&61	The coming Iraqi fighting can be compared to the Muslims' previous battles and the fighting in Iraq is just as the Muslims' struggle against Byzantium suited the Persians.
62&63	Muslims have to be steadfast and they must not affected by the enemy's false rumours which lead to discouragement.
64	Your reprimand to the Crusaders should be just as the poet said: "All there is between you and me is the piercing of kidneys and smiting of necks."
65	Bin Laden commanded Muslims to fear God (Allah) both covertly and overtly, and to be patient in the jihad, for victory requires patience.
66,67,68 ,69&70	Bin Laden commanded Muslims to pray for God (Allah) to defeat the enemies and give Muslims victory over them.

As seen from the table above, bin Laden's speech revolves around many macropropositions which can be inferred from the text. The initial macropropositions can be summarised to nine Higher-level Macropropositions which form the semantic macrostructure of this speech as thematised (HM1-HM9).

HM1:The US and its allies are preparing for war to occupy Iraq and install a puppet government to be submissive to its masters in Washington and Tel Aviv.

HM2:The US and its international allies launched a war against al-Qaeda's fighters

HM3: Bin Laden attempts to share his past experience in the battle of Tora Bora in Afghanistan with the Muslims in Iraq.

HM4: The disguised trenches are necessary as a defensive means to neutralise the US's air force.

HM5: The recourse toguerrilla warfare by Muslims in Iraq will cause many human losses among the US troops in Iraq.

HM6: Bin Laden encourages martyrdom operations to inflict harm on the America troops in Iraq.

HM7: True Muslims must motivate and mobilise the Ummah to liberate themselves from their enslavement to these oppressive ruling regimes which are supported by America.

HM8: There is no harm to form an alliance between the Ba'athists (remnants of Ba'ath Party in Iraq) and al-Qaeda's troops in Iraq although the Ba'athistsare infidels.

HM9: Muslims have to be patients and steadfast in the path of jihad, and they must not be affected by the enemy'sfalse rumours which lead to discouragement.

In this speech, the US preparation for war to occupy Iraq is taken from HM1. In (HM2 - HM5), bin Laden wants to share his past experience in Afghanistan and al-Qaeda's war against the US forces to help Iraqis to combat the enemy via guerrilla warfare where the enemy's bombs have no specific targets. Therefore, the martyrdom operations (suicide bombings) have been emphasised as an effective means to inflict unprecedented casualties on the enemy as shown in HM6. HM7 and HM8 are concerned with the mobilisation of Muslims in general and Iraqis in particular which would most likely lead to the adoption of jihad with the aid of the Ba'athistsand al-Qaeda's fighters in Iraq. To do so, HM9 demonstrates how Muslims are constant and patient in the path of jihad and they should not be affected by the enemy's propaganda and psychological war which may discourage their morale. To sum up, this process is made by reducing the irrelevant details (deletion) and constructing an overall macroproposition (construction). Therefore, the semantic macrostructure can be formulated from the nine higher-level macropropositions (HM1-HM9) as '*The USA and its allies prepared to invade Iraq, therefore, Iraqis must cooperate with the Ba'athists and follow the same path that al-Qaeda fighters adopted in Afghanistan through martyrdom operations to inflict unprecedented casualties on the alliance forces*'. Thus, this semantic macrostructure is comprehensive and informative as it provides a sufficient summary of the speech which might be important to the target readership.

 Ideologically, bin Laden has severely castigated America and its allies for their intervention in Iraq's politics particularly the American pretext to depose the Ba'ath party (Saddam's solo party in Iraq). On one hand, he depicted America as an invader which committed atrocities against the Iraqis. On the other hand, the semantic macrostructure refers to bin Laden as an active actor who has the power and legitimacy to call on jihad to defend Muslims in Iraq. Therefore, the ideological dichotomy of positive and negative representations is apparent in

bin Laden's speech. The in-group is represented by the Iraqis as defenders and guardians and thus they are associated with the positive features; whereas the out-group is described negatively. However, through the criticism of US's plans to invade Iraq, bin Laden has expressed his support to the resistance of the rebels maintaining the actions that the in-group should take. Bin Laden mentioned the recourse to martyrdom operations (suicide attacks) in the confrontation against the USA troops in Afghanistan and the casualties caused to the enemy. This is manifested through the use of the phrase *to inflict unprecedented casualties* which implies that the suicide attacks are lethal weapons which help them achieve their goals.

Micro-Level Analysis

Bin Laden used military and war vocabulary to describe the situation in Afghanistan such as *Crusaders' preparations for war, unjust war, troops, fight, Crusader enemy's air force, battle of Tora Bora, the forces of faith, triumphed, the evil forces of materialism, trenches, bombing, intensive bombardment, warplanes, blowing up and destroying this small area, the planes poured down their fire on us, the American forces, smart bombs, bombs weighing thousand pounds, cluster bombs, bunker busters, bombers like the B-52, dropping twenty to thirty bombs, Modified C-130 planes, modern firepower, attacks, defeat, and martyrdom operations.* The use of these military and war lexicons from the conflict between al-Qaeda's fighters and the US forces to frame current issues is demonstrated in the employment of the noun phrase *Crusaders' preparations for war to invade Iraq*. This type of lexical first appeared when the battle of Tora Bora was being reported and then these lexicons have been used to denote behaviour that is considered to be dubious. Bin Laden simultaneously asserted that al-Qaeda was a defiant force that threatened the US through its provocative behaviour and also distorted and belittled the image of the US. This helped him to suggest to his audience that US forces had been defeated and that al-Qaeda should adopt jihad as its defensive strategy which could be aided by naive Muslims. This is most noticeable from the reference to *trench* or *urban and street warfare* which simultaneously symbolises safety and threat as well as giving a sense of direct involvement. Such a contextual imagery helps bin Laden to relate his experience in Afghanistan to his audience.

Although bin Laden was aware of the technological superiority of the United States which was apparently shown in the description of war in this speech, he underestimated the difficulty of fighting the United States in Iraq as did in Afghanistan. This is possibly due to the two countries' vastly different terrains as Iraq does not have the kind of mountains and caverns that characterise Afghanistan. He argued that it was the unsettled power equilibrium between the al-Qaeda and its opponents led to the recourse to martyrdom operations that caused unparalleled losses. The use of military lexicons to describe the US conflict against the al-Qaeda in Afghanistan makes the differentiation between the in-group and the out-group extremely evident. There is a tendency to describe the Muslim forces as being more adroit in contrast to the depiction of the US forces as being mindless and brutal. This image of supremacy helps bin Laden and his supporters to adopt jihad in Muslim countries.

CONCLUSION

As for the thematic structures following van Dijk's (1980) Semantic Macrostructure, the researchers have noted that the Semantic Macrostructure(SM) could be condensed as *inciting the Muslims in Iraq to defeat the Western power and its allies by launching martyrdom operations*. Accordingly, bin Laden described al-Qaeda's actions against the West as jihad (Holy War) and called every Muslim to take part in this war. This encourages for future' martyrdom operations' or suicide attacks which are regarded as the most substantial impediment for the United States' actions. Thus, the core message of bin Laden's speech is to

brand the US and its allies as the very enemy of Islam. Nevertheless, the Western world is not exempt from bin Laden's recourseto violence is ethically condemnable; however, the concept of 'the West' is merely a section of an enlarged perspective of the world. This is in line with Chilton's (2004, p.189) view that "bin Laden's discourse world is one in which the USA is not the sole or even the primary enemy". The adoption of violence in al-Qaeda's narrative reveals that bin Laden demonstrated this as a strategic goal to end the occupation in Muslim countries. Thus, this conclusion validates Pape's (2005) view that al-Qaeda has the goal of eradicating the enemy from the territories that al-Qaeda's fighters consider as their homelands. However, al-Qaeda deviated from the main goal of confronting the enemy to kill both military personnel and civilians who condemned its violent acts in Muslim countries. Thus, the semantic macrostructure concludes the notion of positive self-representation and negative other-representation which is also evident in other studies as in Bhatia (2007) and al-Shaibani (2011).

The lexical analysis that codes the ideological representations of the selected speech is seen via the use of war and militarylexicons. These lexicons were associated in bin Laden's speech with the negative actions of the out-group. Bin Laden promoted a unique way of life and aspiration of the *Self* and that of the *Other* which was counted as aggressive and oppressive in his speech. Positive lexicons in bin Laden's speech created a universal obligation of the *Self* as a defender and a saviour of the Muslim lands. As for the negative lexicons, the researchers have found that the lexicons that construct the *Other* were more frequently used compared to the lexicons describing the *Self* in the corpus. This is due to a strategic goal that bin Laden has to influence and accentuate the emotion of his respective audiences and subsequently to generate their support. Some of bin Laden's lexicons were expressed via religious references evaluating the foe's actions and personality as negative such as *infidels* and *atheists*. They alsorevealed the religiously negative connotations which were associated with America and its associates.

It has been found that the use of manipulated or selectively cited religious references is a more powerful tool in the encouragement of aggressive behaviour which can be evidenced by the ongoing impact that al-Qaeda's jihadi ideology has had on today's Muslim youths even after the death of bin Laden. The researchers note that bin Laden's speech made use of religious discourse and associated it with politics. This is in congruent with Chilton's (2004) and Leudar, Marsland and Nekvapils' (2004) views. Thus, violence executed as political acts, yet supported by religious argument, create a need for methods of interpreting the legitimacy of such events within religious guidelines. This discursive use has complicated the societal relationship between violence and religion. Thus, religion has represented a moral legitimacy to instil the sense of violence in bin Laden's followers to assault their enemies who have the upper hand over the powerless Muslims.

Ideologically, positive self-presentation of in-group and negative-other presentation of out-group are manifested on the micro level of analysis. The results show that bin Laden mentioned subjects that are defamatory to the in-group yet consistently highlight those that cast the out-group in a negative image. Because ideologies are community orientated, such strategies are typically aimed at political factions (van Dijk, 2001). The analysis of bin Laden's speech seems to fit van Dijk's theory of the Ideological Square because bin Laden never mentioned any lexicons that were either detrimental to his message, his community or himself.

REFERENCES

[1].   Al-Shaibani, G. (2011).*The Iraq war 2003: a critical discourse analysis*. LAMBERT Academic Publishing. Saarbrucken, Germany.

[2].   Bhatia, A. (2007). Religious metaphor in the discourse of illusion: George W. Bush and Osama Bin Laden. *World English, 26*(4): 507-524.

[3].   Blanchard, C.(2007).*Al-Qaeda: statements and evolving ideology*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

[4].   Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983).*Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[5].   Chilton, P. (2004).*Analyzing political discourse: theory and practice*. London:Routledge.

[6].   Crenshaw, M. (1995).*Terrorism in context*.Pennsylvania university press.

[7].   EL-Najjar, S. (2012).Intertextuality and Interdiscursivity in the discourse of Muslim televangelists: The case study of Hamza Yusuf. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Discipline*, *Vol. 6* (1): 76 – 95.

[8].   Fairclough, N. (1989).*Language and power*. London: Longman.

[9].   Fairclough, N.(1992).*Discourse and social change*. Cambridge, UK: Policy Press.

[10]. Fairclough, N.(1995).*Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*. London and New York: Longman.

[11]. Garbelman, J. (2007). Us and them: A critical analysis of the use of language by president George W. Bush and Osama bin Laden in the wake of September 11th. (Order No. 3279304, Indiana University). Pro- Quest Dissertations and Theses.

[12]. Hodges, A., & Nilep, C. (Eds).(2007).*Discourse, war and terrorism*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins (Discourse Approaches to Politics, Society and Culture Series).

[13]. Jackson, R. (2005).*Writing the war on terrorism language, politics and counter-terrorism.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

[14]. Jones, J., & Peccei, J. (2004) Language and politics, in Thomas L.(ed)*Language, society, and power*.New York: Routledge.

[15]. Klimesh, A. (2010).Terror rhetoric: deconstructing dominant and alternative realities. *Graduate Theses and Dissertations.* Iowa State University.

[16]. Lawrence, B. (Ed.). (2005).*Messages to the world: the statements of Osama Bin Laden* (New York: Verso).

[17]. Leudar, I., Marsland, V., & Nekvapil, J. (2004). On membership categorisation: 'Us', 'them' and 'doing violence' in political discourse. *Discourse and Society 15*: 243–266.

[18]. Muqit, A. (2012). Ideology and power relation reflected in the use of pronoun in Osama Bin Laden's speech text. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity.* Vol. 2, (6): 557-561.

[19]. Pape, R. (2005).*Dying to win: the strategic logic of suicide terrorism,* New York: Random House.

[20]. Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2009). 'The discourse-historical approach (DHA).'.in R Wodak& M Meyer (eds),*Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis.* Sage (2nd revised edition), London, 87-121.

[21]. Schmid, A.(2014).Al-Qaeda's "single narrative" and attempts to develop counter-narratives: The state of knowledge. *The Hague: The International Centre for Counter-Terrorism.*

[22]. Sun, J. (2007). Language, Meaning, and World Politics —The Language of the Bush Administration and the Iraq War— *Weatherhead Center for International Affairs.* Harvard University.

[23]. Taylor, M.(2013). A Rhetorical Analysis of Messages to America by Osama bin Laden. Meredith Rhode Island College Digital Commons.RIC.

[24]. Thorne, R.(1997).*Dictionary of contemporary slang*. London. Bloomsbury publishing.

[25]. Van Dijk, T.(1980).*Macrostructures: An interdisciplinary study of global structures in discourse, interaction, and cognition.* New Jersey, U.S.:LEA.

[26]. Van Dijk T. (1988).*News as discourse*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

[27]. Van Dijk, T.(1991).*Racism and the press: critical studies in racism and migration*. London: Routledge.

[28]. Van Dijk, T. (1995).*Discourse, semantics and ideology .Discourse & Society*, 6 (2): 243-289.

[29]. Van Dijk, T. (1997). What is political discourse analysis?. Dins Blommaert, J.; Bulcaen, Ch. (eds.) *Political linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 11-52.

[30]. Van Dijk, T.(1998a).*Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage.

[31]. Van Dijk, T.(1998b).*Opinions and ideologies in the press.* In Allan Bell and Peter Garrett (eds.), *Approaches to Media Discourse*, 21-63.

[32]. Van Dijk, T. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In Schiffrin et al., *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 352-371.

[33]. Van Dijk,T. (2003).*The discourse-knowledge interface*. In Gilbert Weiss & Ruth Wodak (Eds.), *Critical discourse analysis. Theory and interdisciplinarity.* (pp. 85-109). Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave-MacMillan.

[34]. Van Dijk, T. (2004).*Discourse, knowledge and ideology.* In Martin Pütz, JoAnne Neff & Teun A. van Dijk (Eds.) *Communicating ideologies. multidisciplinary perspectives on language, discourse and social practice*, 5-38.

[35]. Van Dijk, T. (2005).War rhetoric of a little ally: political implicatures of Aznar's legitimization of the war in Iraq. *Journal of Language and Politics*, *4*(1): 65-92.

[36].   Van Dijk, T.(2009). Critical discourse studies: a Socio-cognitive approach. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer(eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage,62-85.

[37].   Van Dijk, T., & Kintsch, W.(1983).*Strategies of discourse comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.

[38].   Weiss, G., & Wodak, R. (2003).*Critical discourse analysis; theory and interdisciplinarity.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

[39].   Wodak, R., De Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., & Liebhart, K.(2009).*The discursive construction of national identity.*2nd ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.