

## The Linguistic Functions in King Abdullah II of Jordan Speeches

Abdelaziz Mohammed\*

College of Sciences and Arts, Qilwah, Albaha University, Saudi Arabia

Corresponding Author: Abdelaziz Mohammed, E-mail: amimohammed@bu.edu.sa

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history

Received: September 10, 2018

Accepted: December 02, 2018

Published: January 31, 2019

Volume: 8 Issue: 1

Advance access: December 2018

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: None

### ABSTRACT

The common sense is that each time you revise a discourse you can find new points behind the lines. Thus, this paper aims at analyzing and investigating King Abdullah II of Jordan speech qualitatively. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is used to analyze King Abdullah's speech based on Grice's maxims; Van Dijk; Fairclough; and Johnson and Johnson's models to study both the persuasion styles and persuasion strategies he maintained in his speech. The study concludes that using evidence plays a crucial role in persuading the audience. Thus, it is highly recommended to read/listen to any political discourse in the mirror of its pillars and evidence shown by the speaker should not be taken as a dirty speech.

**Key words:** Discourse Analysis, Persuasive Techniques, Self-image, Analogy

### INTRODUCTION

This is not a political study. It only focuses on the discourse features and the linguistic functions used by King Abdullah II of Jordan in his political speeches, conferences and/or press meetings. Discourse analysis, in some studies, was defined as the 'analysis of language beyond the sentence'. Thus, it is the study of smaller bits of language, such as sounds, parts of words, meaning, and the order of words in sentences. As there were little issues published in the concern of these types of speeches, a number of models, texts and contextual analyses were collected to shed more light on some speeches of King Abdullah II the king of Jordan. In 2001, Fairclough and Van Dijk introduced models to get an in-depth view of such topics and subtopics mentioned in the speeches in order to discover the convincing techniques behind the use of language functioned by the speaker to reach a true self-image as well as the image of the other in the world community (Fairclough, 2001; Van Dijk, 2001). To verify whether the cooperative principle was observed in the two speeches, and whether any deviation, was intended as a persuasive strategy; Grice (1975) proposed four fundamentals of quality, quantity, relevance and manner to be used. Generally, it can be said that not all politics talks are negative or dirty, there are beneficial and optimistic sides to them.

This study is considered important in that it contributes to the establishment and continuation of a genre in discourse analysis which is constructive discourse analysis. It is hoped that this study would help to nationally and globally clarify all peoples' understanding of the Middle East issues and topics (made by) famous political leaders in the area. The study is also important in that it helps people make better judgments about issues that could possibly be misunderstood by

the audience. The speeches of King Abdullah II of Jordan were chosen given the importance of the topics that he addresses, regionally and globally. To help the analyses of the material collected, two questions are raised: 1) "What are the persuasion styles used by King Abdullah II of Jordan to express his idea globally?" 2) "To what extent were these strategies persuading people about a certain thought?"

Therefore, the study assumes that the persuasive styles are not self-sufficient. They can be complemented by a favorable effective context and the political discourses are not always negative or dirty. They can be used to send clean, and optimistic messages. Moreover, this paper is limited to the analysis of the selected speech which is delivered by the King of Jordan 'King Abdullah II' on a globally widespread and well-known talks.

### DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Nearly all authors agree that it is as sounds (phonetics and phonology), parts of words (morphology), meaning (semantics), and the order of words in sentences (syntax). Therefore, the purpose of a discourse analysts is to study larger chunks of language as they flow together. Some discourse analysts consider the larger discourse context in order to understand how it affects the meaning of the sentence. Linguistically, two sentences taken together as a single discourse can have meanings different from each one taken separately. For instance, using signs at swimming pool like "the toilet, not the pool" and "Pool for members only" independently, they seem quite reasonable. But taking them together as a single discourse makes you go back and revise your interpretation of the first sentence after you have read the second one (Fillmore, 1985: 222–254).

### Definition of Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis (DA), is a general term for a number of approaches that is used to analyze any written, vocal, or sign language use, or any significant semiotic event. Discourse analysis is defined as the study of smaller bits of language. Yule (1997:139) argues that discourse analysis is the investigation of how we, as language users, make sense of what we read in texts and understand what speakers mean. It is defined in terms of coherent sequences of sentences, propositions, speech, or turns-at-talk. Contrary to much of traditional linguistics, discourse analysts not only study language use beyond the sentence boundary but also prefer to analyze naturally occurring language use, not invented examples. According to Stubbs (1993:1) discourse is language above the sentence or above the clause. Fairclough (1995a:56) adds that a discourse is a systematic, internally consistent body of representations. It is the language employed in explaining some social condition from a specific viewpoint. Functionalists Jakobson, R., (1960) and Halliday, M. A. K., (1973, 1978, 1985a, 1985b) concerned with how a particular function of language can be used to perform ways of how to do things with it. They reveal that definitions are attributed to the fact that discourse analysis is an inter-disciplinary approach that has been developed from sociolinguistics, sociology, anthropology and social psychology. Consequently, Van Dijk, (1993: 253) reveals that Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a multidisciplinary study that maintains an intricate relationships between text, talk, social cognition, power, society and culture.

### Discourse and Frames

Reframing is a way to talk about going back and re-interpreting the meaning of the first sentence. Frame analysis is a type of discourse analysis that asks “*What activity are speakers engaged in when they say this?*”, “*What do they think they are doing by talking in this way at this time?*” Hence, there may occur a misleading of understanding to what someone hears or reads if he does not know who talks or what the general topic is. For instance, if you read a newspaper, you need to know whether you are reading an editorial, a news story, or an advertisement in order to properly interpret the text you are reading. Earlier, once Orson Welles’ radio broadcasted a program called “The War of the Worlds”, many listeners who listened lately, frightened. They thought they were hearing the actual end of the world. They misunderstood it was a news instead of drama. Bateson (1954: 93-177) demonstrates that no communicative move, verbal or nonverbal, could be understood without reference to a meta-communicative message, or meta-message, about what is going on that is or what frame of interpretation applies to the move.

### Discourse Markers

To break speech into parts and show the relation between parts by using words like ‘*well*’, ‘*oh*’, ‘*but*’, and ‘*and*’ are known as discourse markers. Interjection like ‘*Oh*’ prepares the hearer for a surprising or just-remembered item, and ‘*but*’ indicates

that sentence to follow is in opposition to the one before. However, these markers don’t necessarily mean as they are defined in the dictionary. Some use marker ‘*and*’ just to start a new thought, and others write ‘*but*’ at the end of the sentences, as a way of trailing off gently. To prevent the frustration, it is important to realize that such words can function as discourse markers but rather than its dictionary meaning every time it is used instead. A discourse marker is a word or phrase that plays a role in managing the flow and structure of discourse. Their main function is at the level of discourse (sequences of utterances) rather than at the level of utterances or sentences. The discourse markers are relatively syntax-independent and usually do not change the truth conditional meaning of the sentence (Carol Lynn, et al, 2004: 177).

### Speech acts

Almost any speech act is really the performance of several acts at once (Bach, K., 2014). Statement such as “*I now pronounce you man and wife*” legislates as a marriage. Sentence functions like that is known as speech act. Speech acts are commonly taken to include such acts as promising, ordering, greeting, warning, inviting and congratulating. It is analysis that asks not what form the utterance takes, but what it does. Studying speech acts such as complimenting allows discourse analysts to ask what counts as a compliment, who gives compliments to whom, and what other function they can serve. In 1993, Deborah Tannen have observed that women are more likely both to give compliments and to get them. She added that there are also cultural differences as in some cultures complimenting can be a way of asking for things. By comparing how people in different cultures use language, discourse analysts hope to make a contribution to improving cross-cultural understanding (Tannen, D., 1993).

### Analyzing Language

Scholars observed and approved that thinking comes before speaking. So, thinking comes before understanding of the entity. This is what is called the hermeneutic circle, (i.e. the text is perceived from its detail and the detail of a text is understood from its whole). Language shows what meaning tells. And that is why language is now used by politicians to achieve their goals. They skew language to suit their audience. That is why political speeches are full of euphemisms, question begging, and cloudy speech. There is a general believe bearing in mind it is true that there is a fact that language and politics are interconnected. It enters into the minds of people and pulls out their habits of thought. It helps the politician to design a lie so that it may appear in a truthful form. Chilton and Schaffner, (2002: 1-41) stated that almost any activity in politics or perhaps any attempt to approach people never takes place without reference to language.

### The political persuasion

Persuasive political discourse is the formal dialogue of reasonable to discuss what is proposed alternative courses of action should be taken to solve a societal problem. Politically,

it is expected that all citizens are involved in the making of the decision or persuade others through valid information and logic, and clarify what course of action would be most effective in solving the on focus problem. Johnson, D. and Johnson, R., (2000) claimed that persuasive discourse is generated with the specific aim of convincing the audience about the validity (or fallacy) of a certain proposition.

Achieving a change of the hearer's mental attitude towards a specific statement requires the speaker to hypothesize and maintain an adequate model of the hearer's beliefs and to update it according to the effects that the speaker's propositions have on the hearer's mental state; and that is what is called planning a communication techniques (Johnson, D. & Johnson, R., 2000). Johnson, D. & Johnson, R., (2000) reveal that political discourse is a method of decision making in a democracy. A decision infers that some agreement prevails as to which of several courses of action is most desirable for achieving a goal. Therefore, each alternative course of action is expected to (a) be strongly advocated, (b) receive a complete and fair hearing, and (c) be critically analyzed to reveal its strengths and weaknesses.

### The communication situation

In order to analyze a speech you should look at "Who is speaking to whom and on what occasion, in what language and with what intention?" and taking notes to each heading in the *rhetorical pentangle* as in the table below:

Speaker	What do you know/what can you find out about the speaker as a person?
Audience	What sort of people constitute the audience?
Circumstances	On what occasion is the speech made? Under what circumstances (physically/politically/ etc.)?
Topic	What is the speech about?
Language	What sort of language (vocabulary, style, syntax) does the speaker use?
Purpose	What seems to be the speaker's purpose?

From the URL: <http://jorgenboge.wikidot.com/how-to-analyze-a-speech>

From the criteria on the above table and as political language has been viewed as the primary means of influencing people through its use of rhetoric, the aim is to persuade, seek the support of people, excite them, or claim reform. In conclusion, the major tents of CDA are summarized by Wodak (2007: 25-203) as:

- I. CDA address social problems.
- II. Power relations are discursive.
- III. Discourse constitutes society and culture.
- IV. Discourse does ideological work.
- V. Discourse is interpretive and explanatory.
- VI. Discourse is a form of social action.

### Language and Politics

Interestingly, language and politics are considered as interconnected issues; language is, for instance, considered the

means of expression of politics. It is the way by which politics or political discourse and ideas are widely distributed. Mazrui (1975: 48) states that language is the most important point of entry into habits of thought of a people. In agreeing with Mazrui's points, Harris (2000: 149-169) declares that in politics, words have a powerful effect. Additionally, Ranney (1975: 130), declares that "Every political authority will lead to justify itself by an appeal to language in its symbolic or realistic sense". Generally, politicians seem to be keen on deploying several linguistic mechanisms to legitimize their situations. Ranney (1975: 130) adds "Political authority will lead to justify itself by an appeal to language in its symbolic or realistic sense". Consequently, Chilton & Schaffner (2002: 1-41), add that political activity can never exist without the use of language. They explain that the key role played by politics in expanding the functions and usages of language. On the other hand, it is also arguably the case that the need for language arose from socialization of humans involving the formation of coalitions, the signaling of group boundaries, and all that these developments imply. Conversely, this does not mean that language arises exclusively for these purposes or functions. It may extended to more issues.

A large number of studies have dealt with political discourse in general and critical discourse analysis in particular. For instance, Lakoff (1991) studies how President Bush, the senior, succeeded to persuade the whole international community that the Gulf War is morally justified. Another study is conducted by Chilton and Schaffner (1997: 218) to analyze the speech of John Major, the former British Prime Minister, on October 14, 1994. They find that the repetitive use of the first personal "I" indicates that he appears authoritative and knowledgeable whereas his audience are subordinate and less knowledgeable. Furthermore, they argue that the associated verbs come from lexical fields pertaining belief, conflict, moral rectitude and provision.

### Grice's maxims

The major principal of political discourse is suggested by Grice in 1975. It is known as the cooperative principle. Grice (1975) in his maxims, suggests that each conversation is based on principles of cooperation. He states that "make your conversational contribution what is required, at the stage which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged". He explains his principle in series of maxims as follows.

- a. *Maxim of quantity*: Make your contribution as informative as required. Don not make your contribution more informative than required.
- b. *Maxim of quality*: Be truthful. Don not say what you believe to be false. Don not say what you lack adequate evidence for.
- c. *Maxim of relation*: Be relevant.
- d. *Maxims of manner*: Be perspicuous. Avoid obscurity of expression. Avoid ambiguity. Be brief. Be orderly.

In using Grice's Maxims, politeness and flouting must be shown in the political speech analysis. Lakoff (1991) contends that linguistic behavior can be seen into three types



(polite, non-polite, and rude) and this can be viewed clearly in conferences or meetings where politeness and flouting can be expected. The notion of argumentation analogy has received much attention in political field. Speech is a public speaking activity which commonly in the form of formal talk performed by a leader to express his/her opinion, or give an overview about a thing or event that is important. Although persuasion is an inherited form of human interaction, it is mandatory in the political process.

### **Structure and meaning**

Structuralists assume that certain structures are innocent of meaning. Meaning is, determined by differences between structures, not the structures themselves. The approach adopted by Hasan, Ruqaiya (1971) and Keyser (1980) is one interested in the question "what does this text mean?" and attempts to answer it using a close analysis of language. Additionally, Fish, Stanley (1980: 53) states that you cannot separate linguistic structure from meaning (i.e., there is no distinction between grammatical meaning and literary meaning).

### **Context**

Context as defined in Chambers Twentieth-Century Dictionary, is the parts of discourse or treatise which precede and follow a special passage and may fix its true meaning. Additionally, context in which literary texts are written should be considered to mean the important facts that have helped understanding literary works (Rylance and Simons, 2001: xxiii). Herman (1995:14) states that context can refer to the cognitive context, the set of beliefs, assumptions, presuppositions, frames, which participants activate or draw on to interpret actions.

### **Functionalism**

Jakobson, R., (1960) believes that the functions of language involve relationships between the message and its context. In consequence, there will be varieties of meanings because meaning changes as the function of language changes in a certain context. Jakobson, R., (1960) and Halliday, M. A. K., (1973, 1978, 1985a, 1985b) study language that polysomic, capable of multiple meanings. They develops a functionally based linguistic theory. It contains three principal language functions: *ideational*, which is the expression of content; *interpersonal*, which is the expression of interaction; and *textual*, which is the expression of situation via a coherent text. Halliday concludes that linguistic choices made from these three functions constitute the text.

The British school of Functionalism, led by linguists like J.R Firth (1968a; 1968b; 1968c), Halliday, M. A. K., (1994), and Sinclair, J. M., (1992: 5-19), reject the isolation of language by itself and studies what speakers actually say. Several British functionalists have developed a view of language as a network of options that are assigned their function when language is used in discourse. This view carries the British brand name of systemic functional linguistics, and considers that the organization of language is designed to support its use.

This type of discourse is called destructive political discourse (Johnson, D. & Johnson, R., 2000). Klebanov et al, (2008: 447-463) show how grammar and lexicon help to achieve a flow of linked ideas together to build an organized and effective text. They concluded that frequency of a lexical item counts in the unity of a text. If an item is repeated many times, it will not be participating in the cohesion of the text. They also found out that the distance between words counts as important in text cohesion in the sense that if two words are far apart from each other, it will be less likely to achieve cohesion in their text. The text appears loose.

Furthermore, Farrelly (2010: 98-104) believes that it is almost impossible to exhaust a genre like CDA as there are worlds, nations, societies, sexes, wars, and communications, there a CDA.

Al-Sowaidi et al. (2015) show and analyze lots of discourse clashes in the Arab world during the uprising in Egypt, Libya, and Yemen. They declare that the discourse consisted of banners, announcements, wall graffiti, chanting, speeches and songs. They conclude a number of persuasive tools which helped to shape the Arab mentality for the attempt to change the political situation in the Arab region.

## **METHODS**

The current study is qualitative in nature. It basically analyzes the functions of King Abdulla II of Jordan on one selected speech from his distinguished and rich of linguistic norms. The aim is to see how successfully the language is used to convey political messages of his country worldwide. The study investigates a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of King Abdullah speech which is collected by the researcher from speech at the 70<sup>th</sup> United Nations General Assembly. As this speech is on video, there may be different text-external elements to look for in terms of appearance, self-presentation and impression management. The criteria for analyzing this speech include Grice's maxims, and models from Van Dijk, Fairclough and Johnson & Johnson.

### **Analysis**

Birch (1989) suggests three steps to analyze a text:

- 1- To find out the meaning that is intended by the writer so it becomes clear to the reader or hearer.
- 2- To interpret how the discourse is meant, not what it only means, in the sense that each time the discourse is read new meanings come up. So, the different readings of the text are contextualized by a set of frames, beliefs, assumptions and backgrounds which we call schema.
- 3- The analysis is an eclectic one, in the sense that a number of principles are drawn from literature and applied to the structure of the speeches.

The framework of analysis here has integrated elements from a number of approaches. This speech is mainly compared with Grice's 1975 maxims together with selected principles from Fairclough, Johnson & Johnson, and Van Dijk's models. The approach that is relevant to this study is Constructive Political Discourse Analysis.

### Analysis of king Abdullah II's speech

Politicians function language to show their audiences what they want to imply, what they mean by what they say. In politics, and the general presupposition, the general impact is not to tell the truth. It is a well-known fact that politics is the "dirty game". Harold Pinter (2005) states that politics takes itself away from the kingdom of truth. Pinter agrees completely with George Orwell (1949) in the sense that politicians wish to see people drowned in ignorance and not truth. From evidence mentioned in the literature related to political language and politicians, it is widely observed that the political discourse is the dirtiest speech in that its speaker aspires for power and control on one hand. On the other hand, the cleanest discourse is the religious discourse in which its speaker aspires for truth, interest of people and for the welfare of humanity in general. King Abdullah II's speech is cleaner as it is referred to his religious beliefs and thoughts (see Appendix A).

As in Littell's comparison, the language of assault precedes historic assassinations. Littell (1995) reflects the optimistic scene in the language of speech which is clearly seen in King Abdullah's speech. Not like other hypocritical speech, this favorable language is the language of democracy where we don't find words of assault, vilification, mendacity, and incitement.

As stated, the function of CDA is to show people the truth. By any means of advertisements, statements, facial expressions, or passionate candidates, etc.; minds of people can be changed or destroyed; peace can be jeopardized and heroes can be assassinated. Language can be a source of social practice and social change. Scholars like (Fairclough, 1992, 2003; Schaffner, 1996; McGregor, 2003; and Van Dijk, 1995, 1998 2001, 2006) state, in the power of words, that the spoken word which is capable of showing societal problems and help solve them and as the spoken discourse, which is the topic of this study represents the savior from oppression, illegal institutions, corruption and inequality. Such type of speech like King Abdullah's speech helps people to resist the oppression of evil's acts and its allies.

The King uses metaphor to highlight political language and make it more influential. His speech is supported by Lakoff (1991), and Lakoff and Johnson (1995) when they talked about metaphors in Political Discourse Analysis (PDA).

In this study, Terrorists and extremists (Khawarij), as King Abdullah described them in his speech, are doing evil acts. Some terrorist groups such as Khawarij do immoral actions. King Abdullah II reflects and rejects their actions in his speech trying to convey to the audience their wrong actions. Birch (1989) reveals that each time the text is read a new interpretation with new meanings comes up. This is what has been seen in King's speech. King Abdullah II initiates his speech with "*Bism Allah Alrahman Alraheem*" He uses *reiteration* and repetition of phrases like "outlaw (s)", "All of us", "value(s)", "challenges", "*Bism Allah Alrahman Alraheem*", "extremists" and "religion(s)" is clear. Additionally, the repetition of "our", "we".

Moreover, expression like "I believe" reflects a lot of truth in the language of politics as there is a lot of lies and

bias. There is no affectation in his speech. A part of his speech such as statements like "I have called these crisis a "Third World War" and I believe we must respond with equal intensity. That means global collective action from all of us". Until he said "These efforts must continue and the UN has the central work. But all of us as individuals and as leaders help build the road ahead. Then let suggest seven essential steps.....etc.", confirms the King's responsibility. He recites his evidence one after another from the Holy Qur'an to show that he didn't mention anything not based on facts. During his speech, there is a repetition of pronouns like *I, We, us, our*, which indicates authority and responsibility. Moreover, that means his speech is full of cohesive devices and connected in form. Additionally, the discourse is incorporated through the *intertextuality* technique. He has made his speech alive. He has quoted from the Holy Qur'an verses that are considered proper in both time and place. Together with his own argumentation, he uses verses from the Qur'an to support his ideas as he states "*What separate humanity is menisci compared to what we hold in common. These values of love, peace, justice, compassion "Bism Allah Alrahman Alraheem, Warahmatee Wasi'at Kula Sha'i" "My mercy impresses all things". He adds "Today our outlaw gangs are nothing, but a drop in an ocean. But a drop of venom can poison a well. We must protect a purity of our faith for morally contamination. As Muslims, this is our fight as it is our duty"*.

The *register* used in his speech is formal in structure and style. He delivered them in clear native-speaker English. The language flows naturally to appeal to both native and non-native speakers alike. He mentioned the word "regional crisis" and add "my region" to identify it clearly as in "*This great general assembly, must address argent world issues sustainable inclusive development that can deliver more opportunity especially to young people and peaceful political solutions to regional crisis. It's the world's obligation to find solutions and provide relief for the millions of refugees in my region*" (See Appendix A). He follows that with a clear description to the crisis in the area especially the Syrian crisis. He adds to his evidences a detailed history of the region, UN agencies that acts in the region, human situation, peace, stability, and policy using political registers which showed the positive side of politic issues.

The strategies like reiteration, intertextuality and register are clear language signals which aimed at persuading people and supporting his ideas. Using *modality* helped him to achieve an optimistic sense (as in the example above).

There is a high degree of possibility as in "*It's high time that the international community acts collectively and facing this unprecedented humanitarian crisis and support countries like Jordon and Lebanon which had been carrying the brunt of this burden for over a past four years.*", and in "*My friends in these areas and us must act and act collectively for the future of our world*". Additionally, there is determination in "*I could actively skip the value's wish here equality.....etc.*" and continues "*Here together we can and must create our future of our people's need...etc.*"; and many more (see Appendix A). These types of modality show

his optimism character. The topics carried out in his speech represent the building pillars in his discourse.

## CONCLUSION

The discourse strategies used by King Abdullah II of Jordan in his speech reflect the way he uses language. He prepares a true safe comfortable atmosphere to his discourse. Almost all strategies used in his speech appear to be consistent with Grice's maxims of quality, quantity, relevance and manner which are met with no deviation or violations. He gives proper weight to each term a full information to show his ideas in a clear content without exaggeration. The persuasive styles like *reiteration*, *intertextuality* and *register* are clear language signals aiming at persuading his points. Moreover, the use of *modality* made him succeed in an optimistic way. Each point in his speech is supported by enough evidence. The King tends not to be fluctuated in explaining what was not needed to be explicit. In that, he follows the stick and carrot policy. He calls Extremists "*Khawarij*" (it is an Arabic term which means outlaws). He tries to reflect their incorrect thought and actions. His message to the whole world is that although the Extremists did all these terrorists acts, there is a chance that they could change their ideology and become good citizens. The presupposition is that they practiced terrorism and adopted them as they are ordered by Islam. Thus, King Abdullah in his speech, he gives enough evidence citing verses from the Holy Qur'an to refute their claims. Based on the evidence revealed in this paper, it is recommended that speeches should be read in depth and between the lines in order to find meanings that intended but are not directly expressed or written. Audience are invited to take it from the mouth of the shrewd and experienced politician like King Abdullah II of Jordan. Moreover, it is recommended that curriculum designers should take into consideration that such kind of speech can be suitable for language learning. Also, students majoring in political sciences are advised to read and analyze King Abdullah II of Jordan's speeches and study the persuasive strategies he uses. Finally, as in a political context, the audience would look for an agent to each nominalized phrase. That is why we interpret political discourse differently.

## REFERENCES

- Al-Sowaidi, B., Banda, F., and Mansour, A. (2015) Doing Politics in the Recent Arab Uprising: Towards a Political Discourse Analysis of the Arab Spring Slogans. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, (25.) Arab news. Retrieved from: <http://www.arabnews.com/node/958321/Saudi-arabia>. And from: <http://youtube/FqSzlXkspBQ>
- Bach, Kent. (2014) "Speech Acts." *Speech Acts*. Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy, n.d. Web. 10 Feb. 2014.
- Bateson, Gregory. (1954). *A theory of play and fantasy*. Steps to an ecology of mind, 93-177. New York: Ballantine.
- Birch, D. (1989). *Language, Literature and Critical Practice: Ways of analyzing Text*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Carol Lynn, Moder; Aida Martinovic-Zic (2004). *Discourse Across Languages and Cultures*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. p. 117. 9027230781.
- Chilton, P., & Schaffner, C. (1997). *Discourse and politics*. In T. A. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction*. London: Sage.
- Chilton, P., & Schaffner, C. (2002). Introduction: Themes and principles in the analysis of political discourse. In P. Chilton & C. Schaffner (Eds.), *Politics as text and talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse* (pp. 1-41). Amsterdam: Benjamin.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995a). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. New York: Routledge.
- Farrelly, M. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis in Political Studies: An Illustrative Analysis of the 'Empowerment' Agenda*. *Politics*, Vol. 30, (2), 98-104.
- Fillmore, Ch. C. (1985) *Frames and the Semantics of Understanding*. *Quadernidi Semantica*. Vol. VI, pp. 222-254
- Firth, J. R. 1968a. A synopsis of linguistic theory, 1930-1955 (Special volume of the Philological Society, Oxford, 1957, 1-31). In *Selected papers of J. R. Firth 1952-1959*, ed. F. R. Palmer, 168-205. London: Longman.
- Firth, J. R. 1968b. Descriptive linguistics and the study of English. In *Selected papers of J. R. Firth 1952-1959*, ed. F. R. Palmer, 96-113. London: Longman.
- Firth, J. R. 1968c. Linguistic analysis as a study of meaning. In *Selected papers of J. R. Firth 1952 1959*, ed. F. R. Palmer, 12-26. London: Longman.
- Fish, S. (1980). *Is there a text in this class? The Authority of Interpretative Communicaties*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985a). *Spoken and Written Language*. Geelong: Deakin University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985b). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Arnold.
- Harris, S. (2000). Evasive action: *How politicians respond to questions in political interviews and campaign effect*. *Annul*. In Harris (1991) Rev. 2000. 51:149-169.
- Hasan, Ruqaiya. (1971). Rhyme and Reason in Literature. In Seymour Chatman (ed.), *Literary style: a symposium*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Herman, V. (1995). *Dramatic discourse. Dialogue as Interaction in Plays*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Jakobson, Roman. (1960). *Closing Statements: Linguistics and Poetics Style in language*. T.A. Sebeka, New-York.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (2000). *Civil political discourse in a democracy: The contribution of psychology*.



- Journal of Peace Psychology*, 6, 291-317. [Electronic version]. Retrieved from <http://www.co-operation.org/pages/contro-pol.html>
- Keyser, Samuel Jay. (1980). —Wallace Stevens: Form and Meaning in Four Poems.I. In Marvin K. L. Ching, Michael C. Haley, and Ronald F. Lunsford. (eds.), *Linguistic Perspectives on Literature*. London: Routledge.
- Klebanov, P. B., Diermier, D., and Beigman, E. (2008). Lexical Cohesion Analysis of Political Speech. *Political Analysis*, Vol. 16, No. 4, Special Issue, pp. 447-463.
- Lakoff, G. (1991). Metaphor in politics: An open letter to the internet from George Lakoff. Retrieved from Center for the Cognitive Science of Metaphor Online Web site: <http://www.uoregon.edu/~uophil/metaphor/lakoff-1.htm>
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M., (1995). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Retrieved from <http://www.press.uchicago.edu/Misc/Chicago/467716.html>
- Littell, F. H. (1995). "The Language of Assault vs the Language of Dialogue". *The Christian Ethics Today Foundation*, December 1995 (Issue 4 Page 23). Retrieved from <http://christianethicstoday.com/cetart/index.cfm?fuseaction=Articles.main&ArtID=259>
- Mazrui, A. (1975). *The political sociology of the English language*. The Hague: Mouton.
- McGregor, S. (2003). *Critical Science and Critical Discourse Analysis*. Vol. 15, No. 1.
- Orwell, G. (1949). *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London: Secker & Warburg. Oxford University Press. Oxford.
- Pinter, H. (2005). Art, truth, & politics. Retrieved From <http://www.nobelprize.org> and from [http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel\\_prizes/literature/laureates/2005/pinter-lecture-e.html](http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/2005/pinter-lecture-e.html)
- Ranney, A. (1975). *The governing of men* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.) Hinsdale, IL: The Dryden Press.
- Rylance, S. & Simons, J. (2001). *Literature in Context*. Palgrave: Macmillan.
- Schaffner, C. (1996). Editorial: Political speeches and discourse analysis. [Electronic version]. *Current issues in language & society*, 3, 201-204. Retrieved from <http://www.multilingual-matters.net/cils/003/0201/cils0030201.pdf>.
- Sinclair, J. M., (1992). Trust the text. In *Advances in systemic linguistics*, ed. M. Davies and L. Ravelli, 5-19. London: Pinter.
- Stubbs, M. (1993). *Words and phrases*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tannen, Deborah (1993) *Framing in Discourse*. Oxford University Press. Oxford. USA.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & society*, 4, 249-283.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1995) Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. Retrieved December 26, 2016 from: <http://www.discourse.org>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). What is political discourse analysis? In: Jan Blommaert & Chris Bulcaen (Eds.), *Political linguistics*. (pp. 11-52). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Political discourse and ideology. Retrieved from: <http://www.discoursein-society.org>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). *Politics, Ideology, and Discourse*. Spain: Elsevier Ltd.
- Wodak, R. (2007) "Pragmatics and Critical Discourse Analysis: A Cross disciplinary Inquiry", *Pragmatics & Cognition*, 19: 25-203.
- Yule, G. (1997). *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## APPENDIX A

### King Abdullah II Speech at the 70<sup>th</sup> United Nations General Assembly

(On behalf of the general assembly I have the honor to welcome to the United Nations His Majesty Abdullah the second Ibn Alhusain King of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and to invite him to address the assembly.)

King Abdullah II starts his speech: "Bism Allah Alrahman Alraheem" Mr. President, Secretary General, and your Excellences. Thank you. It is an honor to stand before this distinguished general assembly. I'm here representing Jordan and also God, praising, admiring human being. I'm here as a father who wants his children, like yours, to live in a compassionate and more peaceful world. Such a future, is under ceaseless stress from the "Kahwarij" the outlaws of Islam that operate globally today. Target religious differences hopping to kill cooperation and compassion among the billions of people off face communities in it side by side in many countries. These outlaw gangs use specious and ignorance to expand their own power. Worthily is the free hands to grave their sails to distort the words of God, to justify the most extrusions of crimes. All of us here, are united by our conviction that these forces must be defeated. But before we ask how to achieve this subjective, let's ask what if they were not defeated, what would our world look like? Can we tolerate the future of mass murder, public beheading, kidnapping and slaving are common practices? Whether persecution of communities is law or humanity is cultures treasures preserve for thousands of years our system radically destroy. I have called these crisis a "Third World War" and I believe we must respond with equal intensity. That means global collective action from all of us. But make no mistake. The more important war is the one who ranges on the bottle ground of the heart to soul and mind, and in this fight, all countries, and all people must come together. Jordan is been proud to work with you and your country spare ahead global initiative for tolerance and dialogue. This has been reflected in 'Amman's message' and 'common word' four years ago we help creating 'the global hopefully week' events to focus our people, especially young people, on the essentials of tolerance and co-existences. These efforts must continue and the UN has the central work. But all of us as individuals and as leaders help build the road ahead. Then let suggest seven essential steps. First, let's get back to basics, to essence and share respect of treats. Seems to be that we can sometimes offside the logic picture. What separate humanity is menisci compared to what we hold in common. These values of love, peace, justice, compassion "Bism Allah Alrahman Alraheem, Warahmatee Wasi'at Kula Shaie" "My mercy impresses all things". Second, let's change our tone. On my travels that on the go I saw a road sign that said "fair God if you miles down the road with another that saying the same thing and another saying "finally we will all go to hell" I thought when and how that fear and intimidation creeps so in sedulously into our conversation when there is so much more if we said about the love of God. The most people may think we have nothing to do with the hate that expresses by

extremists. But our world is also thread with violence, fear and anger dominate our discourse with our school lessons, week sermons or international affairs. Third, let's act on our beliefs. Here I mean the more of prays and fasting or 'Zakat' I meant integrating our values and every parts of our daily lives every hour a week/day. By loving our neighbor, showing respect of those different from us and being kind to our children. Each one of us can do something to reflect the spirit of our creator. Fourth, let's densify the voice of moderation. It's one of the greatest ironic voices that the extremist voices use advanced media to propagate ignorant ideas. We mustn't let our screens, airwaves, board band and social media be not mobilized by those of greatest danger to our world. We too must populate our media and more important the minds of our young people with the purity and power of modern issues. Fifth, let's recognize the seat when we examine the motives of these outlaws "the Khawarij" and indeed the motives of the extremists on all sides. We find hunger for power and control of people, of money, of land. They use religion as a mask if there waste crime. Then twisting God's word to promote your own interests. Desire more despicable act than feeding of venerable innocent to recruit them to your acts. In the global Muslim community, 1.7 billion good men and women a causal of humanity. Today our outlaw gangs are nothing, but a drop in an ocean. But a drop of venom can poison a well. We must protect a purity of our faith for morally contamination. As Muslims, this is our fight as it is our duty. Sixth, by all mean, let's be intolerant of intolerance. Extremists rely on the empathy of modernism. But moderation doesn't mean that accepting those who troubling in others and reject all who different. Today people's fight is not between people's communities or religions. It's between all modernist of all faith against all extremists in all religions. Leaders of every country, every belief, every neighborhood, need to take a clear and public stand against tolerance in every kind. This include respecting all places, regardless worship. Whether mosque, church, signage or tumble. And nothing can be more important and can have more impact on framing this respect and co-existed than Jerusalem. The Hashemite custodianship of Jerusalem Islamic and Christian Holley sites is the sacred duty and we join Muslims and Christians everywhere in rejecting threads to the holy places and the Arab character of this holey city. My friends our seventh step is hyper connectivity. In our earlier connectivity desire where we live and interact in our work, our communities, our schools, our lives. Only few years ago we had the internet of computers. Now we talk about the internet of things. But above them all must be the internet of humanity. A hyper connection bringing us together in collective consciousness and common cores. Ladies and gentlemen, by gathering here today, we acknowledge that the power of connecting together far exceeds any individuals. This great general assembly, must address argent world issues sustainable inclusive development that can deliver more opportunity especially to young people and peaceful political solutions to regional crisis. It's the world's obligation to find solutions and provide relief for the millions of refugees in my region. Today we are still facing a huge shortage



cats and threads vital UN program and agencies including UNORWA, UNFCOR and WFP. Today we are haunted by the images of thousands of refugees on the shores and boarders of Europe. Seeking hopes far away from their homeland. In Jordon we have been faced with this challenge since the beginning of the Syrian crisis. Today Syrian refugees alone constitute 20% of my country's population. We have been taking on a significant part of the burden of this humanitarian disaster of the international community shoulders since the beginning. Our support to our country has been a small fraction of the cost we have been doing. It's high time that the international community acts collectively and facing this unprecedented humanitarian crisis and support countries like

Jordon and Lebanon which had been carrying the brunt of this burden for over a past four years. My friends in these areas and us must act and act collectively for the future of our world. I could activity skip the value's wish here equality, compassion, hope need to be connected to everything we do and we must keep ourselves connected to each other for the good of all. These bones of the power and promise of our united nations. Here together we can and must create our future of our people's need. The safest struggle world co-existence, conclusion, share prosperity, and peace. Seven steps can beg up closer to our destination. God welling our countries and people will achieve these and many more. Thank you very much.