

تحليل الخطاب النقدي لداعش على وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي الخطابات السياسية لترامب  
م.م. نعيمة جاسم عجام  
قسم اللغة الإنجليزية - كلية التربية الأساسية  
جامعة بابل

**Critical Discourse Analysis of ISIS (Daish) on Social Media Political  
Speeches of Trump  
Asst. Lec. Naima Jassim Ejam  
English Department – College of Basic of Education  
University of Babylon**

**Abstract**

Social Media is dominating the lives of people and becoming an ever increasing medium of expressing one's thought ,ideas, and beliefs . The Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (henceforth= ISIS) terrorists use social media to prosper and communicate their hateful speech and discrimination acts to the world in order to install fear in the lives of people around the world .

The present study aims to analyze ISIS social media posts by means of critical discourse and determine whether ISIS speech is considered hate speech or not . To fulfill these aims the researcher followed certain procedures which are stating Trump's political speeches and showing his stance on ISIS .

The study ends with a conclusion that ISIS groups use social media as a propaganda to promote their acts of terrorism and terrorize people . ISIS direct their ideologies towards creating hatred within local world public by using social media .

**خلاصة**

تهيمن وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي على حياة الناس وأصبحت وسيلة متزايدة للتعبير عن أفكار المرء وأفكاره ومعتقداته. يستخدم إرهابيو تنظيم الدولة الإسلامية في العراق وسوريا (من الآن فصاعدًا = داعش) وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي للازدهار وإيصال خطاب الكراهية وأعمال التمييز إلى العالم من أجل بث الخوف في حياة الناس في جميع أنحاء العالم.

تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى تحليل منشورات داعش على وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي من خلال الخطاب النقدي وتحديد ما إذا كان خطاب داعش يعتبر خطاب كراهية أم لا. ولتحقيق هذه الأهداف ، اتبع الباحث إجراءات معينة ، منها خطابات ترامب السياسية وإظهار موقفه من داعش.

تنتهي الدراسة باستنتاج مفاده أن تنظيمات داعش تستخدم وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي كدعاية للترويج لأعمالها الإرهابية وترهيب الناس. يوجه داعش أيديولوجياته نحو إثارة الكراهية في العالم المحلي باستخدام وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي.

**Section One**

**1.Introduction**

The term' Discourse' is a general term in language use . i.e. language which has been used as a result of an act of communication in both the written and the spoken form of language (Richards and schmidt, 2010:174). Another definition describes it as a general idea that language is structured according to different patterns that people's utterances follow when they take part in different domains of social life, spoken or in a written form i.e. medical discourse ,and political discourse (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002:2). There are quite few definitions of discourse but they all express the same ideas and meanings.

Discourse analysis means the study of how sentences in spoken and written language form larger meaningful units such as paragraphs, conversations, interviews, etc.). For example, discourse analysis deals with how the choice of articles, pronouns, and tenses affects the structure of the relationship between utterances in a discourse that made by speakers to introduce a new topic, change the topic, or assert a higher role relationship to the other participants (Richards and schmidt, 2010:175). Or it means the focus on knowledge about language beyond the word, clause, phrase, sentence that is needed for successful communication. It looks at patterns of language across texts and considers the ways that use of language presents different views of the world and different understandings. It examines how the use of language is influenced by relationship between participants as well as the effects the use of language has upon social identities and relations. It also considers how views of the world and identities are constructed through the use of discourse, it analyzes both written and spoken discourse (Paltridge, 2008;3).

### 1.2 Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. With such dissident research, critical discourse analysts take explicit position, and thus want to understand expose and ultimately resist social inequality (Van Dijk, 2008: 249). CDA is not so much a direction, school, or specialization next to the many other "approaches" in discourse studies. Rather, it aims to offer a different "mode" or "perspective" of theorizing, analysis, and application throughout the whole field. We may find a more or less critical perspective in such diverse areas as pragmatics, conversation analysis, narrative analysis, rhetoric, stylistics, sociolinguistics, ethnography, or media analysis, among others (Van Dijk, 2008: 249).

Many scholars gave their standpoints of CDA indicating that "there is no single theory or method which is uniform and consistent throughout CDA" (Weiss & Wodak 2003: 68). Further, Weiss and Wodak (ibid: 6) suggest that "the whole theoretical framework of CDA seems eclectic and unsystematic". Martin and Wodak (2003) point out that CDA has never been and has never attempted to be one single specific theory or methodology.

CDA has been mainly associated with the ideas of Norman Fairclough, Ruth Wodak and Teun Van Dijk, although as critical discourse analysts themselves point out that there is no single homogeneous version of CDA. Rather, what we find is a whole range of critical approaches that can be classified as CDA (e.g. Gee, 1990; Scollon, 1998, and Richardson, 2007). Many of these authors emphasize the need for analysis to draw a range of linguistic methods to research things like the production and reception of texts (Wodak and Meyer, 2001; Richardson, 2007). But importantly, what all these authors have in common is the view of language as a means of social construction: language both shapes and is shaped by society. CDA is not so much interested in language use itself, but in the linguistic character of social and cultural processes and structures. It is influenced by literary theory and sociolinguistics because it is not simply a method of decoding the meanings that are hidden in a text; rather it interprets the texts in their specific context by taking into account the historical, present (and in many cases future) circumstances through an attempt to uncover the writer's attitude towards the participants and the circumstances presented in a text. The most fundamental characteristic of Critical Discourse Analysis is its concern with social life and especially the role of discourse in social life.

### 1.3 The Analytical Framework

The analytical framework for any issue is to be processed in terms of the following schema (Abdul-Jabbar and Kareem (2013, 23)) :

- a- Specifying a social problem having a semiotic aspect; locating it outside the text and identifying its semiotic aspects.
- b- Specifying the obstacles for the problem to be tackled by analyzing: (i) the practices in which it is located, (ii) the relationships of its semiotic aspects to other elements within particular practices, (iii) its semiotic aspects through showing its structural analysis or order of discourse, its interactional analysis, its inter-discursive analysis, and its linguistic and semiotic analysis.
- c- Judging whether the social order or network of practices needs the problem.
- d- Identifying possible ways to overcome the problem. And,
- e- Reflecting upon the analysis critically.

### 1.4 Principles and Aims of Critical Discourse Analysis

The aims and the specific nature of CDA should be detailed by a technical discussion about the place of discourse analysis in contemporary scholarship and society. Such a discussion should specify inter alia, the criteria that are characteristic of work in CDA. Instead, we shall simply, and perhaps naively, summarize such criteria by saying that in our opinion CDA should deal primarily with the discourse dimensions of power abuse and the injustice and inequality that result from it. Let us spell out some implications of such a lofty overall aim (Mey, 1985; O Barr, 1984; Steiner, 1985).

First, the focus on dominance and inequality implies that, unlike other domains or approaches in discourse analysis, CDA does not primarily aim to contribute to a specific discipline, paradigm, and school or discourse theory. It is primarily interested and motivated by pressing social issues, which it hopes to better understand through discourse analysis. Theories, descriptions, methods and empirical works are chosen or elaborated as a function of their relevance for the realization of such a sociopolitical goal. Since serious social problems are naturally complex, this usually also means a multidisciplinary approach, in which distinctions are between theories. Description and application become less relevant. This focus on fundamental understanding of social problems such as dominance and inequality does not mean ignoring theoretical issues. On the contrary, without complex and highly sophisticated theories no such understanding is possible. Central to this theoretical endeavor is the analysis of the complex relationships between dominance and discourse (Hall, et al. 1977:76).

Unlike other discourse analysts, critical discourse analysts (should) take an explicit sociopolitical stance: they spell out their point of view, perspective, principles and aims, both within their discipline and within society at large. Although not in each stage of theory formation and analysis, their work is admittedly and ultimately political. Their hope, if occasionally illusory, changes through critical understanding. Their perspective, if possible, that of those who suffer most from dominance and inequality. Their critical targets are the power elites that enact, sustain, legitimate, condone or ignore social inequality and injustice (ibid: 77). That is, one of the criteria of their work is solidarity with those who need it most. Their problems are real problems, that is the serious problems that threaten the lives or well-being of many, and not primarily sometimes petty disciplinary problems of describing discourse structures, let alone the problems of the powerful (including the problems the powerful have with those who are less powerful, or with those who resist it). Their critique of discourse implies a political critique of those responsible for its perversion in the reproduction of dominance and

inequality. Such a critique should not be ad hoc, individual or incidental, but general, structural and focused on groups, while involving power relations between groups. In this sense, critical discourse scholars should also be social and political scientists, as well as social critics and activists. In other words, CDA is unabashedly normative: any critique by definition presupposes an applied ethics (Hall, et al. 1977:77).

Critical discourse analysis is far from easy. In my opinion it is by far the toughest challenge in the discipline. As suggested above, it requires true multidisciplinary, and an account of intricate relationships between text, talk, social cognition, power, society and culture. Its adequacy criteria are not merely observational, descriptive or even explanatory (Fairclough, 1985:41). Ultimately, its success is measured by its effectiveness and relevance, that is, by its contribution to change. In that respect, modesty is mandatory: academic contributions may be marginal in processes of change, in which especially those who are directly involved, and their acts of resistance, are the really effective change agents. This has become particularly clear from large processes of change such as class struggles, decolonization, the Civil Rights Movement and the Women's Movement. Yet, although occasionally marginal, academics have also shown their presence and contributions in these movements. Critical discourse analysts continue this tradition: the 1990s are replete with persistent problems of oppression, injustice and inequality that demand their urgent attention (ibid).

### 1.5 Dominance and Power

One crucial presupposition of adequate critical discourse analysis is understanding the nature of social power and dominance. Once we have such an insight, we may begin to formulate ideas about how discourse contributes to their reproduction. To cut a long philosophical and social scientific analysis short, we assume that we here deal with properties of relations between social groups. That is, while focusing on social power, we ignore purely personal power, unless enacted as an individual realization of group power, that is, by individuals as group members. Social power is based on privileged access to socially valued resources, such as wealth, income, position, status, force, group membership, education or knowledge. Below we shall see that special access to various genres, forms or contexts of discourse and communication is also an important power resource (Clegg, 1989, Lukes, 1986).

Power involves control, namely by (members of) one group over (those of) other groups. Such control may pertain to action and cognition: that is, a powerful group may limit the freedom of action of others, but also influence their minds. Besides the elementary recourse to force to directly control action (as in police violence against demonstrators, or male violence against women), modern and often more effective power is mostly cognitive, and enacted by persuasion, dissimulation or manipulation, among other strategic ways to change the mind of others in one's own interests (ibid). It is at this crucial point where discourse and critical discourse analysis come in: managing the mind of others is essentially a function of text and talk. Note, though, that such mind management is not always bluntly manipulative. On the contrary, dominance may be enacted and reproduced by subtle, routine, everyday forms of text and talk that appear natural and quite acceptable. Hence, CDA also needs to focus on the discursive strategies that legitimate control, or otherwise naturalize the social order, and especially relations of inequality (Fairclough, 1985:61).

Power and dominance are usually organized and institutionalized. The social dominance of groups is thus not merely enacted, individually, by its group members, as is the case in many forms of everyday racism or sexual harassment. It may also be supported or condoned by other group members, sanctioned by the courts, legitimated

by laws, enforced by the police, and ideologically sustained and reproduced by the media or text- books. This social, political and cultural organization of dominance also implies a hierarchy of power: some members of dominant groups and organizations have a special role in planning, decision-making and control over the relations and processes of the enactment of power. These (small) groups will here be called the power elites (Domhoff, 1978:124; Mills, 1956).

### 1.6 Social media

Social media is the term often used to refer to new forms of media that involve interactive participation. Often the development of media is divided into two different ages, the broadcast age and the interactive age. In the broadcast age, media were almost exclusively centralized where one entity—such as a radio or television station, Newspaper Company, or a movie production studio—distributed messages to many people (Boyd, Ellison, 2007:13). Feedback to media outlets was often indirect, delayed, and impersonal. Mediated communication between individuals typically happened on a much smaller level, usually via personal letters, telephone calls, or sometimes on a slightly larger scale through means such as photocopied family newsletters.

With the rise of digital and mobile technologies, interaction on a large scale became easier for individuals than ever before; and as such, a new media age was born where interactivity was placed at the center of new media functions. One individual could now speak too much, and instant feedback was a possibility. Where citizens and consumers used to have limited and somewhat muted voices, now they could share their opinions with many. The low cost and accessibility of new technology also allowed more options for media consumption than ever before – and so instead of only a few news outlets, individuals now have the ability to seek information from several sources and to dialogue with others via message forums about the information posted. At the core of this ongoing revolution is social media (Boyd, Ellison, 2007:13).

## Section Two

### 2. Introduction

The present section provides an analysis of social media used by ISIS groups and terrorists to achieve means of recruitments and acquire means of publishing their hateful speech and agenda.

#### 2.1 Power Relations

In this section we will discuss the displays of power by the published videos of Al-Baghdadi and ISIS groups on social media.

##### 2.2.1 Power relation with Almighty Allah

Al-Baghdadi believes that Allah Almighty is the founder of this world and He forms the fates of humans and everything in this world where they live. Therefore, Al-Baghdadi, in his messages, always asks for help, guide, and protections from evils from Allah Almighty. He frequently repeats the name of Allah Almighty throughout his messages. Throughout these three messages, the name of Allah Almighty has been mentioned for eighty-nine times. Hence, Allah Almighty is being represented as the reference of Al-Baghdadi's ideas, beliefs, hopes, dreams, and actions.

The pronoun 'I' and the pronoun 'we' refers to Al-Baghdadi (the speaker) and to ISIS (his group) respectively, the pronoun 'Him' and the pronoun 'He' represent Allah Almighty. In this context, the pronoun 'we' has no power over anyone, while the pronoun 'Him' is the powerful one. In this respect, Abu Bakr Al-Baghdadi has no power in front of Allah Almighty, and he only represents a normal man who cannot do anything without the aid of Allah Almighty. This belief in the power and supremacy of Allah Almighty is the fundamental ideological concept that formulates Al-Baghdadi's



ambition in the coming of the days. Here, the power relation clarifies how Al-Baghdadi asks to get the blessing and the grace from Allah Almighty. Hence, he wants to show the power relation between Allah Almighty and himself to the listeners.

### 2.2.2 ISIS Relations to Non-Muslims on Social Media

The relationship between ISIS members and non-Muslims (including unbelievers, apostates, Nusairies, Rafidha, Jews, and Crusaders) is to be best described by different pronouns as they are involved through in many phrases and sentences. Those non-Muslims are being referred to as “the enemies of Allah Almighty”, “them”, “they”, and in the same time ISIS terrorists employ the pronoun ‘We’ to represent themselves and other ‘true’ Muslims-including ISIS members, and to show that they are not alone. In this view, Al-Baghdadi also has the same position with equal level with the other Muslims as they want the world to believe through the use of social media.

### 2.2.3 ISIS and Muslims

This relation is double phases; in one phase, ISIS have portrayed themselves as the one with more power than other Muslims. In other phase, they are equal with them. Among Muslims, ISIS named AlBaghdadi as the supreme leader (Caliph) in controlling and leading Muslims and ‘jihadist’ troops. However, in one occasion he puts himself in the same position with them. The discourse used in social media describes the relation with Muslim as solid and represent them as a unit and that all Muslims want ISIS to be their “saviors”.

ISIS present in their speech on social media certain ideologies, they introduce their ideologies basically through the use of pronouns in their message discourses. Those ideologies can be classified as the ideology of divinity and political ideology.

### 2.2.4 Ideology of Divinity

The ideology of divinity is presented by Al-Baghdadi. There is a common belief of Al-Baghdadi and members of ISIS organization on Allah Almighty which motivates them in creating opposition against non-Muslims. It consists of two kinds:

- A. The ideology of principle belief: This ideology is aimed at giving a comprehensive explanation about the nature of being a Muslim. It needs a clear declaration by stating that there is only one God for this world and His last messenger if the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him and his progeny all); that God is Allah Almighty. This ideology can be shown in the following statement “I testify that there is no god except God and I testify the Muhammad is His slave and messenger”. This statement is called ‘Shahadah’, which is considered as an obligatory requirement for everyone to declare his or her converting to Islam. By using the pronoun ‘I’, Al-Baghdadi reflects his position in the sentence as the one who does the activity: saying the ‘Shahadah’. The lexeme ‘God’, with a capital ‘G’, refers to Allah Almighty as the greatest one in this world, while the lexeme ‘god’, with small ‘g’, refers to the gods existing in this universe. The pronoun ‘His’, which is an anaphoric reference to God, shows that Allah Almighty is the owner of the messenger. This statement, Shahadah, is considered a crucial requirement for anyone who wants to be a Muslim, thus, it becomes a ‘principle belief’ for all Muslims to ratify that the God is only one, Allah and Al-Baghdadi wants to show that he is a true Muslim and one of the majority of the Muslims.
- B. The ideology of believers’ duty: once you become a Muslim, you have a duty in this life. Muslims should back every action the perform in the life to the creator and the owner of the universe; Allah Almighty. It is prohibited for any Muslim to relate

everything to Allah Almighty; otherwise he or she will be a non-Muslim at all. Thus, it is a common belief owned by all Muslims and Al-Baghdadi is introducing himself as one of them. This ideology can be clear via the following quotation which is presented in all messages of Al-Baghdadi as an opening statement: "Truly all praise belongs to Allah. We praise Him, and seek His help and His forgiveness. We seek refuge with Allah from the evils of our souls and from the consequences of our deeds. Whomever Allah guides can never be led astray, and whomever Allah leads astray can never be guided." The statements clarify that Muslims should ask Allah Almighty for help and protection from all kinds of evildoing in their life, so Al-Baghdadi, who believes in the supremacy and power of Allah Almighty, calls the Muslims to request Allah for protection, guide, support, and the correct path and only from only Allah Almighty and also to relate everything in their life to Him. The pronoun 'we' and the pronoun 'our' represent Al-Baghdadi and other Muslims. Al-Baghdadi uses those two pronouns to show the unity of all Muslims and their brotherhood. This means that he is the Muslim and he refers to other Muslims by using the pronoun 'we'. To sum up, Al-Baghdadi uses the pronoun 'we' to refer to himself and his group; ISIS and it has a duty to do everything and every action by referring to Allah Almighty. The pronoun 'His' expresses the belonging, i.e., the religion belongs to Muslim and it gives an impression that any Muslim should keep his or her religion with all possible efforts, death or alive.

### 2.2.5 Political Ideology

As for as the political ideology is concerned with the use of declarative sentence and material process, the use of the pronoun 'we' here indicates directly that political ideology is being reflected throughout the message under investigation. Here Al-Baghdadi explicitly announces the establishment of his political arm and calls for all the 'jihadist' groups to be under one 'banner', which is the banner of 'Khilafah'. Here and in many occasions, Al-Baghdadi distinguishes himself from all the terrorist group leaders who preceded him, like Osama ben Laden, Abu Mosaab Al-Zarqawi and others, in that he has all the authority among all Muslims, religious as well as governmental authorities. The Caliph, in the Islamic conventions, is the one who controls everything that he is considered as a religious successor of the prophet Mohammad (peace be upon him and his progeny all) and the supreme leader of the entire Muslim community.

### 2.3 Trump Stance on ISIS

The presidential campaign of Donald Trump had a major part of concentrating on the developing threat of ISIS. He deals with them by stating that the America as a whole will defend this threat and propel it. He refers to the nation as an individual person which is capable enough of defeating the armed extremists and that he would prefer to send American armed troops to support Iraq and Syria in conquering the threat of ISIS groups.

Trump does not recognize the terrorists as representing Islam but he is sure he is not denying it which garnered an immense backlash at his political campaign. He states that "The group known as the Islamic State (in Iraq and al-Sham) or ISIS has gained notoriety for its cruelty and violence. ISIS has been condemned by most mainstream Muslim scholars, both for their premature declaration of an Islamic caliphate, as well as their many contraventions of Islamic law." He condemns their acts of vandalism and describes them as groups attempting are introducing slavery, cruelly killing captives and mutilating their bodies, involving children in war, and using torture.

Regarding the war against terrorists in Afghanistan Trump describes this war by using the word “longest” meaning that America has long stood against extremist groups and Jihadist of ISIS and that United States will continue its efforts in neutralizing these groups. Additionally Trump refers to the previous efforts by previous government leaders as “soft” in dealing with ISIS. The bashing is an intelligent move from Trump to demonstrate for the people of America. His Willingness is to fight and conquer ISIS to strengthen the number of his followers in the American elections.

At the beginning of the election campaign of the most repeated topics of discussion is that of ISIS and what would the next leader of United States do in effort to suppress the dangers of ISIS. Therefore Trump stance was of paramount importance to the success of his election campaign. The words Trump chose to offer his input about ISIS were specially and intentionally picked with great care and delicacy as they need to demonstrate the view that he envision for the war against these extremist groups. Trump stated that there is “no specific timeline for war” the use of this ambiguous setting of time is to signify the fact that America stood against terrorists for sixteen years and it will continue to offer the same extent of vigor and valor for as long as it is needed to eradicate these groups.

Additionally, after the election of Donald as the leader of United States, his stance did not change regarding ISIS as he stated “we will send as much troops as needed to suppress the threat of ISIS” he shows that it does not matter to America the number of troops fighting ISIS in Afghanistan or any other part of the world as long as they are defeated and their threat is no longer in the horizon, which shows the world the confidence he has in defeating ISIS. The choice of words and style is very significant to display the desired image to the populace and the world that America will not yield and lessen it efforts when dealing with terrorists but quite the opposite the efforts will be doubled and the sacrifices will continue until the enemy is defeated.

The appreciation of the sacrifices that Americans have made in the effort of neutralizing ISIS is encapsulated in the following statement: “since the founding of the republic, our country has produced a special class of heroes whose selflessness, courage, and resolve is unmatched in human history” the adjectives used (selflessness, courage, and resolve) are used with great care by Trump to describe the sacrifices that the American soldiers have made in the world effort against ISIS as the offer to the families of the solders appreciation and gratitude for the sacrifices those heroes have made to save the world from the terror of ISIS and he carefully selects these words as he wants their morals to continue to be high and not to dwindle in an attempt to grasp more and more power from them to defeat the extremist groups. Therefore, the manipulation of feelings by the careful choice of words is at it highest here so that America would continue to provide the efforts against the ISIS groups in Afghanistan, Syria, and Iraq.

The statement “ a wound inflicted upon a single member of our community is a wound inflicted upon us all, when one part of America hurt we all hurt, and when one citizen suffers injustice we all suffer.” The perfect display of unity is presented in the above lines as Trump refers to the sacrifices that America endured because of ISIS, he strongly pushes the notion of unity by the special selection of words to inspire people and show that all the parts of America grief for the lose of one combatant who fought bravely against ISIS. Therefore the pain is not individually endured but rather collectively as a nation they suffer together and that the pain of loss is felt throughout the country as the joy of wining.



The statement “ I share the American peoples’ frustration. I also share their frustration over foreign policy that has spent too much time, energy, money, and most importantly lives trying to rebuild countries in our image, instead of perusing our security interests above all other considerations”. Here Trump further more shows that he still is frustrated with the lackluster efforts of previous governments in dealing with ISIS for 16 years and not succeeding despite the monumental costs in lives and resources he believes that he and the nation share the same frustration as the choice of words represents him as one with the nation as a single entity that shares the same ideologies and thinking. He believes that foreign policy should change to accommodate more appropriate courses of action against ISIS groups which are losing significantly and their time is only in single digits now.

Finally trump believes that ISIS is defeated and that their agenda have been exposed and that if the people are united against them they will not hold ground in any country. These statements imply the trust and belief in the American system and way of dealing with extremist groups and terrorists by showing the world that they are a strong nation that has no fear.

#### 2.4 Conclusions

It is concluded that the researcher found that ISIS groups use social media as a propaganda tool to promote their acts of terrorism and to terrorize people. They use it to represent their relations to non Muslims as those infidels that deserve no life and supreme punishment for repenting Al mighty Allah. Thus, the use of Facebook and Twitter is with regards to non Muslims is to install fear and terrorize them. On the other hand the relation to Muslims is unlike that of non Muslims as Al Baghdadi presents that they are here to free the Muslim world from those Jews who have raped the right of Muslims for a rule over the world and thus his speech is a means for recruitment and gaining trust.

ISIS use social media to promote their ideologies regarding divinity and political views. These ideologies are directed towards promoting their beliefs while political ideologies are to advertise their belief of creating an Islamic state for all Muslims.

#### References

- Abdul-Jabbar, L. and Kareem, R. (2013). “Critical Discourse Analysis: Basics and Methodology”. *The International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 2.
- Boyd, M., and Ellison, B. (2007). “Social Network Sites: Definition, History, and Scholarship”. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 13, article 11.
- Clegg, R. (1989). *Frameworks of Power*. London: Sage.
- Domhoff, W. (1978). *The Powers That Be: Processes of Ruling Class Domination in America*. New York: Random House (Vintage Books).
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Hall, S., Lumley, B. and McLennan, G. (1977). *Gramsci on Ideology*, in Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (ed.) *Politics and ideology: Gramsci*. London: Hutchinson.
- Jorgensen, M. and Phillips, L. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. England UK: Sage.
- Lukes, S. (1986). *Power*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mey, J. (1985). *Whose Language: A Study in Linguistic Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Mills, W. (1956). *The Power Elite*. London: Oxford University Press.

- O Barr, M. (1984). *Asking the Right Questions about Language and Power* , in C. Kramarae, M. Schulz and W.M. O Barr (eds) *Language and Power*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage
- Paltridge, B. (2008). "Discourse Analysisan Introduction". *Journal of Sociolinguistics*. New York.
- Richards, C., and Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (4th ed.). London: Longman (Pearson Education).
- Steiner, E. (1985). *Towards a Critical Linguistics*, in P. Chilton (ed.) *Language and the Nuclear Arms Debate: Nukespeak Today*. London: Pinter.
- Van Dijk, T. (2008). *Discourse and Power* , London, England UK: Sage.