



الاستراتيجيات الخطابية لمنشورات الدولة الإسلامية على الفيسبوك

*م. د. حميد طراد/ جامعة واسط / كلية الآداب

أ. د. هنيئا حسن ماليزيا/ أكاديمية اللغات كلية الآداب والعلوم الانسانية

أ.م. د فرح عبد الجبار المناصير/ الجامعة المستنصرية/ كلية الآداب قسم اللغة الانكليزية

تاريخ الاستلام : 2022-03-15

تاريخ القبول : 2022-03-24

ملخص البحث:

يهدف البحث الى دراسة مفهوم (ألانا- الاخر) في منشورات تنظيم داعش على منصة الفيسبوك من خلال تحليل ٢٠ نص تحليليا نوعيا. تم إجراء الدراسة بالاعتماد على نظرية فيركلاف ١٩٩٥ لتحليل النص ونظرية المربع الايدلوجي لغان دايك ٢٠٠٦. خلصت الدراسة إلى أن تنظيم الدولة الإسلامية يستخدم العديد من الأساليب الخطابية لتمثيل الجماعة (ألانا الجمعية) بشكل إيجابي أمام الجمهور. بينما يمثلون المسلمين وغير المسلمين (الأخر الجمعي) سلبًا. استخدم تنظيم الدولة الإسلامية بمنشوراته عدة استراتيجيات بلاغية لإضفاء الشرعية على حججه ، بما في ذلك وصف الفاعل ، والسلطة ، والتصنيف ، والمقارنة ، والتعميم ، والمبالغة ، والمعجمية.

الاستراتيجيات الخطابية لمنشورات الدولة الإسلامية على الفيسبوك

الكلمات المهمة: تحليل الخطاب النقدي, الاستراتيجيات الخطابية,تنظيم الدولة الاسلاميه, البلاغة.



Rhetorical Discursive Strategies of Islamic State Posts on FACEBOOK

Hamid Tarad Lafta (Ph.D.), Wasit University, College of Arts. Hanita Hassan, Associate Professor (Ph.D.), Language Academy, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities (UTM). Farah Abdul-Jabbar Al-Manaseer, Associate Professor (Ph.D.) Al-Mustansiriya University.

Email: htarad@uowasit.edu.iq

Email: hanita@utm.my

Email: farah_fa78@yahoo.com

Receipt date: 2022-03-15

Date of acceptance: 2022-03-24

Abstract

This article investigates and identifies the concept of the self-other representations in Islamic State (IS) posts on the FACEBOOK site. The data involved in twenty posts need to be analyzed qualitatively. The study is conducted based on Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (1995) approach and Van Dijk's (2006) ideological square model (ISD). The article concluded that IS uses several discursive techniques to positively represent the group to the public, while they negatively represent the Muslims and non-Muslims. IS deployed several rhetoric strategies to legitimize its arguments, including actor description, authority, categorization, comparison, generalization, hyperbole, and lexicalization.



1. Introduction

Terrorist groups have understood the value of online social networks and platforms, such as Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, and YouTube. Since the inception of these online social media platforms, they maintain their accounts to exploit these media technology (Weimann, 2006). In Fact, 'the terrorist organizations use these media for their publicity. Meanwhile, the news media gets to benefit from these organizations. Capability to build terror by selling propagating the news to the concerned reader, listener, and viewer (Nacos, 2007, p. 37). As anticipated, the connection of the terrors with the media heightened in both intensity and sophistication, due to the media field in which the terror activities are not only reported but justified (Ben-Yehuda, 2005).

The Islamic State (also referred to as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant [ISIL], the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria [ISIS], or Daesh) is a jihadist terrorist organization based in Iraq that has been commanded by Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi since 2010. Al-Baghdadi declared on 29 of June 2014 the creation of a caliphate, or Islamic state, in the territories under his influence in Iraq and Syria (McCants & McCants, 2015). IS is considered a religious group, but later in their goals and intentions went beyond religious objectives. With the breakup of the nation of Israel and the restoration of former Muslim lands, including parts of Spain, they aimed to expand or strengthen their belief system from Morocco to Pakistan, or to expel all Western powers from the Muslim territories (Coleman, Deutsch, & Marcus, 2014).

As Kernan (2017) remarked, the IS group has created a crucial and efficient communication strategy, including manipulating social media, as an enlarged spot for discussing jihadist ideology to deceive mainstream media and propagate misinformation and charges of terrorist action. Social networking is a technique used to establish direct contact with disadvantaged individuals from all over the world to recruit them on an ongoing basis. Social media acts as a new "radical mosque," exposing people, to extreme views and proselytizing them by active IS members. IS propaganda incorporates different themes and is prepared in multiple languages to reach the broadest possible audience. From graphic pictures of violence to representations of a religious utopia, IS propaganda caters to all tastes (Winter, 2015, p. 8).



Van Dijk (1988) introduces a valuable theoretical idea, he refers to as the 'ideological square,' which summarizes the dual strategies of positive 'ingroup' descriptions and negative outgroups. The dual strategy of this “binary opposition” is frequently represented in discourse through vocabulary choice and other language aspects (Hakam, 2009, p. 37). As asserted by Lauk (2002, p. 2) “us-them polarisation reflects the existence of particular oppositional ideologies that groups create and use for identifying and placing themselves within the network of societal structures and relations”. Wirth-Koliba (2016) said for the principle of power and supremacy to occur, the 'us' and 'them' opposition is essential: one who has authority requires the absence of it by another individual. The supremacy and dominance of someone over others indicate the latter's inferiority; hence, the polarisation of 'us' and 'them' is apparent. This article focuses explicitly on IS' discursive rhetorical processes, which are founded on dichotomous binaries of self and other, with the other being de-legitimized.

2. Critical Discourse Studies as a Research Tool

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a technique that takes into account virtually any perspective on the linguistic use of any social or political issue. Recently, CDA has proven to be an effective technique for assessing critical-qualitative communication (Reynolds, 2018). Additionally, CDA is a qualitative analytical technique for representing, examining, and explaining the mechanisms by which social inequalities are formed and legitimized in a broader context through discourses (Mullet, 2018). Fairclough (2013) argued that the CDA is a vehicle for conveying power and ideology through language.

According to T. A. Van Dijk (1998) “CDA is a type of discourse analytical research that principally studies how social authority misuse, dominance, and inequality are performed, reproduced, and maintained by both text and talk in the social and political context”. The CDA's primary objective is to demonstrate how the power in discourse is applied and utilized to influence and regulate the ideas and actions of dominant groups to ensure their benefits. The CDA places a premium on legitimizing particular circumstances or individuals who adhere to particular ideological ideas. The CDA's principal purpose is to bridge the gap between micro-and macro-level strategies, which is frequently caused by a group's sociological history.



According to Khan et al. (2019), CDA was commonly used to evaluate the contents and sub-themes of specific fields. However, there is one unusually beneficial application of the CDA in politics: it is used to depict legislative acts, election campaigns, protests, and, most notably, political speeches and comments as ideological fights between politicians. Additionally, CDA equips students with the necessary tools and methodologies for delving into the dialogical linkages between discourse and ideology. As stated by Khan et al. (2019) although within CDA there are many different frameworks and techniques, most CDA frameworks address one of the essential principles of the 'self-other' scheme, which illustrates the 'us vs them' binary meaning 'positive self-presentation' besides 'negative other representation helps to construct ideological views, behaviors, and attitudes. One of the decisive approaches that concentrate upon the self-other schema is the ideological square model of Van Dijk.

Fairclough's (1995) CDA model consists of three inter-related analysis processes, which are connected to three inter-related dimensions of discourse. These three dimensions are (i) the object of analysis (including verbal, visual, or combined verbal and visual material); (ii) the processes by which the object is produced and received by human subjects (writing/speaking/designing and reading/listening/viewing); and (iii) the socio-historical conditions that govern these processes (Janks, 2006).

Fairclough asserts that each of these aspects necessitates a distinct type of analysis. For instance, a text analysis, the subject of this article, requires description, whereas a processing analysis requires interpretation, and a social analysis requires explanation. Fairclough's approach is useful because it enables the researcher to focus on the signifiers that make up the text, the specific linguistic selections, how they are juxtaposed, their sequencing, layout, etc. This article explores how IS group uses discourse to portray an "us versus them" ideology through IS' posts on FACEBOOK.

3. Ideological Square Model

According to Teun A. Van Dijk (2006), ideologies, akin to languages, are essentially social. There are no personal or individual ideologies for personal or individual reasons, only ideologies for personal or individual purposes. Ideologies are not significantly negative. They have comparable structures and roles, whether shared by dominant or controlled groups, 'bad'



groups or 'good' groups. Whether shared by strong or dominated groups, 'bad' groups, or 'good' groups, they have similar structures and functions. Ideologies express one of the dimensions of the social identity or self-image of groups. Ideology refers to attitudes, sets of opinions, beliefs, and conditions that form individuals' understanding and use to create and interpret reality (Obiero, 2017). For Hall (1996, p. 26) "the concept of ideology encompasses: the mental frameworks the languages, the concepts, categories, imagery of thought, and the systems of representation which different classes and social groups deploy to make sense of, define, figure out and render intelligible the way society works". Martin (2015) stated that ideology is a generalization of social relations; it is the ideal form of actual interactions, seen from one position in this set of interactions, but universalized, idealized and abstracted.

Previous studies on IS' ideology (Ibish, 2015, p. para. 11) stated that although fighting on the field, IS promotes its media policies with a relentless on- and off-line production that combines pre-modern religious ideology with information management of the 21st century. It has become well-known for its shooting videos in which the makers of a "theatre of cruelty" use "soft focus, slow fades, color saturation, superimpositions, and heavily layered soundtracks". As stated by Valasik and Phillips (2017), the technology proficiency of IS makes it highly unlikely that their ideology will ever be eradicated. It appears like the Islamic caliphate will continue even if it is militarily defeated in Iraq and Syria. Instead of being tied to a specific geographical place, IS will become a digital caliphate that spreads throughout the virtual globe.

Prier (2017) noted that the IS group employed visual or textual messages to assist propagate its extreme ideology on social media to a large audience, messages that fit into both the supporter's and opponent's narratives of power and terror. In other words, IS' cyber warriors combined their ideology with the command of the trend to accomplish three things with one message. First, they revealed the international community's vulnerability and ignorance in fighting them online and on the battlefield. Second, fear has been put on the mass media. Finally, and most notably, new fighters were employed to join the group on the battlefields in Iraq and Syria and online.



This article focuses on the representation of IS versus Muslims and non-Muslims. The most remarkable character of this investigation is the self versus another schema that is visible in IS discourse. Teun A. Van Dijk introduced the (ISM), which was pertinent to this study because it focuses on the polarising macro approach of 'positive self-representation and negative other-representation (Van Dijk 1998, 2004, 2006). Thus, Van Dijk's ideological square is an excellent analytical approach for demonstrating how, along with their supporters and followers (us), IS frequently promotes their group as positive while portraying Muslims, non-Muslims, and their proxy terms (them) negatively. Similarly, the strategy also highlights how IS mitigates its negative acts and comments against Muslims and non-Muslims while concealing or minimizing IS cruel action.

T. A. Van Dijk (1998, 2004); Teun A. Van Dijk (2006) asserts that there are two steps of the analysis; macro-analysis; and micro-analysis. Regarding the macro-analysis, Van Dijk (1998, 2004, 2006) has distinguished four essential strategies used to legitimize the self and de-legitimize the other;

- Emphasize positive things about 'us';
- Emphasize negative things about 'them';
- De-emphasize negative things about 'us'; and.
- De-emphasize positive things about 'them'.

In macro-analysis, the epistemic basis of the article concentrates on the self-other binary described below; IS group: Self, We, Us! In-group, and Muslims and non-Muslims: Others, They, Them! Out-group. This model contains twenty-five main words as rhetorical discursive techniques in terms of micro-analysis; only seven were chosen to be included in this research, such as the definition of the actor, authority, categorization, contrast, generalization, hyperbole, and lexicalization, to represent (us-them) (Teun A Van Dijk, 2006).

A brief explanation of each key term is below:

- Actor Description: The definition of the actor typically provides specific details about an individual, such as a person, location, or thing, as well as how that individual



performs its role either positively or negatively in a social or political sense. As such, members of the group appear to be portrayed positively or neutrally, while members of the outside group appear to be portrayed negatively at the same time.

- Authority: Van Dijk argued that we should take the sense of referencing authorities to affirm one 's claim regarding an authority declaration. Organizations, individuals deemed to be moral leaders and experts, foreign organizations, scholars, the media, the church, or the courts are included.
- Categorization: It means assigning individuals to various categories or, in other words, classifying individuals concerning their beliefs and actions, such as religious or political ones, as Van Dijk notes, "People prefer to categorize individuals."
- Comparison: We may simply mean, by contrast, determining the similarities and differences between two entities, such as persons, locations, events, things, etc. "As such, according to Van Dijk, the discourse analogy," compare ingroups and out-groups, "while out-groups are often negatively compared and positively and vice versa.
- Generalizations: It is a technique used to assign negative and positive attributes to a broad population of a single individual or a small group; for example, lawyers are hard workers.
- Hyperbole: In terms of language distortion and extra stress on something, hyperbole is seen as a linguistic tactic. As such, Van Dijk suggested that hyperbole is a "semantic rhetorical method for enhancing context."
- Lexicalization: The use of semantic characteristics of words to represent something or someone positively or negatively can be said by lexicalization.

4. Research Methodology



During the 2014-2017 invasion of Iraq and Syria, this article explores the portrayal of IS versus Muslims and non-Muslims in the IS discourse. The study is carried out through the qualitative research approach because it explores not only what, where, and when, but also why and how the issue emerged, combining elements from the Ideological Square Model to analyze the intentionally chosen IS discourse in which IS represented their community versus Muslims, non-Muslims. Besides, this qualitative analysis used CDA, a process and research instrument that dates back to the 1970s by constructionists under the Critical Research Paradigm. Also, it should be noted in discourse studies that discourse analysts are not primarily concerned with the sample size of their given corpus because a 'large sample can generate an unmanageable amount of data without contributing to the analytical study outcome'. Therefore, useful theoretical explanations can also be achieved with a limited sample size of the corpus in discourse studies (Waikar, 2018).

According to (Waikar, 2018), in discourse studies, the extracts from any text/utterance, interview, or argument based on keywords are often more precise and selective. Moreover, he added that the emphasis should be on the data's consistency during data collection, not the quantity. In addition to the qualitative investigation, the article does not discuss how representative the sample is, instead focuses on recognizing the subtle implications of the phenomenon. Thus, the article addressed 20 IS posts on FACEBOOK. The researcher divided these discourses into 20 sentences based on their themes in the interest of an in-depth study. In the analysis of the data chosen, NVIVO 12-Plus software is also used. The total number of words is (333), sentences ranged from 3 words to 98 words, sentence themes varied from one sentence to another.

5. Analysis and discussion

The data involving 20 FACEBOOK posts are analyzed through NVIVO 12 Plus software, as is shown in Figure.1 in which the inclusive word cloud of the discourse of 20 posts represents how IS used certain words frequently to portray (us versus them). Besides, by using NVIVO 12 Plus, the pattern of talk and lexical choices of IS can be seen about their group, Muslims, and non-Muslims, both explicitly and implicitly. Further, the software analysis stated clearly IS choice of terms towards Muslims and non-Muslims with a focus on using unfavorable



terms, such as Jewish, unbelievers, Kuffar, polytheists, Cowardice, etc. IS would freely represent Muslims and non-Muslims by using specific lexical options. In the word cloud, the word "peace" is also prominent, showing the prominence of us versus binary ones.



Figure 1. Word frequency

Additionally, Figure.2 illustrates how these commonly used words form a Tree-Map, illustrating the relationship between the words and their collocates. It demonstrates how these frequently used words produce a Tree-Map, revealing the relationship between the words and their collocates. The hierarchy of particular terms and their implications, such as men, prophet, real, war, drops, followers, slaughter, attack, battels, cowardice, and crucified, etc., are also highlighted, indicating the salience of the binary polarizing self-other, as described in the Ideological Square.

peace	men	war	cross	followers	never	slaughter	alone	battles	colors
							arabs	beard	cowardice
			day	indeed	ordered	times	attack	believe	creation
fight	prophet	abu					baghdad	call	crucified
		allah	drop	killing	people	wherever	baker	camp	death
islam	real						banners	church	die
		came	every	muhammad	religion	agreement			

Figure 2. Tree-Map of used terms in the statement



In terms of the micro-analysis, the posts were analyzed based on the square model indicate that Abu Bakar and his followers are considered as actors who continually attack and accuse the Muslims, non-Muslims, Arabs, and non-Arabs using personal pronouns like (*we, I, he, us and, you*) to refer to both IS and their enemies respectively. As an example in the text of the sentence (*we are going to kill you; o Kuffar Insha'Allah we'll slaughter you*), here the pronoun (*we*) refers to the speaker himself and other IS members; he is speaking in the sound of the group to indicate unity and power. Whereas the pronoun (*you*) applies to the enemies of IS (Muslims or non-Muslims) everywhere, regardless of place, time, race, and nationality. The strategy of using specific actions verbs like (kill and slaughter) to threaten non-Muslims with death indicates the skill of those in charge of producing texts in the organization. To indicate the identity as a religious group, IS used words like (*Insha'Allah, and Kuffar*) which are borrowed from the Holy Quran. Certainty is also represented by the model verbs (going to and will), which indicate that IS group decided to kill the non--Muslims; the decision was taken without hesitation or was irreversible.

Moreover, in the sentence (*I want you for ISIS soldier*), the pronouns (*I and you*) refer to IS members. The speaker (*I*) could be any IS member like Abu Bakar or anyone else, whereas the pronoun (*you*) also refers to any follow Muslims worldwide to act as IS fighters. This sentence is somewhat ambiguous using the pronoun (*you*); it is an implicit indication of the organization's success in recruiting young followers in Europe or elsewhere. On the other hand, the ambiguity is manifested in the inability to diagnose who (*You*) is. The other important thing through this short sentence, IS has made the whole world a battlefield by recruiting new potential supporters in all countries of the world to work with the organization despite the distance and the availability of combat capabilities, they can act as a lone- actor.

Lone-actor terrorists are defined according to three criteria: firstly, a lone actor must operate as a single perpetrator in the execution of an attack; secondly, a lone actor must not have a direct affiliation with a terrorist group or organization; and thirdly, a lone actor terrorist must not follow the direct commands or be under the direct influence of a leader or group (Malthaner, 2017). Foreign fighters play a critical and unique role in this quest, providing the group with a huge number of determined combatants, many of whom take on leadership roles. However, the



Islamic States' strength is largely a result of their rivals' policies and vulnerabilities (Khatib, 2015).

Another sentence is (*he was ordered to wage war until Allah is worshipped alone*). This sentence is intended to refer to the prophet Muhammad's role at the beginning of the Islamic call in spreading the Islamic religion. The pronoun (he) refers to the prophet Muhammad, and this sentence indicates that the prophet was commanded (*ordered, to wage, is worshipped*) by God to wage war on the infidels so that they would worship God alone. A religious word like (the prophet) was deliberately used to make the text more impactful on the intended followers. Ideology is inextricably linked to legitimacy, and the Islamic State asserts that it is following Islamic law to justify its acts. When the group conquers a new territory, it frequently prohibits the possession and consumption of alcohol, forces women to cover entirely, and engages in other acts to demonstrate its religious legitimacy. Strict enforcement of traditional punishments such as amputations and beheadings bolsters this image and acts as a constant reminder of the Islamic States' dominance (Khatib, 2015).

Furthermore, in the sentence (*you Indeed, you have been ordered to fight the kafir wherever you find him*), the pronoun (you) was repeated three times to refer to any IS fighter anywhere. This sentence explained the required actions from any IS fighter against the Kafir. First, there is an order from either God or the Caliph, second to fight, and third to find and fight Kafir wherever he is in Iraq and Syria in or outside the IS dreamlands. Repeating the pronoun (you) three times verified the accomplishment of the act of killing the kafir. Here the word (everywhere) was not used to decide where and when the kafir was killed as if this battle against the kafir was open and had no end.

Another sentence like “*O Jews, indeed Allah has gifted us with killing your followers in your own stronghold in France*”. In this sentence, the language of the threat is explicit and directed towards the Jews in France. Killing Jews is a gift from God, which is a justification for killing the enemies on social media and adding a religious effect to the text as Allah gifted the IS fighter to kill the Jews and add a religious effect to the text. The possessive adjective (your) was



repeated twice to refer to the Jews' followers and their location (your own stronghold in France). In the sentence "*The people of the Cross, the followers of the hostile Egyptian church*". The ridicule of other religions was evident in this argument, even though the Christian faith is older than the Islamic religion. The message in this sentence states that worship of any religion other than the Islamic religion is no longer permissible, and whoever violates these instructions exposes himself to being killed or crucified because he is not Muslim. The IS group has denied others of their religious freedoms, contradicting the Holy Quran's texts on religious freedom.

One more sentence (*If death is what you offer us, then know, we came to die*), where the pronouns (*us and we*) refer to IS, and the pronoun (*you*) refers to IS' enemies. In this sentence, the language of defiance and underestimation of death was evident, as if the message of the organization was clear to the enemies that death is inevitable. It arises from a strictly religious viewpoint as if death were a free offer to the IS members, and the solution would be the willingness of all to die for the sake of the organization. This is a strong example of the organization's fighters' power and strength and their utter conviction that their cause is very fair and deserving of sacrifice. Again, the text producer concentrated on the sound of the group as a whole to signify strength, solidarity, and bravery, using terms like (*us and we*) without exception that includes all IS members.

From another perspective, actors, mainly IS soldiers, are represented by compound words like (*Real men are known in times of hardship*), and (*Real struggles need real men*). The adjective (*real*) is repeated twice in these two sentences preceding the noun (*men*) that refers to IS fighters; in the most challenging circumstances, they are brave men who do not fear death. Here, we note in the text that the (IS) tries to distinguish between the real fighters and the difficult hardships and difficulties as if the organization's fighters were intended for those conditions.

Al Baghdadi attempted to create a vivid link between himself as the group's leader and his followers to portray the group's great ties. For this reason, he used authority as a discursive weapon by referencing his name as a strong man and emphasizing his intentions to combat atheists or infidels. The role of the actor is not limited to Al Baghdadi alone; the discourse demonstrated that the members of IS might also behave like actors. They played this role for



multiple purposes like political “*Drop the nationalist flags and raise the banners of Tawheed*”, and “*We don’t believe in the Sykes-picot agreement*”, or religious “*drop the cross*”, and finally for persuasion “*I want you for ISIS soldier*”, and “*One of the sign that you love prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) is your beard*”. Van Dijk contended that the term "authority" might be interpreted as mentioning powers to substantiate a claim made in a statement. These authorities include an organization such as IS, individuals such as Al Baghdadi and his supporters who are regarded as moral leaders and experts, as well as international organizations, academics, the media, the church, and the courts (Khan et al., 2019).

From the ideological aspect, hyperbole is used as a linguistic strategy involving language distortion and additional stress on something. Teun A Van Dijk (2006) stated that hyperbole is a semantic rhetorical device for enhancing meaning. Hyperbole is a discursive technique represented in many sentences within the selected discourse for different aims. Exaggeration was evident in “*And we call upon every Muslim in every place to perform Hijrah to the Islamic State or fight in his land wherever that may be. Abu Bakr al Baghdadi*”. Al Baghdadi was a special individual for all Muslims around the world after the call for Hijrah or the fight against the unbelievers. Exaggeration from another dimension was used to depict IS’ fighters as brave, aggressive, enthusiastic, and determined. As in “*If death is what you offer us then know, we came to die*”, “*Real struggles need real men*”, “*Real men are known in times of hardship*”. And “*O you who attack from the skies below you are men who would give their lives a thousand times over*”. However, exaggeration is mostly used here to frighten Kuffar, such as “*We’re going to kill you; o Kuffar Insha’Allah we’re going to kill you*” without any reference or explanation of who the Kuffar are.

Categorization involves assigning people to different classes or, in other words, classifying people as to their beliefs and actions such as religious or political ones; as Teun A Van Dijk (2006) states, “People tend to categorize people”. The categorization was very intense in the discourse between the two groups, IS and the unbelievers. Purposefully, the IS group was categorized as “*Muslims, brave, patriotic, real men, and ready to give their lives a thousand times over*”. Here, IS group tries to show the group's positive things and deliberately hide their negative issues. The categorization of the non-Muslims was precise to emphasize negative things



about (them) by classifying them as “Kuffar, unbelievers, Jewish, nationalist, followers, the people of the Cross, hostile Egyptian church, polytheists, Arabs and non-Arabs and you”.

The generalization is a strategy being employed by IS to refer negatively to a particular person or a small group to a large population, for example, “*O Jews indeed Allah has gifted us with killing your followers in your stronghold in France*”, and “*oh Masood, the Jewish woman’s son listen well*”. The use of the word Jews reveals that this person is not Muslim, so he is their enemy. On the other hand, the reference to Masoud Barzani’s mother as a Jew is to arouse public opinion against him, and on the other hand, to mention indirectly his ties with Israel. Further, generalizations display the positive aspect of a particular person or a small group to a large population as in “*If death is what you offer us then know, we came to die*”, and “*Real men are known in times of hardship*”. IS tries to show one fighter with incredible physical and military abilities, showing just a soldier, and accordingly, it represents all members of the organization; they are adequately trained and mentally and bodily combat-ready.

Comparison aims to explore the similarities and differences between two entities such as people like IS’ fighters and the Kuffar, places like caliphate and France and mosque, events like Cross and border removing or the IS’ soldiers at the military training center, things like the Cross, banners of Tawheed, etc. Thus, the discourse’s comparison reinforces the IS group’s superiority over its rivals, whether Arabs or non-Arabs. The IS fighters are fearless, driven, according to their belief, by a religious cause to fight and defeat the infidels, the enemies of Islam. They are ready to fight and die until the IS becomes a reality globally (Poirson & Oprisko, 2014).

The last macro strategy examined here is lexicalization; one might propose using semantic features of words to represent something or somebody positively or negatively. Starting with the IS’ fighters who were portrayed positively as brave, real men as in “*If death is what you offer us then know, we came to die*”, “*We are going to kill you; o Kuffar Insha’Allah we’ll slaughter you*”, “*Real struggles need real men*”, “*Real men are known in times of hardship*” And “*O you who attack from the skies below you are men who would give their lives a thousand times over*”. While representing IS enemies negatively with a disdainful emphasis on



distinct characteristics of terms including “Kuffar, unbelievers, Jewish, nationalist, followers, the people of the Cross, hostile Egyptian church, polytheists, Arabs and non-Arabs and you”. Which, in turn, refers to IS’ enemies Muslims and non-Muslims. All the words discussed above are in the text, and their selection was purposefully and precisely to negatively depict enemies.

6. Conclusions

The analysis of the selected data involving FACEBOOK posts by IS arrived at the following conclusion. According to the findings of the study, IS uses a variety of rhetorical methods to depict themselves and their members (I, WE, US) when juxtaposed to those whom they label as their adversaries (Muslims, non-Muslims, Jewish,..etc.) (THEY –YOU –THEM), IS depends heavily on the use of personal pronouns (us vs them) to portray IS against Muslims and non-Muslims, respectively. The pronoun (we) is used by IS to refer to their own members, whilst the pronoun (you) is used by IS to refer to their opponents. Following an examination of the data collected, it became clear that the Islamic State (IS) makes extensive use of compound words such as (Real men) and (Al sheik Abu Wahib's). The discursive methods which were implemented in the data analysis are mostly represented by the direct reference to Al Baghdad as a powerful individual. Another conclusion is that members of IS are also shown as players who play a variety of social and political roles, which is done through the lens of terrorism (I and We). Al Baghdady is represented by the letter (I), and his followers are represented by the letter (we). Extreme exaggeration is another hallmark of IS messages, with the exaggeration serving to emphasize the extremism of their ideas. Categorization is given through the use of the personal pronoun (them) to refer to Muslims/non-Muslims, unbelievers, Jews, and other groups of individuals. Furthermore, they are conveying an unfavorable opinion about them as a result of this. Through the use of personal pronouns, generalization can also be used to depict negative implementation (them). The parallel is then utilized to contrast and contrast IS and its members with their adversaries (the US- THEM).

REFERENCES

- Ben-Yehuda, N. (2005). Terror, media, and moral boundaries. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 46(1-2), 33-53.



- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis. The critical study of language. Language in social life series.* In: London: Longman.
- Nacos, B. L. (2007). *Mass-mediated Terrorism: The Central Role of the Media in Terrorism and Counterterrorism.* Rowman & Littlefield.
- Weimann, G. (2006). *Terror on the Internet: The new arena, the new challenges.* US Institute of Peace Press.
- McCants, W. and W.F. McCants, *The ISIS apocalypse: The history, strategy, and doomsday vision of the Islamic State.* 2015: Macmillan.
- Coleman, P.T., M. Deutsch, and E.C. Marcus, *The handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice.* 2014: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kernan, E.R., *The Islamic State as a Unique Social Movement: Exploiting Social Media in an Era of Religious Revival.* 2017.
- Lauk, E. *Use of us-them polarization in constructing ideological discourses (Estonia 1940-1989).* in *History, Media and Identity II: 23 IAMCR Conference and General Assembly.* 2002.
- Wirth-Koliba, V., *The Diverse and Dynamic World of 'Us' and 'Them' in Political Discourse.* Critical approaches to discourse analysis across disciplines, 2016. 8(1).
- Reynolds, C., *Building theory from media ideology: Coding for power in journalistic discourse.* Journal of Communication Inquiry, 2018. 43(1): p. 47-69.
- Mullet, D.R., *A general Critical Discourse Analysis framework for educational research.* Journal of Advanced Academics, 2018. 29(2): p. 116-142.
- Fairclough, N., *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language.* 2013: Routledge.
- Van Dijk, T.A., *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach.* 1998: Sage.
- Khan, M.H., et al., *Muslims' Representation in Donald Trump's Anti-Muslim-Islam Statement: A Critical Discourse Analysis.* Religions, 2019. 10(2): p. 115.
- Van Dijk, T.A., *Ideology and discourse analysis.* Journal of Political Ideologies, 2006. 11(2): p. 115-140.
- OBIERO, O.B., *A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF DONALD TRUMP'S ANNOUNCEMENT SPEECH.* 2017.
- Hall, S., *New ethnicities.* Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues in cultural studies, 1996: p. 441-449.
- Martin, J.L., *What is ideology?* Sociologia, Problemas e Práticas, 2015(77): p. 9-31.



Ibish, H., *The ISIS Theater of Cruelty*. The New York Times, 2015. 18.

Valasik, M. and M. Phillips, *Understanding modern terror and insurgency through the lens of street gangs: ISIS as a case study*. Journal of Criminological Research, Policy and Practice, 2017. 3(3): p. 192-207.

Prier, J., *Commanding the Trend: Social Media as Information Warfare*. Strategic Studies Quarterly, 2017. 11(4).

Van Dijk, T.A., *Ideology and discourse*. Pompeu Fabra University, Barcelona, 2004.

Van Dijk, T.A., *Discourse and manipulation*. Discourse & Society, 2006. 17(3): p. 359-383.

Waikar, P., *Reading Islamophobia in Hegemonic Neoliberalism Through a Discourse Analysis of Donald Trump's Narratives*. Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs, 2018. 38(2): p. 153-178.