Political Discourse of Jordan: A Critical Discourse Analysis

Hassan Ali Al-Momani[1]

[1] English Department, Tafila Technical University, Jordan

Correspondence: Hassan Al-Momani, English Department, Tafila Technical University, Jordan. Tel: 962-79-049-5902. E-mail: hassan76us@yahoo.com

Abstract

Based on the critical discourse analysis theory, the main purpose of this study is to highlight the social and psychological dimensions of the political discourse of Jordan through analyzing king Abdullah's address to the American Congress in 2007 from socio-cognitive, socio-ideological, and socio-stylistic perspectives. Additionally, the paper uses the critical discourse analysis theory to examine selected quotations from the king's address in order to see how the Jordanian political discourse is influenced by the status, ideologies, and attitudes of the congressmen to whom it is directed.

1. Introduction

The modern writers in the field of discourse analysis, such as Van Dijk (2002), Fairclough (1989) and Fowler (1991) deal with the discourse in the light of critical discourse analysis theory which is an interdisciplinary approach viewing "language as a form of social practice" (Fairclough, 1989, p. 20). This approach paves the way to study political discourse from the social and psychological perspectives through an analytic method.

The roots of critical discourse analysis theory appeared in the scope of critical linguistics, in which Roger Fowler, Gunther Kress, Bob Hodge and Tony Trew started establishing the foundations of this theory. Then, there were many critics such as Ruth Wodak, Norman Fairclough, Teun Van Dijk, Gunther Kress and many others who started to develop this theory into the critical discourse analysis theory, in which the textual analysis has its own theoretical and applied dimensions.

The modern critics of critical discourse analysis theory focus on the relationship between discourse and racism, discourse and ideology, and discourse and knowledge which contribute to the foundations of this theory. Also, the critics of this theory try to integrate the social and cognitive approaches to discourse and critical analysis, and they deal with the social problems and issues that have both a social and cognitive dimensions. Furthermore, the theorists focus on the multidisciplinary studies, in which discourse can be studied from a socio-cognitive dimension. So, discourse in this theory is at the interface of the social and cognitive dimensions, in which discourse is a social practice, and it is at the same time a major way we acquire ideologies.

2. Theoretical Framework on Discourse

Most theorists in the field of discourse focus on the relationship between a text and other fields, such as culture and society. For example, Fairclough defines discourse as "the whole process of interaction of which a text is just a part" (1989, p. 24). Similarly, Wodak & Cillia (2006) claim that "discourses are ideological and that there is no arbitrariness of signs" (713).

Wodak & Meyer (2002) relate discourse with power and they claim that "discourses exert power because they transport knowledge on which collective and individual consciousness feeds" (39). Similarly, Van Dijk (1993) discusses the relationship between discourse and power, in which he claims that if we want to relate power to discourse in a clear way, "we need the cognitive interface of models, knowledge, attitudes and ideologies and other social representations of the social mind" (1).

Thus, it is noticed that most theorists highlight the role of discourse in making individuals constitute their social realities, identities, relations with other social groups, and their knowledge with other social groups (Barker & Galasinski, 2001, p. 65)

3. Theoretical Framework on Critical Discourse Analysis and Political Discourse

Fairclough (1995a) defines critical discourse analysis as a discourse analysis that "aims to systematically explore

often opaque relationships of casuality and determination between (a) discursive practice, events and text, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power; and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony (p. 135). Similarly, Rahimi & Riasati (2011) point out the critical discourse analysis is a discipline that shows the relationship between "language, society, power, identity, ideology, politics and culture" (p. 107).

Al-Majali (2015) claims that political language is not an abstract one; it has a kind of information to convey to the addressee; and it deals "with people's affairs and issues whether they are simple or complex (p. 2). Additionally, Fairclough (1995b) claims that political discourse is a branch of discourse which is based on "thematic level, in which the political text is due to politics, history, and culture (p. 81).

In his article "political discourse and political cognition" Van Dijk (2002) studies the relation between political discourse and political cognition. He argues that political discourse derives from a cognitive process including mental models or from general political representations, such as knowledge, attitudes and ideologies which "are social representations shared by a group" (p. 222). He claims that "political discourse can only be adequately described and explained when we spell out the socio-cognitive interface that relates it to the socially shared political representations that control political actions, processes and systems" (p. 234).

4. Socio-Cognitive Dimension

Teun Van Dijk (2006) has outlined the process of discourse production through highlighting the concepts of mental model, context model and their relation to mind. Mental models are a psychological notion that "account for subjective definitions of situations. They account for personal variation in discourse production comprehension, for style, for interactional conflicts, and especially for the ways discourse is appropriate in given social, political or cultural situtations" (p. 174).

Van Dijk claims that we understand a text when we construct a mental model for it. It is related to the notion of "making sense of text or talk," (p. 169) in which they "have culturally based schematic structures…they represent people's experiences, and people's episodic memory is thus populated by mental models which are subjective, and possibly biased representations of "reality", and may also feature evaluations of events or situations (opinions), as well as emotions associated with such events" (p. 169). Mental models are needed to produce and to understand discourse (p. 169). Furthermore, Van Dijk (2012) argues that these mental models personal or "subjective representations of events or situations, in which a person participates at a certain moment of time, at a certain place, with other participants…engaged with a specific action and with specific goals" (588).

Van Dijk (2006) discusses "Context Models" which reflect participants' personal or subjective beliefs and mental models and embody "large amounts of…socially shared knowledge and other beliefs" (p. 172). These models are represented in "Episodic Memory" and "organized by a handy schema that allows language users to quickly understand the vast amount of possible communicative situations in their everyday lives" (p. 170). Additionally, these models are the basis of "our pragmatic understanding of discourse" (p. 170). They are "dynamic," in which they change with circumstances; they are also "strategic," in which they "provide interpretations of situations;…they exercise their influence in all stages and at all levels of discourse production, from the overall choice of global topics…on the one hand, to the actual actualization of talk in sound structures or graphics, on the other hand" (p. 172).

Furthermore, context models control style, ways of speaking, and rhetoric in discourse (pp. 171, 172). They also define what is appropriate and what is relevant in communicative situation. In other words, they control discourse production and understanding (p. 171).

In his address to the American congress, the king formulates his context models through various ways: he forms a schema in his cognition which consists of three categories: the summary of the political event, the evaluation of the event, and the conclusion of the event (Van Dijk, 2012, pp. 590, 591):

A. Summary of the Events

"I must speak about a cause that is urgent for your people and for mine. I must speak about peace in the Middle East. I must speak about peace replacing the division, war, and conflict that have brought such disaster for the region and for the world."

B. Evaluation of the Event

"Thirteen years later, that work is still not completed. And until it is, we are all at risk. We are all at risk of being victims of further violence resulting from ideologies of terror and hatred."

C. The Pragmatic Conclusion

"We look to you to play an historic role…let us say together: No more!

Let us say together: Let's solve this! Let us say together: Yes, we will achieve this!... This is our challenge as well. And we must not leave it to another generation to meet this challenge…I say: No more bloodshed and no more lives pointlessly taken!"

Commenting on the previous examples of the king's address, we notice how he summarizes the political situation by choosing the unbiased lexicals that do not show any ideological clash between the congressmen and the Arabs: "peace", "division", and "conflict".

Additionally, the lexical meanings of this political discourse are characterized as connotative. This means that the king uses some words that may have specific implications. These connotations are not always found in the dictionary, but often assigned on the basis of the cultural knowledge of the speaker and the audience. Besides, these connotations are cognitively formed and comprehended, so we activate our social knowledge which is "represented as distributed cognition in the semantic memory (part of long-term memory) of the members of a community (Van Dijk, 2012, p. 588) when we read or hear such connotative words. For example, the king uses the negative connotations of the words "war", "conflict", "disaster", "bloodshed". He frequently uses the words that reflect a shared opinion between the Americans and Arabs in order to avoid being biased, such as "disaster for the region and for the world", "for your people and for mine", "We are all at risk", "This is our challenge as well", and "Let us say together: Yes, we will achieve this!". In other words, the king uses the words that make him seem unified with the American congressmen's attitudes towards the "ideologies of terror and hatred". Additionally, the king starts his address by talking about peace in the Middle East which is an acceptable ideology for the congressmen and the American public opinion, and then mentions the words "violence", "terror" and "hatred" He knows the status and ideology of the people whom he addresses. He frequently uses the pronoun "I" in order to reflect his opinion about the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

In psycholinguistics, reference is sometimes made to the notion of "common ground", that is, the knowledge or other beliefs speech participants need to have in common in order to understand each other (Clark, 1996). Besides, cultural knowledge or "common ground" as Van Dijk (2004) calls it is shared by most or "all members of a whole culture. This knowledge is acquired through the process of socialization discourses at home or at school" (p. 78)

Another type of the knowledge of world is the personal knowledge. This type of knowledge may be involved for all readers when they relate the information conveyed by the discourse to their personal experiences. Also, this type of knowledge is never presupposed, it needs to be asserted (p. 77).

The third type of world knowledge is the social group knowledge. This type of knowledge is "typically presupposed in discourse, although such knowledge may only be presupposed in ingroup discourse and not in outgroup discourse" (p. 77). In other words, this type of knowledge is involved in the construction of context models in which the writer or speaker of discourse should focus on the setting of the event (time and place) and on the knowledge of the society to whom he writes or speaks. Thus, social knowledge is shared by all members of a society.

The last type of knowledge is the group knowledge. We mean by group knowledge the knowledge of professional group. This knowledge is shared by all members of professionals and journalists. Besides, the acquisition of group knowledge takes place in meetings, at universities, and through publications (p. 78).

Psychologically speaking, the kind of personal knowledge is typically represented in mental models (Van Dijk, 2004). Indeed, episodic memory, in which mental models are stored, "derives its name from the specific memory people have of interpreted events that we call their experiences. In addition to that, mental models embody constructions of some of the properties of the event they are about; they are also personal and feature knowledge and opinions about specific event with its own properties of time, place, actions or events and participants. Thus, mental models represent how people subjectively construe the events of the world through their experiences" (p. 79).

In his evaluation of the event, the king restores his previous knowledge about the conflict through saying "Thirteen years later". This reference of time reflects that the king shares with the congressmen this piece of knowledge, in which he presupposes that they all know what happened after thirteen years. In this regard, the king avoids bringing any reference of time or place which is unknown to the congressmen. Let us have more examples of the reference in the king's address:

The Arab states recognized that reality in 2002, when we unanimously approved the Arab Peace Initiative…Ten

days ago, in Islamabad, the foreign ministers of key Muslim states met. They came together to assure Palestinians and Israelis that they are not alone, that we back their effort to make and build peace… This was the cause that brought my father King Hussein here in 1994. With Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin beside him, he spoke of a new vision for the Middle East…Time after time; there has been progress towards peace when Americans have actively engaged. Camp David, Madrid, Wye River: nearly every breakthrough was accomplished when America was determined to help the parties succeed…Eleven American presidents and thirty American congresses have already faced this ongoing crisis…Thirteen years ago, my father was here to talk about his hopes for peace…We ask you to hear our call, to honor the spirit of King Hussein and Yitzhak Rabin, and help fulfill the aspirations of Palestinians and Israelis to live in peace today."

Clearly, the king refers to the events that are familiar to the congressmen in order to find a common ground or a shared knowledge between the American congressmen and the Arabs. He reminds them of his father and Israeli Prime Minster Yitzhak Rabin because he knows that these two men are preferred by the congressmen and because he wants to say that he follows their steps. Additionally, he mentions the agreements between Israelis and Palestinians that were sponsored by the American side, such as "Camp David, Madrid, Wye River" in order to show the active American role in the peace process. Finally, it should be stated that the knowledge of and reference to past events reflect the king's typical understanding of the status of congressmen and the American public opinion.

Furthermore, it is noticed in the king's address that he avoids using the biased words to the Arab opinion and attitude. Let us consider the following extract from his address to the American congress to see how the king's mental model of context is not biased to his people's point of view:

> Palestinians and Israelis are not the only victims…It must be a peace that will free young Palestinians to focus on a future of progress and prosperity. It must be a peace that makes Israel a part of the neighborhood, a neighborhood that extends from the shores of the Atlantic Ocean, across the breadth of the southern Mediterranean, to the coast of the Indian Ocean…your responsibility today is paramount. Your potential to help Palestinians and Israelis find peace is unrivalled…The young boy, traveling to school with his brother in Palestine, let him have a life of peace…The mother, watching with fear as her children board a bus in Israel, let her have a life of peace.

Clearly, the king in the above quotation refers to both Palestinians and Israelis. He uses the lexicals that are acceptable for the congressmen such as "peace", "progress", "prosperity", and "neighborhood". His mentioning of the word "neighborhood" implies the meaning of inclusion and exclusion, in which he thinks that Israel can become a part of the Arab world as a neighbor, but it will not be ideologically assimilated with the Arab countries. In this regard, it seems that the king uses the word "neighborhood" as the appropriately acceptable word for the congressmen, but he cannot detach himself from his pan- Arab national ideology which makes him describe the Arab world that "extends from the shores of the Atlantic Ocean, across the breadth of the southern Mediterranean, to the coast of the Indian Ocean". In other words, the king talks about the whole Arab attitude when he refers to idea of being a neighbor to the extended Arab world borders.

Additionally, the king realizes the power that the congressmen have in the international affairs. He frequently uses the polite expression to give an offer and a suggestion "let him/her have a life of peace". His usage of the mental scenario of a young Palestinian boy travelling to school and of an Israeli mother watching with fear her children boarding a bus influences the addressed congressmen's minds who formulate a mental model of this scenario in order to understand it. Clearly, the king's selection of a Palestinian boy and an Israeli woman is significant because he focuses on the innocent people who might be the victims of this conflict. This selection will attract the sympathy of the congressmen to solve the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

Thus, the socio-cognitive dimension is strongly obvious in these examples through the shared mental knowledge between the king and the congressmen. This knowledge influences the mental models of the context that are formulated by the king. Clearly, the king's mental model of the context avoids the biased words which make his address to the congress unacceptable, and at the same time this mental model is strongly related to the socially shared knowledge among all Arabs in their viewpoint of the conflict.

5. Socio-Ideological Dimension

Van Dijk (2001) has explained that ideologies might be "good" or "bad" "depending on the consequences of the social practices based on them…ideologies may thus serve to establish or maintain social dominance, as well as to organize dissidence and opposition…they may serve to found and organize the social thoughts and practices of any social group" (p. 14). He claims that ideologies are based on the interface of both cognition and society; thus, ideologies are "a form of self-scheme of the members of groups, that is, a representation of themselves as a

group, especially also in relation to other groups (p. 14).

According to Van Dijk, ideologies represent "a special form of social cognition shared by social groups" (p. 12). They are the basis of the "social representations" of group members, "including their discourse, which at the same time serves as the means of ideological production, reproduction and challenge" (p. 12).

In the king's address, we notice that there are many kinds of ideologies. We have the Islamic ideology, cultural ideology, nationalist ideology, pan-Arab national ideology, and the American ideology. In all these ideologies, the king is aware of the status of the congressmen and their attitudes and opinions. Let us consider these examples to see how ideologies are formulated in the king's address:

> I meet Muslims thousands of miles away who have a deep, personal response to the suffering of the Palestinian people. They want to know how it is, that ordinary Palestinians are still without rights and without a country. They ask whether the West really means what it says about equality and respect and universal justice… Ours is an Islamic country with a proud record of diversity, moderation, and shared respect… America I know so well, a place where individuality is nurtured, a place where hard work is rewarded, a place where achievement is celebrated. The America I know so well believes that opportunity and justice belong to all. I also learned something of New England virtues. There wasn't actually a law against talking too much, but there was definitely an attitude that you didn't speak unless you could improve on silence. Today, I must speak; I cannot be silent.

From the above quotation, it is clear that the king's use of the word "Muslims" implies the Islamic ideology towards dealing with the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. He avoids saying that the conflict is a religious one, and he plays the role of insider and outsider of the Islamic Arab ideology when he refers to Muslims as "They" in order to be unbiased to the Islamic ideology. In his depiction of the Islamic ideology, the king relates the Muslims' attitudes towards the conflict to the Western attitude towards the Palestinians through using acceptable and unbiased words for the congressmen, such as "equality", "respect", universal justice". He uses the words "ordinary Palestinians", "the suffering of Palestinian people", "without rights", and "without a country" to influence the emotions of the congressmen. He asks indirectly about the Western meaning of equality and respect and universal justice which basics of the Western ideology of dealing with humanity.

Additionally, the king reflects his Islamic and nationalist ideology when he says "Ours is an Islamic country with a proud record of diversity, moderation, and shared respect". The words "diversity, moderation, and shared respect" are identical with what the West calls for in this globe. The usage of these words is due to that the king wants to bridge the ideological difference between the West and the Islamic ideology, and to reply those who have negative connotations about Islam and Arabs. The mentioning of these words makes the congressmen's mental models restore the opposites of these words. Thus, the king is aware of the mental models of the congressmen.

Furthermore, the king's address refers to his knowledge about America when he says "America I know so well". This knowledge of the American cultural values is socially shared between the king and the congressmen, in which the king refers to his learning time at American education. He mentions the words "individuality", "hard work", "opportunity", "justice" which reflect the values of American ideology and culture. He forms a cultural knowledge that is shared between the congressmen and he. Then, he talks about the value of speech in American culture in order to say his opinion: "There wasn't actually a law against talking too much, but there was definitely an attitude that you didn't speak unless you could improve on silence. Today, I must speak; I cannot be silent". Clearly, he finds the motive in the American culture and values that enables him to reveal his opinion. This reflects the king's typical understanding of the American ideology and culture.

The king's address shows us an attempt to harmonize the Arab and American ideologies towards dealing with terrorism ideology. Politically speaking, the word "terrorism" represents to a certain extent the political ideology of the world, in which the word "terrorism" becomes a very important word in the political sense after the terrorist attacks on the United States on 11th September which make the world formulate a political ideology against the terrorist acts all over the world. Let us have this example from the king's address to see how he talks about this ideology:

> And people around the world have been the victims of terrorists and extremists, who use the grievances of this conflict to legitimize and encourage acts of violence. Americans and Jordanians and others have suffered and survived terrorist attacks. In this room, there are representatives of American families and Jordanian families who have lost loved ones. Thousands of people have paid the highest price, the loss of their life. Thousands more continue to pay this terrible price, for their loved ones will never return. Are we going to let these thousands of lives be taken in vain?

From the above quotation we notice a shared knowledge between the American and Arab ideology concerning the terrorism ideology, the king says "Americans and Jordanians". The king wants to say that the terrorists' invested the conflict to legitimize their violence. He wants to say indirectly that the terrorist acts are due to the conflict. His mentioning of "representatives of American families and Jordanian families" is an attempt to build this shared ideology between Americans and Arabs towards terrorism. This is clear from his use of the pronoun "we" in "Are we going to let these thousands of lives be taken in vain?" He enriches his speech with the negative connotations that are based on a shared knowledge, such as "loss", "terrible", "violence", "suffered", "terrorist", and "attacks".

Additionally, the king's address depicts the pan-Arab national ideology, the nationalist ideology, and the Islamic ideology when he says:

> We, all of us, must take risks for peace. The Arab states recognized that reality in 2002, when we unanimously approved the Arab Peace Initiative…The commitment we made in the Arab Peace Initiative is real. And our states are involved in ongoing efforts to advance a fair, just, and comprehensive peace…Let me reaffirm that Jordan is committed to playing a positive role in the peace process…Ten days ago, in Islamabad, the foreign ministers of key Muslim states met. They came together to assure Palestinians and Israelis that they are not alone, that we back their effort to make and build peace.

The king expresses these ideologies through using the words "we, all of us", "our states", and "Jordan is committed to playing a positive role in the peace process". He uses the words that have positive connotations to convey the attitudes of Arabs and Muslims towards the conflict. He says "initiative", "fair", "just", and "comprehensive peace". Also, he avoids being biased in his speech about the Islamic ideology of this conflict, in which he talks about the attitude of the foreign ministers of key Muslim states as "They came together to assure Palestinians and Israelis that they are not alone". Thus, it is clear that the king is aware of selecting the lexicals that show the Arab and Islamic unbiased ideology of Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

Furthermore, the king's address reflects an understanding of the American ideology, values, and foreign policy. This is clear when the king refers to what President Roosevelt says about the American foreign policy:

> My friends, "A decent respect for the rights and dignity of all nations, large and small." That's how President Roosevelt—the great F.D.R.—described the basis of American foreign policy. He pledged American support for the four freedoms, freedom from fear, freedom from want, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion, everywhere in the world. The Four Freedoms speech was given right here, before Congress. And that's entirely fitting. Because it is here in the People's House, that the voices and values of America have made hope real for so many people. Today, the people of the Middle East are searching for these four freedoms.

From the above quotation it is clear that the king selects the words and the values that are known for all congressmen, such as "freedom from fear, freedom from want, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion". He selects these freedoms in order to show the congress that the absence of these values is the reason for the conflict in the Middle East.

6. Socio-Stylistic Dimension

This section deals with the stylistic devices used depending on the mental model of context formulated in the king's cognition which strongly influences the selection of lexical items, syntactic structures and the modes of argumentation (Van Dijk, 2003, pp. 85, 103). Besides, this dimension allows the king to form his stylistic devices to influence the American congressmen's opinions taking into account their attitudes and opinions.

The study of lexical selection is usually carried out in what is traditionally called stylistics. Style may be explained in terms of the opinions of the writers and speakers and the ways they want to influence the readers. In a very broad sense, style may be defined as the set of those sentences and discourse structures that are potentially variable as a function of context.

In addition to that, socio- stylistic dimension is strongly based on the contexts which are mental constructs of participants; they are also individually variable interpretations of the ongoing social situation. Thus, they may be biased, feature personal opinions, and for these reasons also embody the opinions of the participants as members of groups. Besides, context models may be ideologically biased. This means that they may be constructed in accordance with the ideologies of society and the writer or the speaker. Besides, socio-stylistic dimension is mainly related to whom the writer or the speaker directs his speech which influences the selection of lexical items and other stylistic devices that are relevant to the attitudes and ideologies of the addressees.

In the king's address we find that he tends to employ many stylistic devices or strategies that are relevant to the addressed people. These stylistic devices take into account the attitudes and the ideologies of the people to whom his opinion discourse is directed. Thus, the style of the address can be noticed in the modes of argumentation, selection of lexical items, and the persuasive method. Let us consider the following example from the king's address:

> No Palestinian father should be helpless to feed his family and build a future for his sons and daughters. No Israeli mother should fear when her child boards a bus. The young boy, traveling to school with his brother in Palestine, let him have a life of peace. The mother, watching with fear as her children board a bus in Israel, let her have a life of peace. The father in Lebanon, working hard to provide an education for his children, let him have a life of peace. The little girl, born in Iraq, with her wide eyes full of wonder, let her have a life of peace. The family, together eating their evening meal, in Asia, Africa, North America, South America, Europe, Australia, and the Middle East, let them all have a life of peace… The next time a Jordanian, a Palestinian, or an Israeli comes before you, let it be to say: Thank you for helping peace become a reality.

The opinion discourse in the king's address is largely argumentative. This means that tries to make the standpoints more acceptable, credible or truthful by formulating arguments that are purported to sustain the chosen point of view. In other words, such a discourse may be conventionally divided into two main categories: arguments and a conclusion, or a standpoint and arguments. The argumentative way here is based on the persuasive style in influencing the congressmen's attitudes and emotions towards the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. This persuasive style which is the core of argumentation in both of opinion discourses is based on a psychological basis in which the king tries to form a mental model of this event taking into account the emotions and the attitudes of the congressmen to whom he directs his discourse, so he chooses the words that arouse their sympathy with the Palestinians, Israelis, Lebanese, and even the whole suffering people in the world. For example, the selection of the words "father", "feed", "future", "mother", "child", "school", "peace", "fear", "education", "girl", "wonder", and "family" is very significant. These words and scenarios strongly affect the emotions of the American congress. The king is not biased in his argumentation. This is due to the fact that international public opinion can not accept any bias to the Palestinian people without giving persuasive evidence. So, he resorts to describe what is going on in Palestine and Israel as a cycle of violence on both Israeli and Palestinian sides. He also influences the emotions of the congressmen through depicting the scenario of "No Palestinian father should be helpless to feed his family and build a future for his sons and daughters. No Israeli mother should fear when her child boards a bus". These two examples of the historical knowledge that describe an event occurring in Palestine and Israel play a very important role in persuading the congressmen of the cycle of Palestinian and Israeli violence. This method of persuasion is acceptable and more relevant for the American congress because there is no bias in it.

Another stylistic device employed in the king's address is the rhetorical questions. These questions call the attention of the congressmen and they also express the intended main topic of the address. Besides, most of these rhetorical questions are based on the king's cognitive processing in dealing with the issue that he talks about. In other words, he constructs a mental model of the event or the situation that he talks about and expects the congressmen to construct their mental model of the event when they listen to these questions. Additionally, the king does not want to make a question with no answer, so he tries to be more direct, straightforward and brief. This is due to the fact that these questions are directed to the international opinion and are influenced by the western method, in which the questions are subjected to shortness, directness, and straightforwardness. Additionally, we find that the address in the following example ends in a rhetorical question without an answer for the congressmen. This style is also western; it depends on the opinion and attitudes of the congressmen to answer the question:

> Some may say, "Peace is difficult, we can live with the status quo." But, my friends, violent killings are taking place as part of this status quo…Are we going to let these thousands of lives be taken in vain? Has it become acceptable to lose that most basic of human rights? The right to live?... Some may say, "But there are other, urgent challenges." How can there be anything more urgent than the restoration of a world where all people, not only some people, all people have the opportunity to live peacefully?

Commenting on the above example we notice that the king understands well whom he addresses, in which he presupposes in his cognition the opinions and attitudes of some political parties and congressmen. This is clear when he repeats saying "Some may say". He mentions the others' argument and then he gives the counterpart one. Additionally, in his making of questions, the king keeps unbiased to his Islamic Arab ideology, in which he asks using the pronoun "we" and the phrase "violent killings" and focuses on the humanitarian dimension when

he says "basic of human rights" and "all people…live peacefully". Also, he uses the polite and endearment expression in addressing the congress, such as "my friends" in order to make his opinion more acceptable for them.

Moreover, the selection of the lexicals in the king's address is due to the mental model of event or context constructed by the king. All the words that he uses are influenced by the cultural and nationalist ideologies, and to whom he directs his discourse taking into account the attitudes and opinions of the American congressmen. So, his use of lexical items is relevant to the attitudes and the shared ideologies of addressed people. From all the previous examples, we notice how the king conveys his message to the congressmen who are not Arabs in an unbiased way. He selects certain words which are relevant for their status and attitudes, such as "peace", "violence", "terrorists", "individuality", "justice", "diversity", and "equality".

Finally, the king's discourse is mainly influenced by the mental model of the event or the context he constructs and by the status of addressed congressmen, their cultural and ideological backgrounds. These factors influence the king's style in persuading the congressmen to whom he directs his speech or his opinion.

7. Conclusion

Finally, based on the analysis of the king's address to the American congress, it can be concluded that the Jordanian political discourse takes the status of audience into account when it is directed to the international opinion. In other words, the political discourse of Jordan is directed in accordance with the cultural and ideological backgrounds of the people to whom it is addressed. Also, the status and ideologies of audience to whom the political discourse is directed influences the king's style and psyche. This is clear in the lexical usage and modes of argumentation in the political discourse of Jordan which are influenced by the status of audience to whom the king directs his discourse. Furthermore, it is observed that the political discourse of Jordan is more moderate and relevant to the attitudes and opinions of the international public opinion. This is clear from the use of the unbiased words to the Arab Islamic ideology.

References

Al-Majali, W. (2015). Discourse Analysis of the Political Speeches of the Ousted Arab Presidents during the Arab Spring Revolutioning Halliday and Hasan's Framework of Cohesion. *Journal of Education and Practice, 6*(14), 96-108.

Barker, C., & Galasiński, D. (2001). *Cultural Studies and Discourse Analysis, A Dialogue on Language and Identity*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Clark, H. (1996). *Using Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620539

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

Fairclough, N. (1995a). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1995b). *Media Discourse*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the News*. London: Routledge.

Rahimi, F., & Riasati, M. (2011). Critical Discourse Analysis: Scrutinizing Ideologically-Driven Discourses. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 1*(16), 107-112.

Van Dijk, T. (1993). Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse & Society, 4*(2), 249-283. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006

Van Dijk, T. (1997a). Cognitive context models and discourse. In M. Stamenow (Ed.), *Language Structure, Discourse and the Access to Consciousness* (pp. 189-226). Amsterdam: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/aicr.12.09dij

Van Dijk, T. (1997b). *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. London: Sage Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446221884.n1

Van Dijk, T. (1998). Discourse semantics and ideology. *Discourse & Society, 6*(2), 243-289. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926595006002006

Van Dijk, T. (2001). Discourse, ideology and context. *Folia Linguistica, XXX*(1-2), 11-40. https://doi.org/10.1515/flin.2001.35.1-2.11

Van Dijk, T. (2002). Political discourse and political cognition. In P. A. Chilton & C. Schäffner (Eds.), *Politics as Text and Talk. Analytical approaches to political discourse* (pp. 204-236). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.4.11dij

Van Dijk, T. (2003). The Discourse-Knowledge Interface. In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical Discourse Analysis. Theory and Interdisciplinarity* (pp. 85-109). Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave-MacMillan.

Van Dijk, T. (2004). Knowledge and News. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses, 49*(Noviembre), 71-86.

Van Dijk, T. (2006). Discourse, context and cognition. *Discourse Studies, 8*(1), 159-177. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445606059565

Van Dijk, T. (2012). Discourse and Knowledge. In J. P. Gee & M. Handford (Eds.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 587-603). London: Routledge.

Wodak, R., & De Cillia, R. (2006). Politics and Language: Overview Linguistics. In K. Brown (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (pp. 707-719). Oxford: Elsevier Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/04665-4

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2002). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.

Copyrights