



Università
Ca' Foscari
Venezia

Degree programme ("*ordinamento*" D.M.
270/2004)
in International Relations

Final Thesis

—
Ca' Foscari
Dorsoduro 3246
30123 Venezia

Discourse Analysis
The hidden message in diplomatic
communication about ISIS phenomenon

Supervisor

Ch.ma Prof.ssa Daniela Cesiri

Graduand

Giorgia Niero

Matriculation Number 827250

Academic Year

2014 / 2015



Università
Ca' Foscari
Venezia

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Chapter one: Discourse Analysis	
1.1 What is Discourse Analysis	2
1.2 The features of Discourse Analysis	4
1.3 How to do discourse analysis	8
1.4 The research method used	11
Chapter two : The Isis Phenomenon	
2.1 Historical Background	16
2.2 The Most Recent Events	20
Chapter three: The Analysis of the documents	
3.1 Statement of U.S. President Obama	22
3.2 Statement made by the President of the European Parliament	31
3.3 Interview to Bachar al-Assad	33
Conclusions	45
Bibliography	47

—
Ca' Foscari
Dorsoduro 3246
30123 Venezia

INTRODUCTION

The present thesis analyses International communication about ISIS through the means of discourse analysis; the goal of this work is to understand the main functions of discourse in international relations and thereby understand how various factors contribute to the meaning of the discourse, such as power relations, language and religion.

In a context where the use of force is often a method of communication and as a problem-solving method among Nations, I found very interesting to analyse the international communications, which have also political objectives which are achieved through manipulation and through the social power as a form of control. For this reason, my goal is to understand the techniques used, by people who have the power to do this, to control the minds of readers and listeners but also to understand the hidden meaning hidden behind common words that we are used to read.

Furthermore, I decided to apply the methods of discourse analysis to communication concerning ISIS because it is a current topic but also because it is one of those situations where a contribution of international powers is needed to sensitise the audience to the danger connected with ISIS, but also to give a message to this terrorist movement.

Reading my research project, we will start from the definition of discourse analysis, to understand the objective of this methodological approach and then, in the second chapter ISIS will be described to understand what it is, its values and objectives. First of all, I will describe this movement from an historical point of view and then I will describe the latest events related to ISIS which affected different countries, through the methods of discourse analysis to investigate communication concerning ISIS.

In the fourth chapter, I will proceed with the analysis of the documents, trying to understand and explain the reason for the choices made and the message they wanted to convey in this way.

CHAPTER ONE :

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

1.1 What is discourse analysis ?

Discourse Analysis is a modern discipline that studies the language of texts and considers the relationship between language and social, cultural and historical context.

Discourse Analysis also examines the way in which the language creates different worldviews and identities, and how much it is influenced by the relationships between the subjects involved.

The term Discourse Analysis was first introduced by Zellig Harris in 1952 to describe the way to analyse interconnected documents and conversations. Harris thought that “several utterances in different situations have special meanings and linguistic features, and that Discourse Analysis aims to find these meanings”. (1952: 332)

Many sociolinguists have studied the discourse and language, bringing the discipline to be recognised in the modern era as Discourse Analysis. We can classify three scholars as the most important people who developed the importance of discourse analysis: Michel Foucault , Norman Fairclough and Teun Adrianus Van Dijk.

Michel Foucault, a French philosopher, published the “Archaeology of Knowledge” in 1969, work that was then considered as the birth of Discourse Analysis. Foucault in his work said “Nothing has any meaning outside of discourse” Foucault (1972), with which he wanted to explain that it is the discourse and the context that give meaning to the words.

Norman Fairclough researcher of Discourse Analysis, concentrated his work in Critical Discourse Analysis, for which is considered the founder. Critical Discourse Analysis is a form of Discourse Analysis that examines the relationship between language and ideology. It also studies the relationship between language and power, because very often in this analysis there is a political objective, in order to show the

connection of a discourse with a particular ideology. His goal was also the key concept of CDA, that is to analyse how language reproduces power. With his book “Language and Power” (1989) he analysed the link between the speech and the unequal measures of power.

Teun Adrianus Van Dijk is an important scholar who still teaches at the Pompeu Fabra University in Barcelona. Van Dijk has also published several books about the Discourse Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis, analysing especially the racist ideologies in discourse in order to eliminate them.

The first factor that affects the discourse is the context. In fact a person knows how to interpret what another person says, depending on the situation in which we find ourselves. Van Dijk also states that it is not only the situation that affects the discourse but on the contrary, the way the subjects define the context changes and creates the situation. In fact, it is not possible to give a sense of a text without knowing the culture of the people involved and the context of the situation they are experiencing. For these reasons the main objective of Discourse Analysis is to analyse the relationship between language and context in order to have a better understanding of what somebody is saying. So, what we can say is that the Discourse Analysis is a view of language, is the way through which people reach certain goals through language. Moreover, Discourse Analysis analyses the language that is used in certain social and cultural spheres, and the message being transmitted through certain words. Furthermore, the discourse is shaped by the world and the context, but at the same time the language changes the world and the context. The discourse is also shaped by the speeches that were made previously and the ones that will follow. Moreover, social identities, who we are, are given by the use of language which expresses who we are, what we think and what we want.

1.2 The Features of Discourse Analysis

The choice of the language to be used depends on several factors, such as who we are speaking to, the social context, the subject, the goal of the conversation and the level of formality. The kind of language used also depends on the gender of people that

interact. It is analysed the kind of language used speaking about women or men. Then, it can be said that gender is not something that people already have, but something that is created through the way of speaking and the behaviour. However, gender is always associated with many other factors, including the person's social role and identity. A person may have several identities which require the use of different kinds of language on different occasions. In fact, the identities are constructed through the use of discourse. Identities are not predefined, but are continually evolving as we speak and what we do.

In addition, the oral and written communications are never objective or without a political ideology. In fact, in these texts are also described important political and historical processes, which can be also hidden through the text. In order to discover which ideology is present in the text, we can first of all analyse the way in which the text is presented and the perspective taken by the person who is talking. Then, "we can study the concepts which are underlined in the text, or those who are overshadowed, giving importance also to the values and the points of view transmitted by the text". James Paul Gee (2011: 49)

Another important study connected to Discourse Analysis is the study of pragmatics. "Pragmatics is the study of the meaning of a sentence or a discourse, in relation to the context in which it takes place. This also includes knowledge about the issue, and the knowledge between the people involved. However, the way in which people interact also depends on their culture and principles of cooperation. The context is very important to understand the meaning of what is said or written". Brian Paltridge (2012: 41). For context we refer to the physical and social one, and even to the roles of people. Moreover, the meaning is also produced by the interaction between the writer and the reader. In fact, the interpretation of the discourse also depends on how much we know about the context, and what we know about other subjects, and on the norms of the communication. Moreover, quite often we take for granted the knowledge from the reader, also through cooperative principles. Cooperative principles are the principles according to which we give a particular interpretation to what we hear or read. On the other hand, there are situations in which is stated the opposite of what we expect to hear, but is expected that the reader

understand this. This can be done for politeness reasons, so it is important to carefully analyse what we read or hear.

Another important point of pragmatics is the difference of communication and the different meanings given to words in different cultures. “The different cultural values are reflected in what a person says and what he or she means from what they say”. So, we can say that this is another important factor to consider when we are doing discourse analysis. Brian Paltridge (2012: 53)

Moreover, politeness is another important element of pragmatics. “The politeness used in a discourse it is an important element because analysing it we can understand why people decide to say things in a particular way”. Using politeness in a discourse may also become a political strategy to achieve certain goals. “The way people express politeness also differs from culture to culture, and also the same expressions can mean different things in one or another language”; for this reason it is important to analyse this aspect to understand discourse, because if we make a mistake in the understanding or in the expression of a concept in a different language, we can create serious cultural misunderstandings. James Paul Gee (2012: 50)

Another important element in discourse analysis, is grammar, not just the grammar of a sentence but the grammar from a discourse perspective. Is preferred the discourse grammar instead of the grammar of the sentence, because the discourse grammar combines the context and the function of the conversation, showing us the language choices, explaining the relationship between the different words and text elements. An important grammatical element in Discourse Analysis is the texture of a text. When grammar and discourse are integrated through language items, then we can talk about cohesion. “Cohesion is the relationship between the elements of a text, such as words, sentences, pronouns, conjunctions, names. In particular, the relationship between vocabulary items in the text is the lexical cohesion. There are different types of lexical cohesion, and the first of them is the repetition, which refers to the repetition of words in a text”. James Paul Gee (2011: 134)

Then there is the synonymy, according to which we can refer to the same concept using different words. Moreover, the antonymy gives opposed terms to emphasise a concept.

Then, there are lexical bundles, which are combinations of words. The lexical bundles can express many things, including possibility (I don't know if...), willingness to do something (I want to...), obligation (you have to ...).

Another important part of discourse analysis is covered from conjunctions, which combine various parts of the sentence. Conjunctions can be 'finally', 'however', 'and'; or can be additive conjunctions such as 'moreover', 'in addition' or comparative conjunctions like 'on the other hand', 'moreover'. Temporal conjunctions can be 'while', 'meanwhile', 'then'. Finally, consequential conjunctions include words such as 'so that', 'because', 'therefore', 'in conclusion'. "So, conjunctions serve to express a particular message with words, or to highlight the cause and the effect of a phenomenon, or to highlight a particular situation, or also to announce the goal of discourse, to clarify the message and the interpretation". James Paul Gee (2011: 138)

Another important factor to analyse in the grammar of text, is the attitude of the person towards a given topic, shown through some words, adjectives etc. These words are intended to create a positive or negative evaluation of the phenomenon, according to what the person thinks or believes. What we think about a particular topic it can be said explicitly through the use of positive or negative terms, or it can be implicitly said in the context in general. So, by matching the description of the phenomenon with negative or positive adjectives, we can emphasise the idea about that particular case study, also stressing the contrast between positive and negative elements. In addition, a person can emphasise what he thinks, by connecting the discourse to statements made by other people. This can be done "by combining positive terms to indicate support to those declarations, or negative terms to get away from those statements. Moreover, also modal terms can be used, as 'always', 'possibly', to show certainty, possibility, or as 'controversial' to question the statement". James Paul Gee (2011: 171)

The last important element to be analysed is the critical discourse analysis. The aim of Critical Discourse Analysis is to discover the values and messages hidden in the text. Furthermore, the critical discourse analysis studies the use of discourse in different social and political contexts, and also the issues linked with the text such as gender, cultural differences and ideologies. The purpose of critical discourse analysis

is to find the ideologies in the text through the analysis of grammatical elements, and also to link the text with other texts and statements already made. The principles of critical discourse analysis argue that political issues and power relationships are expressed through discourse, and ideologies, in the same way, are produced through the discourse. First of all, “critical discourse analysis addresses the political and social themes, analysing how these are expressed in the text. It also analyses the strategies used to express a certain type of message. Instead, to analyse power relationships that are created in discourse, we must first understand who controls the interactions, the communications between the parties”. Brian Paltridge (2012: 186) In fact, it should be noted that those who usually speak first are in a weaker position than the second one, who has the possibility to reply. In addition, critical discourse analysis says that discourse creates and maintains social relationships. In fact, it is possible to use different terms, positive or negative, to create different types of social relations.

Moreover, critical discourse analysis analyses the text taking into account factors like the relationship between participants, the stereotypes related to culture, values and prejudices towards other nationalities or groups. So, we can say that our use of language, our ideas, will always be influenced by our ideological positions.

There may also be communication strategies, in which moral discourse is used, for example, to contrast the position taken by another person, and as a way to legitimise allegations against others. Thus, “critical discourse analysis, is not just a simple text analysis but, instead, it analyses the relationship between language and discourse, it explains why certain choices are made in the text and how it affects the social and political situation from which the text is made, and finally it seeks to explain the aim of the text”. Adrian Beard (2000: 27)

Another way to analyse the text through critical discourse analysis is to find the messages expressed openly in the text and those instead hidden, in order to understand the aim of the discourse.

1.3 How to do discourse analysis

In order to make a discourse analysis we have to see the text as if it were new, like it is something we have never seen before. In this way we do not give anything for granted and all text will be analysed objectively. So, “for any text we have to act as if it were a third person to read the text, and we must ask ourselves what could seem strange and unusual”. There are some elements to analyse when doing discourse analysis, now I will describe some of them. James Paul Gee (2011: 25)

Deictics

“Deictics are words to be analysed to figure out to who or what they refer. They can be the category of person (I, you, he...), place (here, there...) and time (now, then...). when they are used, it is assumed that the reader already knows or understands to who they are talking about”. So we can figure out what the person wants to say, looking at what he or she actually says and means, with the context. James Paul Gee (2012: 14)

Subjects and predicates

The subject and the predicate are two basic parts to be analysed in discourse analysis. In fact, “the subject is what we decide to talk about, the most important element on which we focus our attention. Whereas the predicate is what we choose to say about the subject. So what is important in the analysis is to discover why it was chosen that subject and why it was decided to describe it in that way and not in another”. James Paul Gee (2012: 23)

Context

“It is important to analyse the context in which it occurs because there are elements which can change the meaning of the conversation, for example the relationship between people, the common knowledge, and the historical and cultural elements”. In fact, the same word may have different meanings depending on the context in which it is used. James Paul Gee (2012: 49)

What the speaker is trying to do

It is also important to analyse, in addition to words and language used, also what the speaker wants to do through that discourse. To create structures of discourse than can achieve the desired objectives, we need not only to join the various parts of a sentence as subject, predicate, adjectives, conjunctions, but we also have to make stylistic choices. For example, “we must choose which words to use, if a formal style or not, because the meaning is given by the context, but especially from the words chosen. For example, Governments use the passive sentences, so they don’t take responsibility for what happen”. Claus Mueller (1973: 53)

“The choice to use different kinds of sentences and words, is made for creating the desired meaning. We then create these images and meanings to make something happen. Then, the language is also used to create a certain identity, or to create relationships with other persons, institutions or Governments”. James Paul Gee (2011: 49)

Theme and topic

One of the first things we can analyse is the first part of a text, and the message it has: “that is the theme of a discourse, the part that explains the topic (subject) of the text. The theme is always before the subject, and explains the context of the discourse”.

Another way to organise the discourse analysis is to find different groups of ideas and information in the text. In this way we can analyse them separately, organising ideas in a better way. Brian Paltridge (2012 : 113)

The main questions for discourse analysts

First of all, we need to ask ourselves what words and expressions were used to give more importance to some things and less to other. In addition to the type of words used, even where we place the sentences in the discourse changes the importance of information. What is explained in the main clause will be the a more important information than the one placed in the subordinate clause. Brian Paltridge (2012: 121)

We also analyse and ask to ourselves what kind of person is speaking, that is what is the identity that the person wants to show in that particular situation. Each person can have different identities and can choose which one to show and in what context, in order to get what he/she wants. “Depending on the manner of discourse that a person chooses, so in turn this person chooses the identity of readers, according to his/her own identity”. We must also ask to ourselves how the language is used to create or maintain relationship with people, Governments or institutions. In fact, “the language is one of the most effective ways to create and change relationships with other subjects”. James Paul Gee (2011: 78)

Another feature to be analysed is the connection that is made through linguistic elements, between sentences of text. These elements help to figure out which expression is connected to another. “Some of cohesive devices can be adverbs, conjunctions, determiners, quantifiers and pronouns. What we need to understand is what the speaker is trying to do or say combining those phrases in that certain way”. For example the link ‘however’ reports that there is an adversative relation between the two sentences, ‘most of’ indicates that in this sentence we will talk about most of the subjects mentioned in the previous sentence. James Paul Gee (2011: 78)

Discover how language is linked to the world and culture

“We can discover the link between the text and the world through the specific meaning that words have, so not only the general one. The specific meaning of a word can change depending on the context in which it is expressed and based on who says it”. One way to do this is to refer to prior knowledge and to what has already been said about this topic. Widdowson (2007: 43)

It is also important to know who is speaking because the meaning of what is said also depends on the identity of the subject, or even the identity that in that particular situation he chooses to use. Moreover, in addition to knowing who is speaking and his identity, we must also understand what is trying to achieve with those words.

Another way to analyse the link between the text and the world, is to find the connections made with other texts. These links can be specified directly, or we can find them looking at the same linguistic style used in another text.

So, we can say in front of a text is that what people want to say is not only what is written in a text. “The message of a text depends on many factors that need to be analysed: the context, the identity of the person who speaks, the culture and then what they would like to say with these expressions, and the political objectives connected with the discourse”. Widdowson (2007: 25)

1.4 The research method used

In my research I followed the basic points of discourse analysis giving particular importance to critical discourse analysis of Van Dijk’s approach, to understand how different ideologies influence the texts and the objectives pursued.

First of all, I analysed the historical and cultural situation linked to ISIS. I studied the historical bases of this movement, the Islamic religion and the corresponding values that pursues.

Then, I decided to analyse some international actors and their views and ideas about this topic. Starting from these assumptions I could investigate the different national viewpoints. To do this I started from the historic events that have connected a certain nation to ISIS, then I studied their culture, ideas and values.

What is really important in my research is to understand, through historical events, the goal of every nation, in order to understand certain stylistic or grammatical structures used to gain their objective.

Moreover, I analysed several studies on discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis in order to understand how the speaker can hide a message in his own words, that is, to understand how stealing away from the literal meaning of what we just read or hear.

Discourse Analysis applied to my research

As we said, I based the study of critical discourse analysis on the studies of Van Dijk, which states that the various ideologies affect and change the texts and speeches, and for this reason he analyses the structure of discourse to find the ideologies.

Van Dijk says that ideology is the set of values and norms of a particular social group, aimed at achieving the objectives, usually of power and dominion. A very important aspect in my research is to follow a pattern in order to find the ideology of the text, following the work of Van Dijk. This scheme is based on the concept of saying positive things about ourselves, that is about the group that shares the same ideology, and saying negative things about the other subjects. Starting from this scheme, then we should analyse the positive statements about the group and the negative ones about others, and also the way that we use to de-emphasise the negative aspects of the group. In this way we analyse the way used to give the desired message, to ensure that readers see things as we want to show them. Van Dijk (2011: 5)

“There are also other elements that help to analyse the ideology of discourse in my research: for example the vagueness, the generalisation, the selection of topics to emphasise some aspects of the discourse, and the example used to demonstrate an important concept”. In fact, an important aspect of my work, but in general also of discourse analysis, is to understand the nature of the social power of the subjects involved. This is because “the power of the speaker leads to the control of readers or listeners, and to influence their ideas and points of view. So, to control and manipulate the people’s ideas and thoughts is one of the primary goals of a text”. Instead of recurring to the use of force to achieve goals, we use words, and persuasion to change the ideas of others in their own interest. In addition, in order to exercise this kind of power, is needed the influence of knowledge, understanding, a certain ideology, values and norms. For this reason, analysing the person expressing the message, we must know his role, his knowledge and ideology. From the analysis of these elements, we can say that the control of knowledge is very important because it shapes our vision and interpretation of the world, and provides a way to

express concepts. Then, once we analyse the ideology of a group, nation or person, we can understand their goals, interests and values, which are the basic elements for the discourse analysis. James Paul Gee (2011: 98)

Another element that I analysed is the connection between the texts and those that may be mental representations of the speaker, his opinions or events in relation to the topic. In fact what he says depends both on his ideology, but also on his knowledge about the topic, the events he lived in connection with it, or the relations that his country had with it. For this reason it is important to analyse first of all who is speaking, the historical elements and anything that might affect his way of saying concepts and its ideology.

Then what I analysed in my research was the structure of the text. That is, when a person with a certain level of power expresses a concept, we must examine how it does and how this concept is able to influence and persuade readers. I have also analysed the structure and functions of the message, and the consequences this may have on the audience.

Other elements of the texts that I analysed, are the contrasts between positive and negative terms, between good and bad. In fact, in these texts as in many others there is the opposition between 'us' and 'them', where 'we' is associated with positive adjectives and examples, while 'they' is associated with negative actions, emphasised by negative adjectives and expressions that explain the severity of what happened. So, in the texts there is a continuous contrast between 'us' and 'them', emphasised by examples that leave no doubt and therefore manipulate the idea of the reader. There are some ways to create this contrast, for example by giving arguments, facts, testifying the negative features of the others, underestimating our negative actions in order to show their actions much more serious, through the choice of the most suitable words to make the idea of positive or negative features, giving plausible details regarding positive or negative events and quoting reliable sources that can testify what was said.

By analysing in detail the various steps that brought me to this research project, following the guidelines of discourse analysis, I started the project by choosing a research topic. One of the best ways to choose the topic is read previous research projects and figure out what questions can be done from the perspective of discourse

analysis, and what is our area of interest. I chose to analyse the issue linked to terrorist movements, and in particular the ISIS movement. I chose this topic because it is a current topic and on which I found really few analysis. For this reason I found that there were several research questions to make, and few answers and solutions already found.

Then, in order to start the research project it was necessary to make a research question, that is the objective of discourse analysis, in this case to understand the hidden message in international communication concerning ISIS. In fact, there is not a real communication and negotiation between the terrorist movement and the international powers, so the documents such as those that I have analysed are the only ways to give them communications. When I decided the topic, I searched deeper historical and cultural details that led to the events analysed, to understand different thoughts, ideologies and goals.

Then, I made a first lexical analysis, trying to stealing away from context, seeing any information as if it were new. In the lexical analysis then I analysed the frequency of words, the type of words, the terms used, the kind of language and the grammatical elements. The first text feature we should note is the speaker's approach toward the listeners. In this way, and through the pronouns used, we can figure out to whom those communications are addressed. Then, from the level of formality of the discourse, we also understand the goal of the speaker, that is if he wants to create confidence with the audience or not.

After that it was important to analyse the adjectives and positive terms opposed to the negative ones, trying to understand the reason for these choices. In fact, once we understand the political and social power of the speaker, and consequently the power and influence he has towards the audience, we can analyse how he tries to manipulate the public's ideas through the negative and positive affirmations. Subsequently, it is also important to analyse the practical examples that the speaker leads to support his ideas. This is because the human mind believe more in something when are given these examples, when it is possible to make the comparison between what is good and what is bad. This is without any doubt an excellent strategy to convince readers to believe in something, in addition to

implying that the speaker's interest is their well-being. This is expressed by the use of the pronoun "we", which I have analysed and found in various part of speech.

So, to sum up, the method used in my research project was first to notice some key elements. These elements for example are: the power relations hidden in the text, who is exercising the power, the identity of the speaker, who is the audience of the text, information which are not introduces in the text, the use of passive voice and the use of adjectives and descriptions to reinforce a concept. Then, analysing the text, I asked myself some questions such as: how are presented information and events in the text, how people are described, what is the message that the speaker wanted to give with his words, what information are repeated in the text and what information are derived from other texts.

CHAPTER TWO:

THE ISIS PHENOMENON

2.1 Historical Background

The origins of ISIS can be found in the Second Gulf War in 2003, war ordered by George W. Bush Jr. in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 made by al Qaeda. “The objectives were to restore the U.S. control over the territory for energy supply, to extend the war on terror from Afghanistan to Iraq, because they were producing weapons of mass destruction. Finally, the United States wanted to bring democracy to those territories”. Loretta Napoleoni (2014: 21)

“The Second Gulf War ended with the fall of Saddam Hussein’s regime in Iraq and to the destruction of the existing governmental structure. In this way the State became fragile in both Government and in the security”. The post-war period was characterised by political and religious contrasts that opposed the Sunni minority to the Shiite majority and the Kurds, a minority in Iraq.

In 2003 the Americans took control of Iraq until 2011, but without being able to establish an effective Iraq army. The Americans sought to support the Shiite regime that they considered democratic. However the Shiite regime excluded the Sunni population, which in contrast had always controlled the country”.

In 2004 the branch of Al-Qaeda established in Iraq, by taking advantage of the weakness of the country, to support the Sunni population and fight the American army. The leader of Al-Qaeda in Iraq was al-Zarqawi, who had sworn allegiance to Osama bin Laden. The Meir Amit Intelligence and Terrorism Information Center (2014: 2)

Al-Zarqawi created a jihadist network in Iraq composed of people from Iraq, Syria and other Arab countries. Al-Zarqawi had several objectives, such as contrasting the U.S. army, creating a Sunni-Shiite war, and the end of the reconstruction of Iraq.

His policy then was characterized by terrorism against the Shiite population. In fact, many civilians were killed by suicide bombers. This movement of al Zarqawi was considered for the first time as a terrorist organisation in 2004. The attacks were organised against U.S. military personnel, civilians and places of worship. The indiscriminate massacre of Muslim civilians was also criticized by Osama bin Laden, in fact started a dispute and a rivalry between Al-Qaeda and the Al-Qaeda group in Iraq which continued to operate independently.

The anti-Shiite legacy, for Al-Zarqawi was based on Middle Ages Islamic sources, and for this reason he had the “Islamic legitimacy” to carry out mass killings against Shiites and their allies.

In 2006 al-Zarqawi was killed by U.S. army. His position as head of the Al-Qaeda branch in Iraq was inherited by al-Muhajir until 2010. Al-Muhajir maintained contacts with Al-Qaeda also in other countries, continuing to organize terrorist attacks. The United States established an amount of \$ 50.000,00 for his killing.

In 2006 the terrorist movement assumed the name of ISI, the Islamic State in Iraq with al-Masri and al-Baghdadi. ISI was formed by Sunni jihadi organisations who had fought against the U.S. army in Iraq.

Terrorist attacks increased until 2010, when the United States killed the heads of ISI, with the help of Iraqi security forces. The control of ISI was inherited by Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi which is still today in this position.

Then, some infrastructure were constructed for logistical support in Syria, for the campaign against the United States.

Between 2011 and 2012, there was the beginning of the civil war in Syria where the ISI took part in a significant way against President Bashr al Assad, initially establishing relations with al-Qaeda headed by al-Zawahiri who had taken the place of Osama Bin Laden.

In 2011 the U.S. army withdrew from Iraq, leaving a vacuum of military security in the territory. Moreover in this way, ISI was able to reinforce its terrorist movement against the Shiite population and the Iraqi Government. By 2012 the terrorist campaign grew increasingly causing thousands of civilian casualties. “The culmination of the terrorist campaign of the ISI was the attack on the Abu Ghraib prison, near Baghdad, in which there were rebels who have fought against the

American army”. CNN (2015) “The components of ISIS entered the prison armed, releasing about 500 al-Qaeda components which reinforced the ISIS.

This campaign continued, and were released thousands of al-Qaeda operatives”. The Meir Amit Intelligence and Terrorism Information Center (2014: 28)

Then, the use of suicide bombers became the trademark of Al-Qaeda and ISIS. Osama bin Laden already searched for suicide bombers among Iraqi civilians, stressing the importance of these operations against the American enemy.

During the first years of American presence in Iraq, there were several suicide attacks against U.S. forces, the Iraqi government and the Iraqi Shiites.

This program became a real mass killing that caused many civilian casualties.

At the end of 2011, ISI sent Iraqi and Syrian jihadist in Syria against the regime. In this way they set up in the territory a jihadist organization which began to move away from the ISI, its founder. The leader of ISI, Al-Baghdadi, in order to avoid this, joined the jihadist organization and the ISI under his command, called this new organization with the new name ISIS: “The Islamic State in Iraq and greater Syria”. This change of name of the terrorist movement was a clear sign that the jihadist group was creating a larger strategy than the previous one which was circumscribed only in the Iraqi territory.

Nevertheless, the new jihadist organization wanted to remain independent from ISI, and for this reason it swore alliance to Al-Qaeda. Then, Al-Qaeda declared that ISIS was no longer its branch. As a result, ISIS said that Al-Qaeda was no longer the foundation of jihad, unlike ISIS who was the only jihadi organization. This dispute also led to clashes between the ISIS and the new jihadist organisation, which continued their programs independently.

“After this division between ISIS and Al-Qaeda, each group began to operate in different ways: ISIS continued to use brutal methods using force to enforce religious principles. On the contrary, the jihadist group with Al-Qaeda decided to leave the possibility to rivals to cooperate. Despite the isolation from other jihadist groups, ISIS continued its struggle to return to “caliphate” which was proclaimed on June 29, 2014, sparking a huge wave of terrorism during the following weeks”. The Meir Amit Intelligence and Terrorism Information Center (2014: 9)

So, the ISIS is a Sunni organisation, which has very large and dangerous goals. What they want is to eliminate all kind of non-Muslim people, not Sunni and not Arabic people. For this reason, non-Muslims are exterminated if they don't want to convert to the Muslim religion, even by force. What is being claimed is that ISIS may be just born in U.S. military prisons. The largest American prison in Iraq was Camp Bucca, a prison in which there were some of the main leaders of ISIS.

Like all groups that are inspired by Islamic Fundamentalism, the ISIS recognised itself in the principle of 1928, according to which "the Quran is our Constitution", which sees Islam as a complete and total system for the government of the Muslim community. ISIS believes in the *jihād*, that is the holy war against the infidels in order to establish an Islamic State, and also for the restoration of the Caliphate abolished in 1924 by Ataturk, the founder of modern Turkey. The Caliphate, or Islamic State, was proclaimed on June 29 2014, in the occupied territories of Iraq and Syria, when ISIS also distanced itself from Al Qaeda. The leader who currently leads the ISIS, al-Baghdadi, has announced the beginning of a new international jihad, which should hit over the Middle East and the West as well.

Today ISIS occupies militarily various territories in Iraq and Syria. "It also demonstrated through several terrorist attacks and kidnappings that it can get brutal solutions, such as the beheading of American journalists and British aid worker, which was also transmitted via internet in order to have an even stronger impact to the world". The Meir Amit Intelligence and Terrorism Information Center (2014: 203)

"It is still very unclear how, but ISIS is recruiting jihadist cells in Europe and America, which threatens to bring jihad also to the West, and this can also be a result of military operations organised by the United States with a strong international support and even a support made by some Arab countries".

For these reasons, ISIS represents a serious threat, also because the situation might lose control with regard to the relationship between Islam and the West. The Meir Amit Intelligence and Terrorism Information Center (2014: 205)

2.2 The Most Recent Events

One of the areas currently more affected by the terrorist movement is Libya, where ISIS is slowly gaining more influence. On fact, in Libya is undergoing a civil war from four years, since Colonel Gheddafi has died. The civil war has affected mainly the forces loyal to Gheddafi and other revolutionary forces in the country.

The Libyan territory is then controlled by two main rival factions. One is located to the East of Lybia and is controlled by the Government of Tobruk, a city in the north eastern Libya, near the border with Egypt. Benghazi instead, which is the most important city, is under the control of different groups, including Ansar al Sharia, who would the Islamic law throughout the country, and who are considered close to al-Qaeda. In addition, “other cities in the northeast of the country are controlled by different factions allied with ISIS.

Then, the western territory of Libya is controlled by rebels of the Libyan Dawn, Islamists, which also control the capital Tripoli”. The Meir Amit Intelligence and Terrorism Information Center (2014: 173)

So, in Libya at the moment there are two parliaments. The first one at Tobruk, from 2014, which is recognised by the International community but not by the Libyan Supreme Court. The Prime Minister is Abdullah al-Thani.

The second is the National Congress located in Tripoli from 2012, which decided to continue to operate even after the expiry of the mandate. The Prime Minister is Omar al-Hasi and is supported by several Islamic groups.

So, at the moment ISIS took full control in some cities, of government buildings, hospitals, radio and TV. Following the terrorist attack in an hotel in Tripoli, well frequented by foreigners, there have been several meetings if the international community, but without significant results.

Following the beheading of 21 Christians from Egypt in the Libyan coast, the Egyptian forces with the Libyan ones, loyal to the Parliament of Tobruk, killed about 40 militants of the Islamic State, through airstrikes.

Italy, instead, due to these events, decided to repatriate the staff of the Embassy in Tripoli, inviting even compatriots to leave the country. This is not an usual decision, in fact is thought to have been taken in order to liberate Libya before an Italian

attack. In this situation, Barack Obama said that he is ready to use U.S. troops in the battlefield.

Another important event that has affected the entire international community was the destruction of the Temple of Bel in Palmyra, Syria, which was one of the most important pieces of architecture with a great cultural meaning. The Temple of Bel has been for 2000 years the religious centre of Palmyra.

From here, we can see that ISIS doesn't want just to take brutal executions but also wants to erase history, more precisely to eliminate the antiquities and those ancient sites they consider to be earlier than the religion of Islam.

Another event that is affecting several European countries is the wave of immigration from Libya. The greatest fear comes from a report of ISIS, in which is stated that migrants are a way to get to Europe. Many immigrants come from North Africa, Libya and Egypt, people who flee to avoid being killed and who cannot go home because they should cross the territories occupied from ISIS. The fear is that the Islamic movement may enter in our territories with immigrants without being noticed. It is also established the danger of an attack to Italy. ISIS also sent a video threatening Italy, saying that they were in the south of Rome. That threat increased the fear of an attack, also because Libya is only 300 miles from Sicily. Moreover, the Italian coast guard had been threatened with Kalashnikovs to clear quickly the boat full of migrants, to hand them over. It is thought that they did this to get back into Libya and fill it again with other migrants.

Last October, ISIS published a story in the magazine Dabiq, entitled "Reflections on the final crusade", which describes how they will conquer Rome. They wrote that they will conquer Rome, breaking the crosses, enslaving women and children, and if they will not succeed, their children will.

So, what we can say is that ISIS is a real threat to Italy, is a threat difficult to deal with and probably could destroy the national territory. President of the Libyan Parliament Saleh Aqila (2015)

CHAPTER THREE:

THE ANALYSIS OF THE DOCUMENTS

3.1 Statement of U.S President Obama ¹

“Statement by the President on ISIL

My fellow Americans, tonight I want to speak to you about what the United States will do with our friends and allies to degrade and ultimately destroy the terrorist group known as ISIL.

As Commander-in-Chief, my highest priority is the security of the American people. Over the last several years, we have consistently taken the fight to terrorists who threaten our country. We took out Osama bin Laden and much of al Qaeda’s leadership in Afghanistan and Pakistan. We’ve targeted al Qaeda’s affiliate in Yemen, and recently eliminated the top commander of its affiliate in Somalia. We’ve done so while bringing more than 140,000 American troops home from Iraq, and drawing down our forces in Afghanistan, where our combat mission will end later this year. Thanks to our military and counterterrorism professionals, America is safer.

Still, we continue to face a terrorist threat. We can’t erase every trace of evil from the world, and small groups of killers have the capacity to do great harm. That was the case before 9/11, and that remains true today. And that’s why we must remain vigilant as threats emerge. At this moment, the greatest threats come from the Middle East and North Africa, where radical groups exploit grievances for their own gain. And one of those groups is ISIL -- which calls itself the “Islamic State.”

Now let’s make two things clear: ISIL is not “Islamic.” No religion condones the killing of innocents. And the vast majority of ISIL’s victims have been Muslim. And ISIL is certainly not a state. It was formerly al Qaeda’s affiliate in Iraq, and has taken advantage of sectarian strife and Syria’s civil war to gain territory on both sides of the Iraq-Syrian border. It is recognized by no government, nor by the people

¹ www.whitehouse.gov Speeches and remarks of President Obama. 10.09.2014

it subjugates. ISIL is a terrorist organization, pure and simple. And it has no vision other than the slaughter of all who stand in its way.

In a region that has known so much bloodshed, these terrorists are unique in their brutality. They execute captured prisoners. They kill children. They enslave, rape, and force women into marriage. They threatened a religious minority with genocide. And in acts of barbarism, they took the lives of two American journalists - - Jim Foley and Steven Sotloff.

So ISIL poses a threat to the people of Iraq and Syria, and the broader Middle East -- including American citizens, personnel and facilities. If left unchecked, these terrorists could pose a growing threat beyond that region, including to the United States. While we have not yet detected specific plotting against our homeland, ISIL leaders have threatened America and our allies. Our Intelligence Community believes that thousands of foreigners -- including Europeans and some Americans -- have joined them in Syria and Iraq. Trained and battle-hardened, these fighters could try to return to their home countries and carry out deadly attacks.

I know many Americans are concerned about these threats. Tonight, I want you to know that the United States of America is meeting them with strength and resolve. Last month, I ordered our military to take targeted action against ISIL to stop its advances. Since then, we've conducted more than 150 successful airstrikes in Iraq. These strikes have protected American personnel and facilities, killed ISIL fighters, destroyed weapons, and given space for Iraqi and Kurdish forces to reclaim key territory. These strikes have also helped save the lives of thousands of innocent men, women and children.

But this is not our fight alone. American power can make a decisive difference, but we cannot do for Iraqis what they must do for themselves, nor can we take the place of Arab partners in securing their region. And that's why I've insisted that additional U.S. action depended upon Iraqis forming an inclusive government, which they have now done in recent days. So tonight, with a new Iraqi government in place, and following consultations with allies abroad and Congress at home, I can announce that America will lead a broad coalition to roll back this terrorist threat.

Our objective is clear: We will degrade, and ultimately destroy, ISIL through a comprehensive and sustained counterterrorism strategy.

First, we will conduct a systematic campaign of airstrikes against these terrorists. Working with the Iraqi government, we will expand our efforts beyond protecting our own people and humanitarian missions, so that we're hitting ISIL targets as Iraqi forces go on offense. Moreover, I have made it clear that we will hunt down terrorists who threaten our country, wherever they are. That means I will not hesitate to take action against ISIL in Syria, as well as Iraq. This is a core principle of my presidency: If you threaten America, you will find no safe haven.

Second, we will increase our support to forces fighting these terrorists on the ground. In June, I deployed several hundred American service members to Iraq to assess how we can best support Iraqi security forces. Now that those teams have completed their work -- and Iraq has formed a government -- we will send an additional 475 service members to Iraq. As I have said before, these American forces will not have a combat mission -- we will not get dragged into another ground war in Iraq. But they are needed to support Iraqi and Kurdish forces with training, intelligence and equipment. We'll also support Iraq's efforts to stand up National Guard Units to help Sunni communities secure their own freedom from ISIL's control.

Across the border, in Syria, we have ramped up our military assistance to the Syrian opposition. Tonight, I call on Congress again to give us additional authorities and resources to train and equip these fighters. In the fight against ISIL, we cannot rely on an Assad regime that terrorizes its own people -- a regime that will never regain the legitimacy it has lost. Instead, we must strengthen the opposition as the best counterweight to extremists like ISIL, while pursuing the political solution necessary to solve Syria's crisis once and for all.

Third, we will continue to draw on our substantial counterterrorism capabilities to prevent ISIL attacks. Working with our partners, we will redouble our efforts to cut off its funding; improve our intelligence; strengthen our defenses; counter its warped ideology; and stem the flow of foreign fighters into and out of the Middle East. And in two weeks, I will chair a meeting of the U.N. Security Council to further mobilize the international community around this effort.

Fourth, we will continue to provide humanitarian assistance to innocent civilians who have been displaced by this terrorist organization. This includes Sunni

and Shia Muslims who are at grave risk, as well as tens of thousands of Christians and other religious minorities. We cannot allow these communities to be driven from their ancient homelands.

So this is our strategy. And in each of these four parts of our strategy, America will be joined by a broad coalition of partners. Already, allies are flying planes with us over Iraq; sending arms and assistance to Iraqi security forces and the Syrian opposition; sharing intelligence; and providing billions of dollars in humanitarian aid. Secretary Kerry was in Iraq today meeting with the new government and supporting their efforts to promote unity. And in the coming days he will travel across the Middle East and Europe to enlist more partners in this fight, especially Arab nations who can help mobilize Sunni communities in Iraq and Syria, to drive these terrorists from their lands. This is American leadership at its best: We stand with people who fight for their own freedom, and we rally other nations on behalf of our common security and common humanity.

My administration has also secured bipartisan support for this approach here at home. I have the authority to address the threat from ISIL, but I believe we are strongest as a nation when the President and Congress work together. So I welcome congressional support for this effort in order to show the world that Americans are united in confronting this danger.

Now, it will take time to eradicate a cancer like ISIL. And any time we take military action, there are risks involved — especially to the servicemen and women who carry out these missions. But I want the American people to understand how this effort will be different from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. It will not involve American combat troops fighting on foreign soil. This counterterrorism campaign will be waged through a steady, relentless effort to take out ISIL wherever they exist, using our air power and our support for partner forces on the ground. This strategy of taking out terrorists who threaten us, while supporting partners on the front lines, is one that we have successfully pursued in Yemen and Somalia for years. And it is consistent with the approach I outlined earlier this year: to use force against anyone who threatens America's core interests, but to mobilize partners wherever possible to address broader challenges to international order.

My fellow Americans, we live in a time of great change. Tomorrow marks 13 years since our country was attacked. Next week marks six years since our economy suffered its worst setback since the Great Depression. Yet despite these shocks, through the pain we have felt and the grueling work required to bounce back, America is better positioned today to seize the future than any other nation on Earth.

Our technology companies and universities are unmatched. Our manufacturing and auto industries are thriving. Energy independence is closer than it's been in decades. For all the work that remains, our businesses are in the longest uninterrupted stretch of job creation in our history. Despite all the divisions and discord within our democracy, I see the grit and determination and common goodness of the American people every single day -- and that makes me more confident than ever about our country's future.

Abroad, American leadership is the one constant in an uncertain world. It is America that has the capacity and the will to mobilize the world against terrorists. It is America that has rallied the world against Russian aggression, and in support of the Ukrainian peoples' right to determine their own destiny. It is America -- our scientists, our doctors, our know-how -- that can help contain and cure the outbreak of Ebola. It is America that helped remove and destroy Syria's declared chemical weapons so that they can't pose a threat to the Syrian people or the world again. And it is America that is helping Muslim communities around the world not just in the fight against terrorism, but in the fight for opportunity, and tolerance, and a more hopeful future.

America, our endless blessings bestow an enduring burden. But as Americans, we welcome our responsibility to lead. From Europe to Asia, from the far reaches of Africa to war-torn capitals of the Middle East, we stand for freedom, for justice, for dignity. These are values that have guided our nation since its founding.

Tonight, I ask for your support in carrying that leadership forward. I do so as a Commander-in-Chief who could not be prouder of our men and women in uniform -- pilots who bravely fly in the face of danger above the Middle East, and service members who support our partners on the ground.

When we helped prevent the massacre of civilians trapped on a distant mountain, here's what one of them said: "We owe our American friends our lives.

Our children will always remember that there was someone who felt our struggle and made a long journey to protect innocent people.”

That is the difference we make in the world. And our own safety, our own security, depends upon our willingness to do what it takes to defend this nation and uphold the values that we stand for — timeless ideals that will endure long after those who offer only hate and destruction have been vanquished from the Earth.

May God bless our troops, and may God bless the United States of America.”

Analysis of the U.S. President’s statement

In the introduction of this speech we see immediately the almost conversational tone that President Obama used with American citizens. In fact, Obama speaks to people calling them “fellow”, his companions in the common struggle in support of their friends and allies. Then, from the first words we understand which are the two main subjects: the American President with his citizens on the one hand, and on the other the terrorist group ISIL.

In the first paragraph, it is clear that the President, with his positive words, is trying to reassure readers, in fact what he does is to list all the successes of American forces in the fight against terrorism. He concludes the paragraph with a statement, saying that America is safe, thanks to these counterterrorism programs.

In the second paragraph it seems that Obama wants to prepare readers to accept his upcoming statements. In fact, he lists the conditions for which it is still necessary to fight against terrorism. He uses the example, of great impact for Americans, of 11th September, to make alive the threat. To emphasize the negative characteristics attributed to terrorist groups, he repeats several times the words “threat”, “terrorist”, “evil”. Then the other actors are no longer under intended, but he says first the origin of the major terrorist groups, naming the ISIL (or ISIS).

Then, he makes two statements that contrast in a strong way the fundamentals of ISIS, and his goal is clear: to discredit the terrorist group and show it in this way also to Americans. In fact, Obama says that ISIS is not “Islamic” because no religion can lead to mass killings. However, on the contrary, ISIS claims to act in the name of religion. Then Obama says that ISIS is not a State, as it defines itself, despite the conquests of territories, and moreover is nor recognized as a state by any

Government. Obama continues doing strong accusation that leaves no alternatives: ISIS is only a terrorist organization and its only goal is the annihilation of all people on its way. It is clear that this is a direct message to the terrorist group, a statement in strong contrast with the principles of ISIS, of loyalty to the religion and to the Islamic values.

In the next paragraph the President lists several claims, characterized by short sentences and divided from one another. This method is used to make each statement more effective and to highlight the quantity and seriousness of the crimes committed by the terrorist group. Also he puts in one hand the evil, namely ISIS, and on the other Iraq, saying that they have known so many bloodshed, and America that due to the terrorism, lost two American journalists, killed by ISIS. In this way, President Obama wants to create a sense of anger and revenge for Americans and American allies.

Then, he makes a statement to alarm and warn Americans. He says that ISIS is a threat not only to Iraq and Syria but also for American citizens, also saying that some Europeans and Americans are now their allies. These words seem almost looking for an excuse to attack by U.S. military forces. It is a way to find support from the Americans, which are facing a real threat against them.

Then, Obama doesn't use more the pronoun "we", but he speaks directly to Americans firsthand. This change is used to show the President closer to the people and their problems, and also to reassure them. This message serves also to mitigate the effect of the subsequent statements, which describe the American military actions. First were listed all the brutal actions committed by ISIS, here are listed the actions committed by the Americans, but these are all positive terms, in sense that military actions were made to save many lives.

With the next statements, Obama says that they don't fight this war alone, but together with the new Government in Iraq and allies abroad. Obama, using the pronoun "I", seems to appeal to these subjects for collaboration.

The second part of the article begins with a clear message of American goal: to destroy ISIL. The use of the future "will" express certainty, proximity of the action, so is a definite plan to follow, almost a threat against their enemies.

Then he lists the four points of the American program. This is done both to make citizens aware of American politics, but also as a warning to terrorist groups.

First of all, still using the future “will”, he underlines the willingness to continue air strikes against terrorists and then he repeats that the U.S. forces will stop all the threats to America, anywhere they are. Here America wants to make it clear that they will not attack just in Iraq but anywhere they need. Concluding the first point, President Obama uses a way of saying to explain, without telling explicitly that they will have no mercy for nobody if threatened. The goal of this statement was to have the effect of a warning or a threat.

The second step of the American program describes the aid that America will continue to give to Iraq. Obama in these sentences, repeated several times the word “support” to convince Americans that this will not be a war for U.S. but only a support to the allies. To strengthen the claims just made, the President gives other reasons to fight ISIS, reinforcing the determination in the American people. He says they must act in this way and strengthen the opposition in Syria and Iraq, to fight against regimes that terrorize their own people.

In the third point Obama makes an appeal to the international community to stop the flow of terrorists. Also here is made a long list of actions to take, in order to reassure American citizens on ongoing projects.

The President concluded by reinforcing its program, saying that it is supported by many partners which are already operating in these territories. He also reinforces its goals saying that they will look for other allies, especially among the Arab Nations.

The next sentence is meant to conclude by giving a positive image of U.S. , in fact he says that Americans stay only with those who are fighting for their freedom, having as objective the common security.

Then the President uses a metaphor which compares the ISIL to cancer. He uses this metaphor to explain the gravity of this threat and to say that it will take time to delete it.

In this section he repeats the concept for which it will not be a war like the one in Afghanistan, but there will be only airstrikes and aid for the allies. With these words, he wants to reassure Americans about this program, by strengthening the claims saying that this program has already been successful in other situations. In fact, this

method is often used by heads of Government: using examples of past successes to get approval to undertake some action.

In the last paragraphs President Obama draws attention of Americans referring directly to them. In these sentences the President lists the economic and political successes and development of the United States, saying that it is also thanks to the determination and cooperation of citizens that America has faced several obstacles and became what it is now.

He continues listing the various international successes, describing in the end also what the U.S. is doing to the Muslim population, giving not only help against terrorism but also the possibility for a better future.

The purpose of these statements is to create a common mentality, a joint effort to combat terrorism.

All the positive adjectives that describe the United States serve to transmit safety in American projects so that they are shared from everybody. For this reason he finishes with a message that explain that it is in the nature of being American to fight for freedom, justice and dignity. He conveys this message almost as a national duty, saying that these are values that have always led the United States.

To raise even more people and to get help in the fight against terrorism, Obama referred the words spoken by a civilian of the Middle East, who says that they owe their lives to the Americans, and that their children will remember them forever.

Obama concluded the article by saying that this is the difference between them and other actors. These messages and testimonies, if are true, are an effective tool that touching the feelings and values of people, lead them to believe in American projects and objectives, something that Obama was trying to obtain with this article.

3.2 Statement made by the President of the European Parliament

“Schulz on the situation in Iraq”²

Brussels -

11-08-2014

Commenting on the latest developments in Iraq, the President of the European Parliament Martin Schulz stated:

“On behalf of the European Parliament, I firmly condemn the terror and violence spread by the Islamic State (IS) across Iraq and the Middle East, which has claimed so many innocent lives, including women and children.

I commend the international efforts aimed at giving shelter to the people fleeing IS violence, offering humanitarian relief and avoiding genocide, and further loss of lives. The European Union and its Member States must resolutely support all efforts which provide support and humanitarian aid to the affected people and suffocate the jihadi networks which pose a global threat.

Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi has created a system of terror targeting religious and cultural minorities, which knows no justice and no mercy. It must be stopped.

All the moderate forces within Iraq and the international community must coalesce, setting aside their divisions, to stop IS’ deadly plan, reconcile Iraqis and put an end to the spiral of terror and the erosion of the Iraqi state.

I support the efforts of the Iraqi President Fuad Masum to create an inclusive government for all the Iraqi citizens. In this crucial phase for the future of Iraq, the interest of the country and of its citizens cannot be trumped by personal interests: inclusiveness must be the guiding principle to reverse the polarization of the country on which IS has thrived.

The EU neighbourhood is on all sides under the strain of terrorists and extremists who through death and violence aim to subjugate people, redraw maps and suffocate democratic transition. More than ever the EU needs a strong common

² www.europarl.europa.eu Martin Schulz 11/08/2014

foreign policy to help those espousing democracy in these countries, and increase security, stability and prosperity.”

Analysis of Schulz’s statement

First of all, what we notice in this article is the use of the first person singular “I” instead of “We” as is commonly seen in international communications.

We can understand the reason of this from the first paragraph: in fact Schulz announced that he will speak on behalf of the European Parliament. This happens when the subject has the power to be able to speak in a subjective way even if his thinking is attributable to a larger group of subjects.

In the first paragraph, the introduction of the article, Schulz expresses clearly the condemnation of ISIS. The adverb “firmly” characterizes the decisiveness with which the President declared, on behalf of the European Parliament, to condemn the ISIS.

It is also underlined the blame for killing many innocent people, giving more prominence to the fact that they also killed women and children. This point is stressed because women and children usually are not part of the military forces and are considered as weaker, so pointing out that they were unjustly killed , definitely increases the gravity of the situation.

Then, the President continues making recommendations to the international community. In fact, the main subjects used in the article are three: Schulz and the European Parliament, the European Union and the terrorist movement. Obviously, the European Union is characterized by positive adjectives denoting help and collaboration, while ISIS is described with strong, violent and negative terms.

This is a common way to differentiate what is good from what is not, to achieve the objectives of the statement, in this case to create awareness and cooperation against terrorism.

In the recommendations to the European Union, it’s used another adverb denoting the status of decisiveness and firmness in combating the ISIS. In this case is used the term “resolutely” to leave no choice than to help and give support to populations subject to terrorism.

Schulz then uses the modal verb “must” to give to the phrase a sense of urgency, an order to take action as soon as possible. In this way he orders to stop the system of terror against minorities.

In the following paragraph he continues in a similar way, with the sense of urgency and order. In fact it is used the same modal verb towards Iraq and the international community. In this way, he explained that he wants five things from them : to work together, to leave aside their divisions, to stop the ISIS, to bring together Iraqis and to stop terror in the territory.

Then the President declared openly to support the program of Iraqi President, so not only condemns ISIS but also takes a clear position about that. We perceive this decisiveness by the use of the first person and the use of the present simple. Schulz then goes on to say what they can and what they cannot do. He uses the term “cannot” saying that the interest of Iraq cannot be trumped by personal interests. And then he uses again the modal verb “must” saying that inclusiveness should be the guiding principle.

3.3 Interview to Bachar al-Assad and the conclusion of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on Syria ³

BACHAR AL-ASSAD : Bashar al-Assad is the President of Syria since 2000, when he took his father’s place. He was elected by the people because he promised to bring big changes in Syria: he promised to eliminate government corruption and to develop the country like other States.

In 2000 Syria was experiencing a period of severe recession, and already during the first year of the Presidency, the promised reforms were not applied. It seemed that Bashar was continuing the policy of his father. In fact he continued the military occupation of Lebanon and the tensions with Turkey. After Syria was accused of murdering the Prime Minister of Lebanon, the international community

³ www.diplomatie.gouv.fr Interview of Bachar al-Assad to the BBC 09/02/2015 and to the France 2 TV 20/04/2015

forced Bashar to withdraw troops. Since then, all the relationships between Syria and many Arab States ended.

Bashar's policy was characterized by suppression of dissent, by limits on exit and entry of people into the country, were blocked social media and internet sites. Were also brought some testimonies under which regime opponents were tortured and killed.

In 2011 people began the protests calling for political reforms, civil rights and the end of the state of emergency. These requests were blocked with violence. Arab League observers, having suspended Syria, claimed that thousands of civilians were killed by the regime. Anyway, the President Bashar continues his policy, despite condemnation from several international actors who are reflecting on how to act against al-Assad.

INDEPENDENT INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY ON SYRIA:

The Independent International Commission was established in 2011 by the Human Rights Council with a mandate to investigate violations of human rights law and to investigate on crimes committed and to discover who is responsible for these crimes. But the Syrian Government has not allowed the Commission to carry out investigations within the country. For this reason the investigations are based on interviews, witnesses and victims.

“« Fact-checking » of Bachar al-Assad's assertions with the conclusions of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on Syria (April 2015)

1) About the peaceful origin of the conflict in 2011

What B. al-Assad says:“We took the decision to fight terrorism from the very beginning (...). Some still talk about that period as “peaceful-demonstration period” and I will tell you that during the first few weeks, many policemen were killed, shot dead. (...) From the very beginning, the demonstrations weren't peaceful” (BBC). “Actually, since the first few weeks of the conflict, the terrorists infiltrated the situation in Syria with the support of Western countries and regional countries, and they started attacking the civilians and destroying public places, public properties

and private properties, and that's documented on the internet, by them, not by us. ” (France2).

What the CoI says: As protests erupted in Dara'a city in March 2011, government forces opened fire on demonstrators. The situation has degenerated from legitimate popular aspirations into a conflagration of an unparalleled scale and magnitude (§134). The murder and torture of civilian residents and captured armed individuals formed part of the earliest ground attacks. By 2012, as the country moved towards civil war, government forces had committed a number of mass killings of civilians during ground assaults (§ 6 to 8). Since the start of the unrest in Syria in March 2011, Government forces, notably agents of its security and intelligence agencies, have tortured and ill-treated men, women and children in their custody (Annex II, §129).

2) Crimes against civilians and accountability of their perpetrators

What B. al-Assad says:“Some mistakes were committed towards some civilians, that happened from time to time, and some people were punished for these mistakes” (BBC).

What the CoI says:

► The Commission has collected numerous accounts of torture and deaths in custody in government prisons across Syria occurring between March 2011 and January 2015, supporting its finding of the crime against humanity of torture and murder. The widespread and systematic use of torture was documented in multiple facilities in Damascus (...).The collected information indicates the existence of a State policy implemented across governorates (§73).

► The Government has continued to perpetrate torture and other forms of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment as part of a widespread and systematic attack directed against a civilian population, indicating the existence of a State policy. The Government has therefore, as previously found, committed torture

and other inhumane acts as crimes against humanity. This conduct is also prosecutable as the war crimes of torture and inhuman treatment. (Annex II, §155).

▶ Government forces perpetrated massacres and unlawful killings as part of a widespread attack directed against the civilian population. (.). The coordination and active participation of Government institutions indicated that the attacks were conducted as a matter of institutional policy. The massacres and unlawful killings formed part of those attacks and constitute crimes against humanity. Government forces also committed the war crime of murder. The massacres and unlawful killings formed part of those attacks and constitute crimes against humanity. Government forces also committed the war crime of murder. (Annex II, §57- 58).

▶ The Syrian authorities have demonstrated their unwillingness to bring perpetrators to justice (§138) and continue to commit these crimes with impunity. Members of intelligence agencies and their military and civilian superiors failing to prevent and punish these crimes can be held individually criminally liable for the conduct described above. (Annex II, §157).

▶ As part of this widespread attack on the civilian population, government forces have perpetrated murder, torture, rape and acts of enforced disappearance. (§48-49). Civilians have been deliberately targeted and killed by Government forces during military attacks. Indiscriminate and disproportionate attacks by Government forces have also contributed significantly to civilian casualties. (Annex II, §47).

▶ Government forces continue to disregard their international legal obligations to refrain from attacking cultural objects and sites and to not use them for military purposes. In continuing to use the Aleppo Citadel, a World Heritage site, as a military base to bombard the Old City of Aleppo, the Government has endangered the site and disregarded Security Council Resolution 2139, adopted on 22 February 2014 (Annex II, §256).

3) About the international character of the conflict

What B. al-Assad says :“(...) For us, it’s about being independent, to work for our interest, to work for the common interest of others, but we’ll never be puppets who work against our interests for their interests. (..) We didn’t start this conflict with the others. They started, they supported terrorists, they gave them the umbrella (...)”. (BBC)

What the CoI says: Throughout the duration of the violence in the Syrian Arab Republic, government forces have relied on paramilitary groups and militias; initially the *shabbiha*, and now the National Defence Force. It has benefited from the intervention of foreign fighters, including Hizbullah and Iraqi Shia militias. (§16)

4) About the roots of extremism and violence along religious lines

What B. al-Assad says: What they called- the so-called moderate opposition, was a fantasy. (...) Even in the Western media outlets, they are talking about the ISIS, and al-Nusra, and Al Qaeda affiliates, organizations and groups prevailing. It doesn’t happen suddenly. It’s illogical, unrealistic to suddenly shift from moderate to extremist. They have the same grassroots. (BBC)

What the CoI says: Whether subjected to violations by government forces or ISIS, the evidence collected indicates that Sunni Muslim men are disproportionately overrepresented among the victims in the Syrian conflict (§58). The circumstances of many of the arrests indicate that they were conducted on discriminatory grounds, such as the religious or geographic origin of persons. (Annex II, §106)

5) About Syrian forces using barrel bombs, dropped from helicopters

What B. al-Assad says: “I know about the army. They use bullets, missiles, and bombs. (..) There are no indiscriminate weapons. When you shoot, you aim, and when you aim, you aim at terrorists in order to protect civilians.(...) There are no barrel bombs.(..) We don’t have barrels.” (BBC) – “We never heard in our army of indiscriminate killing weapons (...)We have regular bombs, regular armaments. (...) In our army we only use regular bombs that could be targeted. So, we don’t have any

armament that could be shelled indiscriminately. (...) Why to kill indiscriminately? Why to kill the civilians? The war in Syria is about winning the hearts of the people; it's not about killing people." (France2)

What the CoI says:

▶ The Government's use of indiscriminate shelling and aerial bombardment has been informed by its use of a variety of weaponry. The Government began hostilities by employing artillery shells, mortars and rockets against restive and sometimes besieged areas. By mid 2012, the use of cluster munitions, thermobaric bombs and missiles was documented, often used against civilian objectives, such as schools and hospitals. The Government has also used incendiary weapons (§13).

▶ The use of barrel bombs in aerial campaigns against whole areas is in violation of international humanitarian law and in some cases, amounts to the war crime of targeting civilians. Government forces have systematically targeted civilians and civilian infrastructure, demonstrating the intent to kill, wound and maim. Targets have included markets, shops, hospitals, schools, and public spaces where civilians gather in large numbers (Annex II, §228).

6) About responsibilities of the attacks and the "legitimate" use of force.

What B. al-Assad says: "We've been attacked in Damascus and in Aleppo, we've been attacked by rebels, not vice versa. They've been attacking the Syrians with mortars, so you have to retaliate and defend your people". "Your question is about asking us to stop fulfilling our duty to defend our people against the terrorists? Of course [that's legitimate use of force]". (BBC)

What the CoI says:

▶ As protests erupted in Dara'a city in March 2011, government forces opened fire on demonstrators. As the protests spread across the country, they were met with a violent, often lethal response from the Government. (§6) ;

►The Government's aerial attacks, directed at civilians, are consistent with the Government forces' counterinsurgency strategy. Employed since 2012, the strategy includes creating conditions of life so unbearable that the civilian population living in armed-group-controlled areas displace, eroding possible bases of supporting for the groups. (§13 annex II on "Massacres").

7) About chemical attacks, in particular the use of chlorine gas by Syrian army helicopters

What B. al-Assad says: "No, definitely not. (...) Chlorine gas exists in any factory, in any house in Syria, in anywhere in the world. It's not a military material. (...) Second, if you want to use gas as a WMD, you have to talk about thousands or maybe tens of thousands of victims in a few hours. That didn't happen in Syria". (BBC) – "This is another fake narrative by the Western governments. Why? Because we have two factories of chlorine. One of them is closed for a few years now, it's not used anyway, and the other one is in the northern part in Syria, (...) it's on the Turkish border, it's under the control of the terrorists for two years (...). So, the chlorine in Syria is under the control of the rebels. This is first. Second, it's not a weapon of mass destruction. The regular armaments that we have are more influential than chlorine, so we don't need it anyway. (...) We didn't use it. We don't need to use it. We have our regular armaments, and we could achieve our goals without it. So, we don't use it. No, there's no proof." (France2)

What the CoI says: In April 2014, the Government dropped barrel bombs containing chemical agents, likely chlorine, on locations in Idlib and Hama governorates. The first attributed finding of use of chemical weapons by a warring party was noted, but did not spur greater action to end the conflict (§ 15).

8) About the "starve or surrender" military tactics of the Syrian Army.

What B. al-Assad says: "That's not correct for one reason, because in most of the areas where the rebels took over, the civilians fled and came to our areas, so in most of the areas that we encircle and attack are only militants". (BBC)

What the CoI says: The mainstays of government attacks on restive areas have remained static. They include (a) the encirclement of an area, including the setting up of checkpoints at all access points; (b) the imposition of a siege, including preventing the flow of food, medical supplies, and sometimes water and electricity, into the town or area; (c) the shelling and aerial bombardment of the besieged area; (d) the arrest, and often disappearance, of wounded persons attempting to leave the besieged area to seek medical treatment no longer available inside and of those attempting to break the siege, usually by smuggling in food and medical supplies. Victims have often described the Government's strategy as that of "tansheef al bakhar", or draining the sea to kill the fish. Over the past four years, the Government has implemented this strategy with relative consistency. The sieges imposed by the Government have become longer and, consequently, more harsh. (...) Residents of Yarmouk camp in Damascus city have been besieged since May 2013. Infants have died as a result the Government's "surrender or starve" siege strategy. (§ 10 and 11).

► The Government's aerial attacks, directed at civilians, are consistent with the Government forces' counterinsurgency strategy. Employed since 2012, the strategy includes creating conditions of life so unbearable that the civilian population living in armed-group-controlled areas displace, eroding possible bases of supporting for the groups. (§13 annex II on "Massacres").

9) About the shelling of schools by the Syrian regime

What B. al-Assad says: "No, definitely not (...). What is the aim of shelling schools, realistically? Why would a government shell a school? What do we gain from that? Again, it's different between having casualties during the war, because that's a war, and every war in the world has these side effects, and between aiming at schools. That's the big difference. There's no way to aim at schools". (BBC)

What the CoI says: Government forces attack schools in the context of their military operations. According to the United Nations Children's Fund, 160 children were killed in attacks on schools in 2014. Regular armed forces have also used schools for military purposes, depriving children of education and exposing educational facilities to attack. (§68).

10) About the killing of students and children

What B. al-Assad says:“Why do you want us to kill students and children? What do we get?” (BBC)

What the CoI says:

► Intelligence and security agencies have detained young children since 2011. Held in the same cells as adults, children are exposed to sexual violence and subjected to the same ill-treatment and torture as adult detainees. In detention, children have also witnessed violent torture and death. (§66)

► As the unrest developed into an armed conflict, government forces began to use children as part of coordinated military operations to locate armed group fighters prior to attack or act as informants, exposing them to retaliation and punishment. (§67);

► The presence of children was documented in Military Security Branch 235, known as the Palestine Branch, and in the Air Force Intelligence Branch in Mezzeh military airport (Damascus), detention facilities in which torture is systematically employed. (..). A 5-year-old child [has] been detained and tortured with his mother in several different Government detention facilities, including Branch 248 in Kafr Sousa (Annex II, §195).

The failure of the Syrian authorities to protect children from the effects of conflict has resulted in a devastating level of displacement of children. In targeting schools and failing to take precautions in attacks to minimize harm to children and schools has led to a significant loss of access to education among Syrian children, while indiscriminate attacks continue to maim and kill children on a massive scale. In detaining children and exposing them to ill-treatment and torture in detention facilities, Syrian authorities, including the military, security and intelligence agencies, have violated children’s human rights and the rules of international humanitarian law, amounting to war crimes. They have perpetrated crimes against humanity, entailing individual criminal responsibility for the direct perpetrators of

crimes and their authors at the highest levels of the chain of command, including the highest levels of Government. (Annex II, §196).”

Analysis of the interview to Bashar al-Assad

1)Regarding the conflict in 2011, al-Assad explains his point of view by dividing the discourse in two parts: one using the pronoun “we” and the other using “they”. In fact the two main subjects are Syria and terrorists.

Al-Assad here uses often the passive voice to point out that the victims are the Syrians, who were killed during the demonstrations.

Al-Assad continues to use the pronoun “they”, speaking not only about the terrorists but also about Western countries, giving them the blame for the destruction and casualties among civilians.

On the contrary, the Commission says exactly the opposite. Here the subject that makes the statement is a third party who then speaks objectively about the Syrian government and the Israeli civilians.

First of all, with the help of positive and negative adjectives, are compared the legitimate demands of the people and the torture and murder made by the Government. Then there are two subjects: Syria and its Government, as two different subjects. To emphasize a concept, is placed between commas; it was done to make clear who is responsible for the torture to men, women and children: security agents of Syria. This paradox is characterized by the phrase “men, women and children in their custody”.

2)Here al-Assad does not use more the subject used before, but rather he uses the indefinite pronoun “some” to justify himself, saying that “some” people were punished.

He uses “some” also as an adjective as if would not define what crimes he’s talking about, and how many civilians have been affected. So this is the desire to remain vague and superficial talking about responsibility of the crimes. Instead, the Commission responds by bringing clear examples which are based on research. In fact, it considers them crimes against humanity, characterized by continuous and widespread use of torture, adjectives which are in contrast with “some” used by Assad.

In the next statements, the Commission lists all crimes committed. It is repeated many times the subject “government” at the beginning of every sentence, to emphasize its responsibility. The Commission, by listing all the crimes committed and the prerequisites to be considered a crime against humanity, cancels what said by Assad. From here we can see the importance of language in diplomatic communications: the words and the testimonies help to convince readers.

The Commission concludes by confirming what al-Assad has said: Syria doesn't want to condemn the perpetrators of the crimes and indeed continues to make them.

3)Al-Assad wants to confirm the division between “them” and “others” and he does so with the help of possessive pronouns “our” and “their”. The phrase “we'll never be puppets” serves to make it clear that Syria is independent and acts by itself, unlike other acting with terrorists.

The commission's response discredits again what al-Assad said, statement based on real examples.

4)Al-Assad using the pronoun “they” is trying to convince that Syria does not use barrel bombs, leaving some subjects that somebody else use them. Moreover, despite the evidence that testify the contrary, al-Assad uses positive terms to describe its policy: he says that they are aimed at a specific target which are terrorist.

5)Regarding the issue of barrel bombs, al-Assad uses vague and non linear language that doesn't give a clear idea of what is his message. To do this he moves from the first singular person “I” to “they” without following a logical thread. In addition, to confirm what he said, he poses a question in which he asks why we should kill indiscriminately. Asking a question rather than making a statement is to show the alienation towards the situation.

Also in this case the Commission gives examples and testimonials by creating short sentences which don't allow alternative ideas.

6)In this case al-Assad makes statements in a passive mode, in order to show Syria as a victim of the attacks. He also uses the pronoun “they” without specifying the subject, just to give the reason of self-defence. The commission instead describes the behaviour of the Syrian Government with adjectives like violent, lethal,

unbearable, writing between the commas that the objectives of the Syrian attacks were civilians, to emphasize the free choice made by the Syrian government.

In the last part of the interview the choice of communication made by both sides is confirmed. In fact we can see this for examples in the question regarding the destruction of schools by the Syrian regime, to which al-Assad responds in a vague way, or again by formulating questions that show the surprise and disbelief about these themes. While the Commission in this case affirms the contrary giving certain data and naming the source from which it draws these findings, so giving security and reliability to his statements, a goal that all the international communications would like to achieve.

CONCLUSIONS

Isaac Goldberg, an American journalist, author, critic, translator, editor and lecturer, affirmed:

“Diplomacy is to do and say the nastiest things in the nicest way”. In fact, from the analysis conducted in this thesis I was able to see some of the techniques used in international communication.

George W. Bush’s statement that “For diplomacy to be effective, words must be credible, and no one can doubt the word of America”, we can see that the power that he can have on the audience, through the right words, adjectives, pronouns and other grammatical elements.

Through this analysis, we understand what message is hidden behind the classic international communications, in this case as in many others. All of these techniques, such as the ones used by the U.S. President, are techniques that are learned by actors who have the power to do this kind of communication, who, following the words of George W. Bush, through the language can make the most negative elements as positive.

Moreover, the analysis of the other documents have shown how strong is the power of language. In fact, certain communications such as those made by European Parliament, are shown as certain, and this is done in order to manipulate the mind of people which not only relies on these statements which are demonstrated also by practical examples, but also relies on the actor who gives these communications.

For these reasons, at the end of this work I can say that what matters in international communication is not just the literal meaning, but there are many elements which influence the meaning and the objective of that discourse. The first element is the historical and social context, then the values, ideologies, the political objective, the international relations between the actors involved, the choice of words to use and how the concepts are explained.

Finally, what I would like to analyse or see analysed would be new research surveys to find out what would be the best way to use the language in areas such as those connected with ISIS. In detail, I think it would be really interesting to study different languages to use in various international negotiations and with different

cultures. That is, what are the best tactics to use to find a dialogue with a different culture, different political system and values.

Using discourse analysis for text analysis, is a tool of great importance, as it makes clear the hidden messages within the texts, and because it makes us understand the power of language: it is up to us to decide how to use it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brian Paltridge 2012. *Discourse Analysis*. Bloomsbury. London, New Delhi, New York, Sydney

James Paul Gee 2011. *How to do Discourse Analysis. A toolkit*. Routledge. Taylor and Francis Group. New York and London

James Paul Gee. 1999 *An introduction to Discourse Analysis. Theory and method*. Routledge

Adrian Beard 2000. *The language of Politics*. Routledge. New York and London

Claus Mueller 1973. *The politics of communication*. Oxford University Press. London, Oxford, New York

Meriel Bloor, Thomas Bloor 2013. *The practice of critical discourse analysis. An introduction*. Routledge

Gillian Brown, George Yule 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge University Press

Widdowson 2007. *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford University Press

Foucault 1972. *The Archeology of Knowledge*. London Routledge.

Loretta Napoleoni 2014. *Isis. Lo Stato del terrore*. Feltrinelli Editore

The Meir Amit Intelligence and Terrorism Information Center 2014. *Isis: Portrait of a jihadi terrorist organization*

Websites consulted:

<<http://www.thepostinternazionale.it/mondo/iraq/isis-iraq-vera-storia>>
<<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/the-origins-of-isis-finding-the-birthplace-of-jihad/>>
<<http://historyofislam.com/contents/the-modern-age/who-are-the-alavis/>>
<<http://www.thepostinternazionale.it/mondo/libia/>>
<<http://edition.cnn.com/2015/08/31/middleeast/palmyra-temple-damaged/>>
<<http://discourses.org/OldArticles/Principles%20of%20critical%20discourse%20analysis.pdf>>
<<http://www.state.gov/>>
<<http://www.esteri.it/mae/en/>>
<<http://www.nytimes.com/>>
<<http://www.bbc.com/news>>
<<http://www.mofa.gov.iq/en/>>
<<http://government.ru/en/>>
<<http://www.ilgiornale.it/news/mondo/libia-presidente-parlamento-isis-pericolo-litalia-gentiloni-1105985.html>>