

Terrorism in Newsweek: Unveiling the Connection between Language, Ideology, and Power

Bambang Trisno Adi*

Binawan School of Health Sciences, Jakarta, Indonesia

DOI: 10.22236/JER_Vol1Issue2pp166-179

The study analyzes the discourse on terrorism in the Newsweek magazine and exposes how the notion of ideology and power contributes to the hegemonic representations of Muslims and Islam in the post 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Centre (WTC). Two Newsweek articles appeared on the 24th September 2001 were selected. The study employed Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA); this is a five-stage analytical methodology that perceives language within a three-dimensional framework: text, discourse, and society. The representation of discourse on terrorism, as found in the analysis, supports a conception that media coverage is not merely the representation of facts but also that of ideas which has gone through various considerations incorporating the three key notions of text, discourse and society altogether. The elements within the textual level and discourse level were ideologically used to represent terrorism with regard to its actor, process, and goal, constituting a commonsense as to how it should be perceived. The study concluded that the representation of discourse on terrorism in Newsweek during the post 9/11 period was perceived from what Chomsky considers as the propagandistic approach.

Keywords: critical discourse analysis, terrorism, ideological functioning, media language, semiotics,

Penelitian ini menganalisa secara kritis diskursus tentang terorisme dalam majalah Newsweek dan mengungkap adanya pengaruh ideologi dan kekuasaan tertentu dalam membentuk gambaran diskriminatif terhadap Muslim dan Islam setelah serangan 11/9 di WTC. Dua artikel yang ada di Newsweek diteliti. Metode Fairclough dalam Analisa Diskursus Kritis (CDA), berupa lima tahapan analisa sebagai gabungan dari kerangka 3 dimensi (teks, diskursus dan masyarakat), digunakan untuk menghasilkan analisa yang mendalam. Penyajian diskursus terorisme dalam analisa tersebut membenarkan sebuah konsepsi bahwa pemberitaan media bukan hanya sekedar penyajian fakta-fakta, tapi juga penyebaran ide-ide yang telah dikemas dengan menggabungkan ketiga elemen penting tersebut, yaitu teks, diskursus dan masyarakat. Elemen-elemen dalam tataran teks dan diskursus dikemas dengan muatan ide-ide untuk menentukan konsepsi terorisme yang menyangkut tentang aktor, proses dan sasaran targetnya. Penelitian ini berkesimpulan bahwa penyajian diskursus terorisme dalam majalah Newsweek pasca peristiwa 9/11 menggunakan pendekatan sebagaimana yang disebut Chomsky sebagai pendekatan propaganda.

* Corresponding author. Email: bambang@binawan-ihs.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

The modern trend in linguistics perceives language as a social practice or “language as social semiotic” (Halliday, 1979). The trend attempts to observe its significance and function in social reality. It focuses on the function of language as a medium of social interaction, a medium used by people to function socially such as asking questions, making appointment, discussing a topic, writing a critical essay, etc. In other words, the focus is on the ‘performance’: how and what people do with language in their daily social interaction (Chomsky, 1975, 1997; Radford, 1997).

Language and society are perceived to have an “internal and dialectical relationship” (Fairclough, 1989, p. 5). The particular relationship between language and society can simply be understood by observing how and what people do with language to accomplish their social function. This conception of language as a social practice creates a term called ‘discourse.’ The methods of analyzing discourse have been developed, one of which is so-called a three-dimensional framework. It perceives language to involve three dimensional phenomena, i.e. a produced text intended for discursive events (discourse practice) such as interpretation, consumption, distribution, etc., within a general social practice.

In September 2001, America introduced a new discourse called ‘war on terrorism’ to wage a war on what so-called international network of terrorism as a response to the September 11 attack on the World Trade Centre (WTC) in New York. In this case, the word terrorism seemed to solely refer to Bin Laden’s Al-Qaeda, who was blamed as a mastermind of the attack. Based on this accusation, America and its allies bombed Afghanistan and destroyed the Taliban government which was considered for harboring terrorists. This was supported by Bush’s statement in Newsweek: “either you are with us or with terrorists.” (October 1, 2001, p. 6).

In the statement, the US power to determine the conception of terrorism and terrorists was unilaterally asserted. Thus the conception became simple but problematic because any other conception would be just considered as that of terrorists. The conception can also be inconsistently applied to include those similar means or actions of terror launched by the US government or its allies. Chomsky names this attitude ‘propagandistic approach,’ constructing and exploiting meanings for a particular term or concept such as terrorism or terrorist as a weapon to serve a particular system of power (George, 1991; Herman & Chomsky, 2002; Winston 2002). Herman (as cited in George, 1991) also argues that this attitude is in accordance with “the basic western model” of the discourse on terrorism that puts itself as a victim who has the right to respond it in any way possible (p. 43-44).

This study therefore attempts to analyze the discourse on terrorism published in the Newsweek magazine on September 24, 2001 and to find if the discourse helps maintain the hegemony and unequal relation of power. Four research questions are posed in the study: (1) Does the representation of discourse on terrorism in the magazine assert Fowler’s conception that media coverage is not a representation of facts but of ideas (Fowler, 1991)? (2) Are ideological functions for unequal relation of power utilized in representing discourse on terrorism? (3) Has commonsense, a particular dominant way, been established in representing

discourse on terrorism? and (4) Is the representation of discourse on terrorism perceived from what Chomsky considers as the propagandistic approach?

The study limits its sample to one international publication, the September 24, 2001 edition of Newsweek magazine, with specific reference to its two news articles appeared on that edition. There are some reasons why the magazine was chosen. In addition to its worldwide readership, Newsweek gives much attention on current and global issues, particularly political issues, in a way that stimulates readers' thinking about the analyses and perspectives it offers. In other words, it adds to its presentation of facts and events some ideological functions that construct its presentation as not mere facts and events but also as ideas and opinions. This particular way of fact presentation was applicable to its articles that covered the September 11 events. The articles, especially those in the September 24, 2001 edition, gave extensive coverage of the events, to the extent that the discourse on terrorism was a dominant issue. However, considering its limited sampling of two news articles, it may not suffice to offer great extent of generalization based on its future findings. In other words, its future findings with regard to the representation of discourse on terrorism may not be generalized to all editions of the magazine for the rest of the months in the year 2001, let alone to be considered as its typical representation of discourse on terrorism. However, it will give some ideas what sort of representation it has, at least, within September 2001. Therefore, a larger and more representative sample should be analyzed to arrive at some points that can be generalized to a larger extent. This might generate some ideas to further research in this topic.

METHOD

The study adopted Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) covering five stages (Fairclough & Chouliaraki 2001; Wetherell 2001). Stage one focused on a social problem having a semiotic aspect. Stage two identified obstacles to the social problem by analyzing the network of practices, the relationship of semiosis to other elements, and the discourse. Stage three considered whether the social order needs the problem. Stage four identified possible ways past the obstacles, with stage five doing critical reflection. The procedure in the data analysis followed, in a chronological way, those five steps.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

CDA of the First Article

The following is CDA of the first article, *A Nation United*, which appeared on September 24, 2001.

Stage one: Social problems in their semiotic aspects.

In this article there are problems both in the activities of a social practice, in the social practice per se, and in the representation of a social practice. The problem pertaining to particular social practices resides in exploiting the accumulated feelings of grief and anger by the Bush administration ("Grief and love, rage and vengefulness, pride and defiance – a volatile set of emotions was let loose in America last week": paragraph 10) to justify the potential launching

of a unilateral military response to the so-called terrorists behind the 9/11 attack and a nation which provides sanctuary for them (“The crusade to root out terrorists, and punish those who harbor them...”: paragraph 6).

Stage two: Identifying obstacles to the social problem(s) being tackled

A. Analysis of the network of practices where the problem is located

The obstacles of tackling the problems mentioned above can be observed within two levels of network in which they are situated; one is America as a society and the other as a government. These two levels are interrelated to one another and can interact in a way that the government might condition the society or vice versa. The two can also influence one another and together they can determine the social perceptions and constructs by which the whole nation of America conceives and projects the nature of its Self to others. In this case, the role of the media in which the voices of both government and society can find their platform is very significant.

B. Analysis of the relationship of semiosis to other elements within the particular practice(s) concerned

In the article, the representation of 9/11 events is focused on the aftermath period. In other words, it pays its utmost attention to describing the impacts on the Americans during post 9/11. It completely ignores – even the simplest observation or a mere allusion to – questions around how 9/11 happened chronologically and how it was possible given the networks of sophisticated measures the US has developed to anticipate similar events.

C. Analysis of the discourse

(i) Structural analysis: the order of discourse

The article generally represents the discourse of terrorism with specific reference to the impacts made by the 9/11 attack on the World Trade Centre and Pentagon. The genre employed in the article is mainly news report which includes recommendations to people and government of America. The discourse of terrorism in the news report genre and recommendations together constitute an order of discourse that emphasizes the superiority of America as a nation.

(ii) Interactional analysis includes both analysis of text and discourse

Analysis of the text:

In terms of text structure, the researcher observes that the article is divided into two main parts. One is about the description of the post 9/11 impacts on people both inside and outside America. The other is about the set of hypothetical assumptions on what will happen, especially for Americans, in the face of the 9/11 events.

The texts in the article consist of both simple and complex clauses which are linked together with linking words to facilitate cohesion among the clauses or without linking words – with mere meaningful interrelations among the clauses – to construct, at least, coherent representations. In the former, linking words, i.e. “and”, “and then”, “but”, “first”, are employed in some instances throughout the texts to create cohesive clauses and sentences. However, the

readers may discover that clauses, sentences or even paragraphs in the article are mostly tied together by virtue of their meaningful interrelations.

At the experiential level, many verbs used in the text are non-transactive, i.e. verbs that indicate an action restricted to one entity or actor; no passing movement from an actor to an affected person in the course of the action.

At the interpersonal level, all clauses in the article, except one which is a question cited from “The Star-Spangled Banner” at the beginning sentence of paragraph 1, are declarative (making statements, rather than asking questions for instance). This is of course very relevant to the major part of the article, especially the first part of it, which is about representation of people’s responses to the 9/11 attack.

At the textual level, some sentences – especially in the first part of the article – are reorganized with marked themes, i.e. their first constituents are not Subjects (S) as usual. For instance, those with circumstantial adjuncts of time and place as their first constituents can be seen throughout paragraph 1.

All week long, all across America and the world, the flag flew with pride and defiance. On trucks barreling down Los Angeles freeways. In the front yards and shop windows of the South and Midwest. Tiny ones on countless shirts and lapels. A huge one on the wall of the stricken Pentagon. At Buckingham Palace, an American flag was unfurled... (Paragraph 1).

“A Nation United”, as title of the article, is a marked phrase of something like America United. It can trigger readers’ attention to the Americans’ spirit of reunion as a nation in the post-9/11 events. It can let the readers venture into the logical implication of reunion. A reunion implies the previous condition of separation or breakaway, after being united, which could be sparked by internal problems of unresolved differences, political or economic, that can lead to lack of unity among the members. The ideological function of the title can be spotted as throughout the whole text it is transformed to commonly mean the “renewed spirit of togetherness”, despite the potential fact that it can imply internal problems faced by America and how the 9/11 event helped people put aside the problems and drown in the sorrow of its deep impacts and stand together under the banner of the Bush administration as well.

Analysis of the discourse:

Discussing the article’s grammatical dimension within the interpersonal level, the researcher finds out that most of its clauses are declarative, with very few exceptions of some interrogative ones. However, within the analysis of speech acts, the declarative clauses may not simply be those which just tell the readers about statements; and so are the interrogative clauses which may not simply ask for information.

While analyzing clauses combination, the researcher observes that most of clauses, sentences and, especially, paragraphs of the article are made interrelated to one another without the use of linking words such as *and*, *but*, *however*, etc. The absence of these linking words is strictly maintained between one paragraph and the other throughout the article. In spite of that

absence, the whole paragraphs still read and smoothly develop as one unit of discussion. In other words, they are coherent. They are interrelated with one another in such a way that the last sentences of a paragraph shed some lights on what will be a focus of the next paragraph.

The idea of intertextuality, how other texts – from inside or outside – are explicitly drawn upon in the article, can be perceived through discourse representations which may be direct (and thus marked) or indirect (unmarked). In the article, the direct discourse representations are very dominant, especially in the part where people's responses and stories about the post 9/11 are recorded. To use the direct discourse representation is very useful in that the idea of authenticity and fidelity to what is being represented is carefully fulfilled.

Analyzing the orders of discourse above, the current researcher has stated that, basically, the genre of news report is utilized in the article with an addition of some observations and recommendations offered for President Bush and all Americans. All of these contribute to what Fairclough (2000: 13) considers as the text's "hybridity", i.e. the mixture of some discourses, genres, styles and registers in the text.

Stage three: Does the social order need the problems?

The social order within which the article was constructed, and at the same time constructive of the society, has interest in the problems not being resolved. The 9/11 attacks were, in a way, just plausibly right in their timing for the Bush administration to regain people's support and launch its planned neoconservative foreign policies. The media, which is commercial in their orientation, facilitates the course of actions taken by the Bush administration. At the same time, the Americans, already so accustomed with Muslims' stereotypes as the Other in the mainstream media, expect the media to represent their defiance, anger and solidarity in the face of 9/11 attacks as well as somehow rather to infer the Muslims' stereotypes in the 9/11 coverage.

Stage four: Possible ways past the obstacles

The above analysis of the article uncovers problems in discourse representation of terrorism pertaining to what constitutes the acts of terror and who the terrorists are and how to deal with both terror and its perpetrators. The American government has interests to let the problems unresolved. Therefore, one of the ways to overcome this situation is none but to ensure that what is considered as 'structural limitations' created by the Bush administration do not play an upper hand on the process of text production, distribution and interpretation in American media industry. This way is quite ideal – and radical in its approach – as it concerns with the very root of the problems, i.e. the socio-structural control over the media.

Moreover, there should be a gradual and on-going process of unraveling the shackle of the US hegemonic tendencies while dealing with rest of the world, especially with the Muslim nations and their social backgrounds. In other words, this includes in it another way of problem solving which is the need for a constructive break from the typical routine of demonizing Muslims and Islam in the media and academic circles (Ahmed, 1992; Poole, 2002; Silberstain, 2002).

Stage five: Reflection of the analysis

The foregoing critical discourse analysis of the article, *A Nation United*, helps bridge the gaps

between the extremely textual and contextual approaches to reading the text. In other words, it combines the two approaches, perceiving the texts as products of discourse practices (the text production, distribution and interpretation) within a larger scope of social practices (the network of social order). As an attempt to provide an explanatory critique of the discourse on terrorism in the article, the analysis may give some insights, based on the available textual and discourse properties, into the problems of discourse representations and the ways out of the problems. In identifying the problem solution, the researcher emphasizes the role of the US in the worldwide leadership. The question is for the US as a global leader whether it will sincerely act as a partner and a guide for other nations, or simply throw its weight to assert its hegemony and imperialism over other nations (Ahmed, 2003; Huntington, 2003).

CDA of the Second Article

The following is CDA of the second article, *Bush: 'We're at War'*, which is the first to appear together with the other seven articles classified under the theme of 'fighting back' in the September 24, 2001 edition of Newsweek.

Stage one: Social problems in their semiotic aspects.

In the article, there is a problem with regard to representing the post 9/11 events as there is the absence of significantly critical account being made for the pre-9/11 events. The critical account would be the inquiry into how the 9/11 attacks could have happened, given the fact that the US has developed the thoroughly thoughtful security measures called Standard Operation Procedures (SOP) to anticipate various potential modes of hijacking or the fact that the Bush administration had failed to respond to previously given warnings by the US intelligence agencies (CIA and FBI) about potential terrorist attacks in the American soil. The two issues, which center upon the failure of the Bush administration to anticipate and respond to the 9/11 attackers, are sketchily referred to in the article.

Stage two: Identifying obstacles to the social problem(s) being tackled

A. Analysis of the network of practices where the problem is located

The problem discussed above can be conceived within the network of practices, including the neo-conservatism and its Project for the New American Century (PNAC), which highly influences the course of US foreign policies under the Bush administration as well as the latter's geo-political interests, especially with regard to oil businesses. This network of practices together inspired the Bush administration to easily resort to military actions – carpet bombings – as in Afghanistan later. Under the Bush administration, America wants to reassert its military supremacy as the sole superpower so that nobody would dare challenge its dominant global leadership to further secure its geopolitical interests.

B. Analysis of the relationship of semiosis to other elements within the particular practice(s) concerned

Unlike the first article, in the present article, there is a representation of what happened on

September 11, 2001, though the representation is not chronologically clear. The unclear and nonlinear – scattered in some different paragraphs – representation thus misses, intentionally or not, some important and critical reports such as what actually Bush’s presidential activities were at the time when the 9/11 attacks happened and whether or not Bush had received briefings about some terrorist threats on American soil in the morning when he was about to start his activities, etc. But still, except for statements saying that the “Congress will no doubt hold hearings to assign the fault for a massive failure of intelligence” (paragraph 6), within the pre-9/11 events, there is no, curiously, investigative representation of how, for instance, some suspected terrorists, including Muhammad Atta himself, could easily find their sanctuary in America and even get trained for piloting in one of Florida’s flight schools without any risk of close monitoring by the concerned intelligence agencies.

C. Analysis of the discourse

(i) Structural analysis: The order of discourse

The genre employed in the article is still within the boundary of news reporting. However, some modifications have been made as to how the so-called facts about the 9/11 events are presented. In other words, there is a question of modified stylistics in the representation of 9/11 in the article. The modification apparently puts overemphasis on the point about al-Qaeda and its operatives which should have been dealt concisely instead. The overemphasis has something to do with the stylistics which has been carefully modified throughout the article to build the rhetoric of war. The genre of news report and its particular stylistics in representing the discourse of terrorism constitute an order of discourse that crafts the rhetoric of war and quickly dominates the public discourse in America and the whole world in the post 9/11 events.

(ii) Interactional analysis includes both analysis of text and discourse

Analysis of the text:

Basically, the present researcher observes that there are four main parts of the article, i.e. (1) the apologetic question of how 9/11 could have happened (paragraphs 1-4), (2) the declaration of war on terror (paragraphs 5-6), (3) the focus on al-Qaeda, Muhammad Atta and his fellow accomplices (paragraphs 7-22) and (4) actions to avoid future attacks (paragraphs 23-24).

The researcher considers part one which touches upon the question of how 9/11 could have happened as central and fundamental that any objective reporting of the 9/11 events cannot afford to ignore. However, the way some paragraphs related to that issue is reorganized, rather than critically dissecting the issue to know the very answers to that question, seems to draw readers’ attention to the ‘dazed reaction’ and helplessness of the US authorities in the face of the 9/11 attacks. It seems even to manufacture the readers’ consent to, and thus their taking for granted, the so-unbelievably ‘evil genius’ portrait of its perpetrators. In fact, it is towards the focus on this evil genius that the whole article is directed. In other words, it is not really concerned with providing the very answers to the above question.

The clauses featured in the article are both simple and complex. The linking words, such as “and”, “and then”, “but”, etc., are used to provide links between the clauses. However,

very often, especially between one paragraph and the other, the linking words are not used but the connection is obvious, and still they read as interrelated to one another. In addition, having thoroughly read the article, one may observe that the complex sentences – at least those which have main and subordinate clauses – outnumber the simple ones.

At the experiential level, since the researcher found at least four main points in the article, the choice of using either transactive or non-transactive verbs could vary according to a particular point under consideration. However, as the following table shows, generally speaking, throughout the first six paragraphs, we find that the non-transactive verbs have more occurrences (71) than the transactive ones do (51). Even on the paragraph by paragraph basis, the first three paragraphs, excluding paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 that reflect more or less the same distribution, show that the non-transactive verbs (9, 13, 13) are even used almost twice as many as the transactive ones (5, 5, 9). So far as the description of events on the very day of the 9/11 is concerned, the dominant use of non-transactive verbs is consistent with some FAA top officials' 'dazed reaction' to the 9/11 attacks; the reaction that basically, except for few, does not need for passing any action from an actor to the affected. In the article, the dazed reaction that also underlines the war rhetoric of the Bush administration brings a particular direction for the 9/11 representation.

At the interpersonal level, the sentences are basically declarative with few imperatives and interrogatives. All these available three types of sentences are employed in the article in such a way that supports the dominant scenario described with regard to the 9/11, i.e. the US officials' disbelief that the 9/11 could have happened, the chaotic aftermath and the focus on the external factors, rather than the internal ones, demonizing the potential enemies of the United States.

With regard to the time references used in the article, the absolute tense of the past is very dominant as it generally concerns with the description the 9/11 episode which has already happened. However, some instances of future tense are also available as in "Congress will no doubt hold hearings..." (paragraph 6) and "The blame game will go on" (paragraph 7). Some instances of present time expressions are also available as the article refers to an event or information about something that is considered as a fact in the present and perhaps still prevails in the future.

At the textual level, the marked and unmarked themes are both evenly used in the article. However, due to its novelty that can grab the readers' attention, the marked theme is often used to direct their minds into the main scenario introduced in the article with regard to the representation of 9/11, i.e. the US officials' disbelief that it could have happened – the disbelief of which lets them resort to the 'dazed reaction' and the helplessness in the face of it. The first six sentences in paragraph one may illustrate this directed representation.

As regards words, the article is titled *Bush: 'We're at war'*, referring to Bush's remarks once he declared what is later known as the war on terrorism. The use of the word *war* to reflect 'great efforts made to deal with or end' terrorism has its immediate problem as it would exclude any effort but military force and power, since the word *war* itself intimately connotes physical and forceful fights (Hornby, 1995). Using the word *war* to root out terrorism implies that the

Bush administration will not bother itself unnecessarily to consider other approaches, such as social or political reasons that lead to the acts of terror. This is because the discourse practices – constituting the discourse orders - which accommodate the social or political reasons can be in conflict with the larger social orders that sustain the US hegemonic interests as the world superpower in the post-9/11 era.

Analysis of the discourse:

While discussing the grammar, particularly at the interpersonal level, it is noted that the declarative, interrogative and imperative sentences do not necessarily tell the readers merely about statement, question and command respectively. As in instance, the researcher discusses an imperative sentence “Consider the dazed reaction of top officials of the Federal Aviation Administration...” (paragraph 3). The sentence is a supporting detail of the fact that “few US government officials really believed [a small band of zealots] could [knock down the WTC]” (paragraph 3).

However, the imperative sentence may not simply command the readers to consider what is being proposed. It is one of the ways to convince them and put forward the argument to them in such a way as if they have no other alternative but to agree with logic of the argument. Otherwise, they may have been labeled as not following the official sources as in the first instance (the US officials’ dazed reaction) or unpatriotic as in the second instance (unwillingness to take revenge for the 9/11 victims).

As it has been discussed in the whole-text language organization, there are at least four main ideas introduced in the article. All these four ideas are smoothly developed throughout the article as they are interrelated with one another. Together, the four ideas build a coherent description of the 9/11 events, the description of which conforms to what has been designated in the official sources.

In the article, the direct discourse representation is sometimes used to refer to the official sources or experts who would offer a legal prestige to a particular representation. For instance, while stating that “Washington was an armed camp on hair-trigger alert,” the article refers to Bush’s declaration “[w]e’re at war” (paragraph 5).

One instance of interdiscursive – implicit or latent intertextual – way of drawing outside references into the text to ensure relevance is in paragraph 4, in which the description of the chaotic aftermath is available. A sentence which is interdiscursively transformed into the paragraph is *Land your plane immediately, Clemer was instructed by an air traffic controller; or risk getting shot down by the US Air Force*. The sentence seems to be a direct discourse representation, but there is no any quotation mark (“...”) to indicate. It reads more like an indirect discourse representation with a particular rewording to give an effect which is available in a direct discourse representation. In this case, the demarcation line between the writers’ words and the original source pertaining to that particular event is even more ambiguous than that in its alternative form of indirect discourse representation. In other words, the level of textual hybridity of the sentence is quite high to the extent that readers may raise potential doubt about the authenticity of the very event that is said to take place during the chaotic aftermath.

The doubt is easily triggered by the fact that the sentence seems to be of indirect discourse representation, yet the writers attempt to reword it to sound like that of direct representation. The doubt is even intensified as there is no way to substantiate the authenticity of the representation as the distinction between the writers' words and the original source is extremely remote.

Stage three: Does the social order need the problems?

The social order within which the article was produced needs the problem of representing the 9/11 events to prevail. The text demonizing a group of Muslims – under the banner of al-Qaeda led by Osama bin Laden – as “Islamic extremists” and “Islamic terrorists” (paragraph 8) allegedly responsible for 9/11 sends an implied message that there is an imaginary link between Islam as a religion and terrorism. To reassert the imaginary link between Islam and terrorism justifies the long-held conception that Islam and Muslims constitute a threat to the West and thus must be forcefully confronted (Esposito, 1992; Mousalli, 1998; Poole 2002), if possible through military power. Linking Islam with terrorism is generally presumed in the Western media to the extent that even if the word ‘terrorism’ or ‘terrorist’ is left unspecified, without the adjective ‘Islamic,’ it still alludes to, none other but, Islam or Muslims. In other words, since the word is not used for other than describing the acts done by some Muslims, the word is then ideologically reserved for Muslims (Karim, 1997, 2000, 2002).

Stage four: Possible ways past the obstacles

Similar to the problem and solution proposed in the first article, the American government must ensure that the media is independent and not pressured under the ‘structural limitations’ to offer an objective and critical representation of any issue, both of national or international significance. In other words, the media is not supposed only to parrot what the so-called ‘official sources’ have stated. Rather, it must exercise its freedom and liberty to seek and investigate the whole issue to come up with a more holistic, responsible, and reliable representation, especially that of the 9/11 coverage.

Therefore, if the media needs to refer to Muslims and Islam while covering the 9/11 events, given the fact of all those misunderstandings, stereotypes and prejudices that prevail in the West, it must carefully draw a wise and reliable representation so as not to merely reassert the negative images of Muslims and Islam. Most, if not all, Orientalists, the avowed specialists about the Orient especially with regard to Muslims and Islam, have contributed to all those misunderstandings, stereotypes and prejudices about Muslims and Islam. Thus, rather than just inheriting the way they approach any issue related to Muslims and Islam, the media must be willing and committed enough to pursue the truth no matter how hard it is to accept. That is what it takes to offer a critical, objective, and reliable representation of the 9/11 events.

In addition, the researcher also suggests the extremely urgent need for the US to avoid myopic and hegemonic prisms while dealing with the rest of the world by engaging more in the self-critical examination. There are four characteristics of the US foreign policies that constitute these myopic and hegemonic prisms. First, the US denies the rights of other countries

to plan their own destiny. In economic terms, the US has structured the global economy to perpetually enrich itself and reduce non-Western societies to abject poverty. Second, related to the US denial of others to prosper is its role as a prime mover of nearly all events of world-wide significance. Along this line of thought, America is seen as the only country responsible to protect the whole world from all perceived dangers. Acting on the basis of this logic, America often ends up denying others rights to decide their own fate, interfering with the problems of other countries economically (Fox, 2001; Pillar, 2001), militarily (Bergen, 2001; Sardar & Davies, 2002), culturally (Pillar, 2001; Sardar & Davies, 2002), etc. And this later breeds, in many parts of the world, a culture of resistance toward America's one-man-show attitude with which Fox (2001) considers America as a "*de facto* world government". This culture of resistance is instigated by the people's frustration, anger, loss of hope and chance to express themselves, and other accumulated emotional feelings. Third, the role as a prime mover of almost all international events, is made possible through an ontological conception that America is the only perfect and qualified nation to undertake that self-burdening action. It is through this ontological logic that America deals with the rest of the world. For instance, 'terrorists' are inherently evil, but America must be good and virtuous; it will never be the otherwise. The fourth, having the aforementioned three characteristics, it just makes it feasible for America to direct its powers, science, and technology to provide the rest of the world with the standards of defining mechanism. It is under America's authority to decide the perception of what it means by freedom, justice, democracy, human rights, globalization, free market, terrorism, terrorist, fundamentalist, Islam, being a Muslim, axis of evil, war on terrorism, rouge states, etc. In other words, it reflects America's one-sided attitude and uncompromised dominance in dealing with the rest of the world, which was then made subject to unquestioning allegiance to the US world-wide war on terrorism. On what constitutes the terms 'war' and 'terrorism', it is America's right to decide and formulate the answers subjectively and arbitrarily.

Stage five: Reflection of the analysis

As it has been stated earlier, the first article contains many presuppositions of how the 9/11 events will later be represented. It is for this reason that similar problems and solutions are also applicable to the present article. The article, as its size is larger than that of the previous one, provides more representations related to the 9/11 events. However, except for further demonizing Muslims and asserting distorted image of Islam, the article tells about the superficial representation of the massive intelligence failures and the US helplessness in the face of the 9/11 attacks, focusing instead on the potential enemies, al-Qaeda and its alleged operatives, that must be avenged and crushed into pieces by none other than military force and power. It fails to address the very roots of acts of terrorism; the social and political motivations that characterize their phenomena. Unless the obstacles to solving the problems are removed, the acts of terrorism may still prevail or may even be intensified by the US sole military approach to combating them as it can further escalate the level of socio-cultural and political complaints and devastations caused by the US myopic and hegemonic approaches to dealing with the rest of the world.

CONCLUSIONS

Having done the critical discourse analysis of terrorism in the two Newsweek's articles the researcher comes to four main points. First, the representation of discourse on terrorism in the magazine asserts Fowler's conception that media coverage is not merely a representation of facts but of ideas which has gone through various considerations incorporating the three key notions of text, discourse and society altogether. The three-dimensional framework of analysis into the articles substantiates this assertion.

Second, ideological functions for unequal relations of power are utilized in representing discourse on terrorism. The elements within the textual level and the discourse level are ideologically used to represent terrorism with regard to its actor, process, and goal. The elements within the textual level include the choice of whole-text language organization, clauses combination, grammar, and words, whereas the elements within the discourse level include the choice of speech act, coherence, intertextuality, and interdiscursivity. The 9/11 actors (perpetrators) are allegedly Osama bin Laden and his operatives who are mainly Arab Muslims. Popularizing this alleged suspicion both in the discourse and social practices further perpetuates the demonizing stereotypes of Arabs and Muslims and intensifies misunderstanding of Islam. The 9/11 processes (events) are characterized by the US dazed reaction and helplessness as well as the Americans' support for the Bush administration. The goal (the target) is the US as an innocent victim of the evil genius, Osama bin Laden and his operatives.

Third, the commonsense, a particular dominant way, has been established in representing discourse on terrorism. Through discourse and social practices, the Bush administration attempts to manufacture the Americans' consent about the actors, processes, and goal of the 9/11 attacks. Finally, the representation of discourse on terrorism in the post 9/11 period is perceived from what Chomsky considers as the propagandistic approach. The three-dimensional framework of analysis unveils the dialectical relationship between language, ideology and power.

Regarding the limitations, the study limits its sample of analysis to only two articles. In the course of doing CDA, the researcher committed himself to strictly administering the five-stage methodology devised by Fairclough. The researcher must have left some parts of the articles unanalyzed, as how Fairclough himself had done while critically analyzing the discourse on new labour (Wetherell, 2001). However, while discussing the whole-text organization, the researcher attempted to provide as comprehensive an analysis as possible, comprising whole paragraphs in the articles.

Finally, further studies need to include more samples to anticipate potential changes in the direction of particular discourse under critical analysis and reduce the amount of unanalyzed parts of the sample. Although generalization is not the ultimate aim of CDA, since it may be considered as a qualitative study, the larger the sample is, the more comprehensive the total representation of particular discourse will be.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, A. S. (1992). *Postmodernism and Islam: Predicament and promise*. London: Routledge.
- Ahmed, A. S. (2003). America and the challenge of Islam. *The Hedgehog Review*, 5 (1), 19-31.

- Bergen, P. L. (2001). *Holy war, Inc.: Inside the secret world of Osama bin Laden*. London: Weidenfield & Nicolson.
- Chomsky, N. (1975). *Syntactic structures*. The Hague: Monte de Gruyter.
- Chomsky, N. (1997). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Esposito, J. L. (1992). *The Islamic threat: Myth or reality?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fairclough, N., & Chouliaraki, L. (2001). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. New York: Longman.
- Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press*. London: Routledge.
- Fox, J. (2001). *Chomsky and globalization*. UK: Icon Books Ltd.
- George, A. (Ed.). (1991). *Western state terrorism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1979). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. London: Edward Arnold Ltd.
- Herman, E. S. (1992). *Beyond hypocrisy: Decoding the news in an age of propaganda*. Boston: South End Press.
- Hornby, A. S. (1995). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary of current English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Huntington, Samuel P. (2003) America in the world. *The Hedgehog Review*, 5 (1), 7-18.
- Karim, K. H. (1997). The Historical resilience of primary stereotypes: Core images of the Muslim other. Ino Riggins, Stephen Harold. *The Language and Politics of Exclusion: Others in Discourse*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Karim, K. H. (2000). *Islamic peril: Media and global violence*. Montreal: Black Rose.
- Karim, K. H. (2002). Making sense of "Islamic peril": Journalism as cultural practice. In B. Zelizer & S. Barbie (Eds.), *Journalism after September 11*. London: Routledge.
- Mousalli, A. S. (1998). *Islamic fundamentalism: Myths and realities*. UK: Ithaca Press.
- Pillar, P. R. (2001). *Terrorism and US foreign policy*. Washington: Brookings Institution Press
- Poole, E. (2002). *Reporting Islam: Media representations of British Muslims*. New York: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd.
- Radford, A. (1997). *Syntactic theory and the structure of English: A minimalist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sardar, Z & Davies, M. W. (2002). *Why do people hate America?* UK: Icon Books Ltd.
- Silberstein, S. (2002). *Wars of words: Language, politics and 9/11*. London: Routledge.
- Wetherell, M. Taylor, S. Yates, S. J. (Eds.). (2001). *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis*. London: Sage Publications Inc.
- Winston, M. (2002). *On Chomsky*. Belmont: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, Inc.