

 <p>ISSN NO. 2320-5407</p>	<p>Journal Homepage: - <a href="http://www.journalijar.com">www.journalijar.com</a></p> <p><b>INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)</b></p> <p>Article DOI:10.21474/IJAR01/4991 DOI URL: <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/4991">http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/4991</a></p>	 <p>INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR) ISSN 2320-5407 Journal Homepage: <a href="http://www.journalijar.com">http://www.journalijar.com</a> Journal DOI:10.21474/IJAR01</p>
---	--	---

### RESEARCH ARTICLE

#### PERSUASION IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE: THE SAUDI MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS ADEL AL-JUBEIR'S SPEECHES AS A CASE STUDY.

**Mohammed Ahmed Aboraas.**

Department Of Foreign Languages, College Of Arts & Humanities, Albaha University, Ministry Of Education, Kingdom Of Saudi Arabia.

#### Manuscript Info

##### Manuscript History

Received: 27 May 2017

Final Accepted: 29 June 2017

Published: July 2017

##### Key words:-

Critical Discourse Analysis, Persuasive techniques, self-image, analogy, argumentation.

#### Abstract

This research deals with a critical discourse reading of five speeches and press conferences delivered by the Saudi Minister of Foreign Affairs Adel Al-Jubeir at Munich Security Conference (MSC) on February 12, 2016, in Brussels on July 21, 2016, on February 12, 2017 in Riyadh with UN Secretary General, on 24 January 2017 in Riyadh with French Foreign Minister, Jean-Marc Ayrault and on February 8, 2017 in Ankara with the Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs. Since it is an untrodden topic, a number of models, texts and contextual analyses are drawn from literature in order to shed more light on Al-Jubeir's speeches. Fairclough (2001) and van Dijk (2001)'s models among other authors were applied to get an in-depth view of the topics and subtopics mentioned in the speeches in order to uncover the persuasive techniques behind the use of language functioned by the speaker to reach a true self-image as well as the image of the other in the world community. Afterwards, the researcher examined Adel Al-Jubeir's use of analogy, as well as argumentation, as persuasive techniques employed in this discourse. Grice's (1975) four maxims of quality, quantity, relevance and manner were used to verify whether the Cooperative Principle was observed in the two speeches, and whether any deviation, if found, was intended as a persuasive strategy. The study concluded with recommendations, opportunities for change in the region, and facts about CDA in its optimistic unprecedented new look. Politics is not all destructive. There are constructive and optimistic gates to it.

*Copy Right, IJAR, 2017., All rights reserved.*

#### Introduction:-

##### Analyzing Language:-

Users of language usually think about what they want to say, then they say it. So thinking comes before speaking, (Gelvin 1982). Thinking comes before understanding of the entity. This is what is called the hermeneutic circle, that is, the text is perceived from its detail and the detail of a text is understood from its whole. So language shows what meaning tells. And that is why language is now used by politicians to achieve their goals. They skew language to suit their audience. That is why also political speeches are full of euphemisms, question begging, and cloudy speech. The fact that language and politics are interconnected is actually true. It penetrates into the minds of people and pulls out their habits of thought. It helps the politician to design a lie so that it may appear in a truthful form.

**Corresponding Author:- Mohammed Ahmed Aboraas.**

**Address:-** Department Of Foreign Languages, College Of Arts & Humanities, Albaha University, Ministry Of Education, Kingdom Of Saudi Arabia.

Almost any activity in politics or perhaps any endeavor to approach people never takes place without reference to language, (Chilton & Schaffner, 2002).

### **The Language of Persuasion:-**

Persuasive political discourse is the formal dialogue of reasonable to discuss which of proposed alternative courses of action should be taken to solve a societal problem. It is intended to involve all citizens in the making of the decision, persuade others (through valid information and logic), and clarify what course of action would be most effective in solving the society problem. Persuasive discourse is generated with the specific aim of convincing the audience about the validity (or fallacy) of a certain proposition (Johnson & R, Johnson, 2000).

According to Johnson and R. Johnson (2000); planning a communication that achieves a change of the hearer's mental attitude towards a specific statement requires the speaker to hypothesis and maintain an adequate model of the hearer's beliefs and to update it according to the effects that the speaker's propositions have on the hearer's mental state.

Political discourse is a method of decision making in a democracy. A decision implies that some agreement prevails as to which of several courses of action is most desirable for achieving a goal (Johnson & F. Johnson, 2000). Therefore, according to Johnson and F. Johnson, within constructive political discourse, each alternative course of action is expected to (a) be strongly advocated, (b) receive a complete and fair hearing, and (c) be critically analyzed to reveal its strengths and weaknesses.

### **Al-Jubeir's Speeches:-**

On February 12, 2016, Adel Al-Jubeir was invited to a conference for security in Munich. He started his speech by greeting his audience with the suitable form of address in German and English, then he thanked everybody for the kind invitation. He began to talk about the Middle East region as it is the most important topic of his lecture, then he moved on to discuss further issues like the society of Saudi Arabia, women rights, illiteracy and the relationship between Islam and ISIS, denying what ISIS do by the name of Islam. When he finished his speech, a reporter asked him about ISIS and its strong relationship with Islam. He answered him using the technique of argumentation analogy. He showed that every religion has it psychopaths like KKK in the Christianity who kills by the name of Jesus.

On July 21, 2016, Al-Jubeir gave a lecture in the Belgium Royal Institute Egmont in Brussell entitled "Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the Regional Issues: Challenges and Aspirations", (see Appendix 2). In his lecture, Al-Jubeir gave a thunderbolt reply to the allegations put forth by the Iranian Consul. The latter has already accused Saudi Arabia first by exporting terrorism, and second by saying that Al-Qaeda has a relationship to Iran is a joke, and third that Saudi Arabia supports Daesh.

On February 12, 2017, Foreign Minister Adel Al-Jubeir Joint Press Conference with UN Secretary General, one of the audiences asked him about the agreements with Houthis militia are stating that the negotiations are dead he replied clearly by counting more than seventy agreements dealt with no response from Houthis.

The Press Conference Saudi Foreign Minister Adel Al-Jubeir and French Foreign Minister, Jean-Marc Ayrault held in Riyadh, 24 January 2017, showed how much the Kingdom is supporting the Syrian people to pass through their endurance to the safe side.

On 24 January 2017, in Riyadh Saudi Minister of Foreign Affairs made a press conference with French Minister of Foreign Affairs. A reporter asked Al-Jubier about Iranian president's speech which accused Saudi government by interference Bahrain the answer was so persuasive, the Bahraini government asked for help and the Saudi government responded.

This study is concerned with a critical analysis of the five discourses delivered by Adel Al-Jubeir both in Munich (Appendix 1) and Brussell (Appendix 2). The two speeches were followed by replies to some questions raised by some news reporters. A reporter commented saying " you talked about Daesh as non-Islamic, the reality is that Daesh is Islamic and very Islamic as it attracts psychopaths from Middle East and Europe. It is based on Islamic standards and its members take pieces of advice and instructions from Islam, I invite you to comment on this." The Minister answered him by drawing an analogy showing the similarities of psychopaths in different religions and we

can't connect them to their religions. He quoted some verses from Qur'an to show the reporter the reality of Islam, (see Appendix 1 & 2). The rest of the texts are three press conferences held in Riyadh and Ankara (see Appendixes 3, 4, and 5).

### **Significance of Study:-**

This study is significant in that it contributes to the establishment and continuation of a genre in discourse analysis which is constructive discourse analysis. It is hoped that this study would help to nationally and globally clarify all peoples' understanding of the Middle East issues and topics declared in Al-Jubeir's two speeches. The study is important in that it helps people reach better judgments on topics that overwhelmed the whole world. It helps people; laymen or professionals, to share and think about finding solutions to the Middle East chronic cancer problems or even share and live the events or at least sympathize with innocent people in the Middle East. I mean to find solutions to social problems, (Johnson & Johnson 2000)

Through persuasive styles (Lakoff 1991) a speech by an Arab official like Al-Jubeir and in a place like Munich, people can see, hear, and share. From a man like Al-Jubeir, people might look at the other side of the coin, might switch the game from dirt to transparency and cleanness. The study is also a message from an innocent face to the new generations who wish to live in peace. The researcher has chosen this topic for research because it is distinguished from the rest of political discourses. The speech sends an optimistic message to the whole world. The research is an attempt to show that Al-Jubeir's message is fair, hopeful, and convincing. In a pulpit like Munich, political decisions can be made, policies can be decided, and laws can be enacted.

### **Research Questions:-**

This study seeks to find answers to the following questions:-

1. What are the persuasion styles utilized by Adel Al-Jubeir to persuade people of his message?
2. How successful were these strategies in persuading people?

### **Research Hypotheses:-**

The current study sets forward the following hypotheses:-

1. Persuasive styles are not self-sufficient. They have to be complemented by a favorable socio-political context.
2. Political discourse is not all destructive and dirty. There is constructive, clean, and optimistic face to it.

### **Limitations of the Study:-**

This study is limited to the analysis of five speeches which were delivered by the Saudi Minister of Foreign Affairs Adel Al-Jubeir on February 12, 2016 in Munich Security Conference, on July 21, 2016 in Brussels, on February 12, 2017 in Riyadh, on 24 January 2017 in Riyadh and on February 8, 2017 in Ankara. The speeches are read, analyzed, and commented on by the researcher employing political discourse approaches existing in the literature. The study also limits itself to the application of certain criteria already set forth by leading prominent scholars as Norman Fairclough and Van Dijk.

### **Objectives of the study:-**

The main objective of this study is to analyze the speeches of the Saudi Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Adel Al-Jubeir. The goal is also to show the self-image of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia as clarified by Al-Jubeir and the image of the other as well. The researcher thinks that there are many styles in each language that can be used for persuading people. Although there are language universals, there are also specific characteristics that differentiate one language from another. These strategies can be used intricately to convince people in some way or another and to argue those who think they are different. The ultimate goal is to come to a compromise. The result is to see social change, to comfort the oppressed, to punish evil, to eradicate killing, to stop bloodshed, and to cut the roots of terrorism. The researcher hopes that the analysis of Al-Jubeir's speeches would show facts about the region to the whole world. It is expected that the world would understand that, as Al-Jubeir stated, there are challenges facing the region. The whole world is invited to participate in dealing with these challenges together with its people.

### **Methodology:-**

This study is concerned with the analysis of Al-Jubeir's five speeches. The texts are analyzed according to a number of proposed criteria drawn from literature. Criteria include Grice's maxims, and models from Van Dijk, Fairclough and Johnson & Johnson. Conclusions and recommendations about the results of analysis are written down. Discussion of the answers to the research questions is also drawn.

**Definition of Discourse Analysis:-**

Yule (1997:139) argues that "discourse analysis is the investigation of how we, as language users, make sense of what we read in texts and understand what speakers mean". For Stubbs (1993:1) "discourse is language above the sentence or above the clause". For Fairclough (1995:56), a discourse is a systematic, internally consistent body of representations. It is the language employed in explaining some social condition from a specific viewpoint. Functionalists like Roman Jakobson (1960) and Halliday (1973,1978,1985a,1985b) were very concerned with how a particular function of language can be used to perform ways of how to do things with it.

There is a variety of definitions of discourse analysis. This number of definitions is attributed to the fact that discourse analysis is an inter-disciplinary approach that has been developed from sociolinguistics, sociology, anthropology and social psychology. Accordingly, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a multidisciplinary study that maintains an "intricate relationships between text, talk, social cognition, power, society and culture, (Van Dijk,1993a:253).

From its beginnings, political language has been viewed as the primary means of influencing people through its use of rhetoric. The aim is to persuade, seek the support of people, excite them, or claim reform.

The major tents of CDA are summarized by Fairclough and Wodak (1997:271-80) as:

1. CDA address social problems.
2. Power relations are discursive.
3. Discourse constitutes society and culture.
4. Discourse does ideological work.
5. Discourse is interpretive and explanatory.
6. Discourse is a form of social action.

**Chapter Two****Review of Literature****Introduction:-**

In this chapter, concentration is given to the aspect of language that deals with what people mean by what they say, which is called pragmatics, (Yule, 2006). In other words, much can be understood from what is said. So, talking or delivering speeches, or answering questions in a press conference (as in the case of this study) helps audience to understand what speakers want to convey. Negotiating an issue or a topic helps to exchange ideas and reach a compromise. In discourse analysis, we attempt to recognize what is meant from context, i. e., the language used before and after the utterance. In analyzing Al-Jubeir's speech, the researcher puts into consideration the linguistic context, the physical context, i. e., the places where the discourse is delivered, the context of situation, and the social context with the background in which the discourse takes place.

**Grice's Maxims:-**

The basic interest of political discourse is Grice's 1975 principle known as the cooperative principle. H. Paul Grice was interested in the use of logic in everyday conversation. Grice's maxims suggested that each conversation is based on principles of cooperation, "make your conversational contribution what is required, at the stage which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged", (Grice 1975). He explained his principle in the form of a series of maxims.

**Maxim of quantity:-**

"Make your contribution as informative as required."

"Don't make your contribution more informative than required."

**Maxim of quality:-**

"Be truthful."

"Don't say what you believe to be false."

"Don't say what you lack adequate evidence for."

**Maxim of relation:-**

"Be relevant."

**Maxims of manner:-**

"Be perspicuous."

"Avoid obscurity of expression."

"Avoid ambiguity."

"Be brief."

"Be orderly."

In using Grice's Maxims, politeness and flouting must be showed in the political speech analysis. Lakoff (1989) contends that linguistic behavior can be seen into three types (polite, non-polite, and rude) and this can be viewed clearly in conferences or meetings where politeness and flouting can be expected.

The notion of argumentation analogy has received much attention in political field. Speech is a public speaking activity which commonly in the form of formal talk performed by a leader to express his/her opinion, or give an overview about a thing or event that is important (Priatmoko, 2013). Within this framework addressers tend to reach an understanding with their addressees through the use of different strategies (Fairclough, 2001). Although persuasion is an inherited form of human interaction, it is mandatory in the political process.

**Structures and meanings:-**

Structuralists assume that certain structures are innocent of meaning. Meaning is, then, determined by differences between structures, not the structures themselves.

The approach adopted by Ruqaiya Hasan (1971) and Samuel Jay Keyser (1980) is one interested in the question "what does this text mean?" and attempts to answer it using a close analysis of language. Stanley Fish (1980) demands not to know "what does a text mean" rather "what does a text do". Fish's position is that you cannot separate linguistic structure from meaning:

in other words, there is no distinction between grammatical meaning and literary meaning. This is an important point because there is a view within intrinsic criticism that understanding language, and that includes specific grammatical structures, is a preliminary process in interpretation, which leads to understanding the literary style of the text, which in turn leads to a reader formulating an appropriate literary response to a text. The process therefore suggests that readers move from grammatical meaning to literary meaning. The point that Fish is making here, and which is made increasingly within contemporary discourse analysis, is that there is no "from/ to" movement involved – what a text means in grammatical terms is the same as its meaning in literary terms. (Fish, 1980: 53).

**Context:-**

Rylance and Simons (2001: xvii) present the definition of context as being found in Chambers Twentieth-Century Dictionary: "the parts of discourse or treatise which precede and follow a special passage and may fix its true meaning." They also add that the context in which literary texts are written should be considered to mean the important facts that have helped understanding literary works. (Rylance and Simons, 2001: xxiii)

Herman (1995:14) believes that the notion of the context: "includes extra-linguistic co-ordinates like the immediate spatio-temporal setting of speech, the roles and status of participants, etc". She also adds:

Context can also refer to the cognitive context, the set of beliefs, assumptions, presuppositions, frames, which participants activate or draw on to interpret actions. The linguistic environment within which a linguistic feature is located has also been termed the context of that feature.

**Functionalism:-**

Jakobson (1960) is mainly concerned with understanding how a particular function of language is determined linguistically. This enables him to believe that the functions of language involve relationships between the message and its context. As a result, he is involved with situationally determined meanings in the analysis of texts, because he was interested in the manner in which language functions in context. In consequence, there will be varieties of meanings because meaning changes as the function of language changes in a certain context. Jakobson is, then, concerned with language that is polysemic, capable of multiple meanings. Like Jakobson, Halliday (1973, 1978, 1985a, 1985b) develops a functionally based linguistic theory. He develops three principal language functions:

ideational, which is the expression of content, interpersonal, which is the expression of interaction, and textual, which is the expression of situation via a coherent text. Halliday believes that linguistic choices made from these three functions constitute the text. Furthermore, he is concerned principally with sentence grammar, but from a sociological perspective (1978). Halliday(1983) views literature as a verbal art and "by analysing a literary text as verbal artifact, we are asserting its status as literature".

The British school of Functionalism, led by linguists like J.R Firth, Michael Halliday, and John Sinclair, rejected the isolation of language by itself and studied what speakers actually say. Several British functionalists have developed a view of language as a network of options that are assigned their function when language is used in discourse. This view carries the British brand name of systemic functional linguistics, and considers that the organization of language is designed to support its use.

One classic demonstration ..... was Given by Halliday for William Goldings the Inheritors. To evoke a "Neanderthal tribe's Point of view" Gelding uses clause patterns whose subjects are not people but parts of the body or inanimate objects, the effect is an atmosphere of ineffectual activity.

(Van Dijk, 1996:35-6)

### **Language and politics:-**

It is widely conceived that language and politics are interconnected; language is, for instance, considered the means of expression of politics. It is the method by which politics or political discourse and ideas are widely disseminated. Mazrui (1975) corroborates this when he writes that "Language is the most important point of entry into habits of thought of a people. It embodies within itself cumulative association derived from the total experience of its people" (p. 48). In the same spirit, Harris avers that "in politics, words have a powerful effect" (1979. p. 58).

Furthermore, Harris asserts that George Orwell is interested in demonstrating how "political language is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable" (1979, p. 58).

In a similar vein, Ranney (1975), claims further that every "political authority will lead to justify itself by an appeal to language in its symbolic or realistic sense" (p. 130). Politicians are, subsequently, keen on deploying several linguistic mechanisms to legitimize their stance. "political authority will lead to justify itself by an appeal to language in its symbolic or realistic sense" (p. 130). Politicians are, subsequently, keen on deploying several linguistic mechanisms to legitimize their stance.

According to Chilton and Schaffner (2002), political activity can never exist without the use of language. They contend that although other behaviors are involved (for instance, physical coercion), doing politics is predominantly constituted in language. They also underscore the key role played by politics in expanding the functions and usages of language, "Conversely, it is also arguably the case that the need for language (or for the cultural elaboration of the cultural instinct) arose from socialization of humans involving the formation of coalitions, the signaling of group boundaries, and all that these developments imply" (p. 3). However, this does not mean that language arises exclusively for these purposes or functions.

### **Related Studies:-**

A large number of studies have dealt with political discourse in general and critical discourse analysis in particular.

In 1991, Lakoff studied how President Bush, the senior, succeeded to persuade the whole of the international community that the Gulf War is morally justified.

Chilton and Schaffner (1997) did a discourse analysis of the previous British Prime Minister, John Major's speech on 14 October, 1994. They found that the repetitive use of the first personal "I" indicates that he appears authoritative and knowledgeable whereas his audience are subordinate and less knowledgeable.

Furthermore, Chilton and Schaffner (1997) show how the pronouns *we/us/our/ours* are dexterously deployed in this speech. According to the writers, "We" may include the speaker, the direct hearers in the hall as well as those who consider themselves supporters of the party. Contextually, it excludes Labour (they or them). They argue that the associated verbs come from lexical fields pertaining belief, conflict, moral rectitude and provision. The following is an illuminating excerpt from Major's speech: how wrong they have been... and how right we have been... it is we

who have... we have won... we've beaten... we are the party of the union... they are our issues... This is our ground [not Labour's]. (Chilton and Schaffner, p.218)

To trace the notion of the Other and how it is (mis)represented in the press. Van Dijk' (2000a) scrutinized a news report taken from the British tabloid, *The Sun*, of 2 February 1989.

The purpose of his analysis was to clarify how the discursive investigation of the structures of the text can disclose a generally positive or negative opinion about "Us" versus "Them."

Van Dijk (2001) is another major contribution in the arena of ideological analysis of political discourse which entails detecting in text and talk the expression of such ideologically based opinions. Textual as well as contextual elements are investigated to illustrate the various shades of ideology that are wrapped in the structure of discourse.

Gerda Mansour (2002) has explored U.S. President George W. Bush's 24 June 2002 speech in which he sets out his administration's Middle East policy. She states that to some, this speech seems balanced; however, her linguistic analysis reveals a diametrically different conclusion. She spotlights the schizoid style of this speech as she can detect two sides of the president's personality: a preacher in a church and a stern father. The first speaker is a preacher whose passages abound with highly emotionally charged vocabulary, clichés and pious commandments. In addition, the preacher's paragraphs end with a biblical allusion, "The Bible says: 'I have set before you life and death, therefore, choose life'", (06/24/2002).

The speech's other persona, she contends, is that of an authoritarian figure addressing the naughty boys in his class with stern reprimands, orders, demands and threats interlaced with promises. This is reflected in his manipulation with modals such as *must* and *will*. Moreover, she explores his use of speech acts.

She concludes by stating that the linguistic analysis of this speech shows that all the available stylistic tools to express power and make demands are aimed at only one side in the conflict, the Palestinian part, while the other side receives some cautiously worded advice. Promises are of the carrot-and-stick style and contain little that is concrete and even less that can be called binding. The use of conditional clauses, hedges, and attenuates color his promises. This type of discourse is called "destructive political discourse", (Johnson & Johnson, 2000).

In 2008, Klebanov et al. did a study on how cohesion unites pieces of text together to appear a connected body of ideas. The authors showed how grammar and lexicon help to achieve a flow of linked ideas together to build an organized and effective text. The authors reached the conclusion that frequency of a lexical item counts in the unity of a text. If an item is repeated many times, it will not be participating in the cohesion of the text. They also found out that the distance between words counts as important in text cohesion in the sense that if two words are far apart from each other, it will be less likely to achieve cohesion in their text. The text appears loose.

Farrelly (2010) investigated how CDA contributes to the advancement of social practices in general and specific texts in particular. He believes that it is almost impossible to exhaust a genre like CDA. And so long as there are worlds, nations, societies, sexes, wars, and communications, there CDA. The author concentrated on the press release and contented that through CDA, an imaginary can be uncovered and contradictions can be cleared.

Al-Sowaidi et al. (2015) critically analyzed a number of slogans which were spreading during the uprising in Egypt, Libya, and Yemen. The collection and analysis showed lots of discourse cleches in the Arab world. The discourse consisted of banners, announcements, wall graffiti, chanting, speeches and songs. The authors came up with a number of persuasive tools which helped to shape the Arab mentality for the attempt to change the political situation in the Arab region.

In the present study, the approach adopted is a constructive political discourse analysis. The mold that can welcome Al-Jubeir's speeches is more constructive than destructive. The nature of this discourse is neither aggressive nor hypocrite. The discourse is actually put in the form of reasoned views which are discoursed according to logical terms. It presents a number of propositions to choose from which of the alternatives could be selected to solve a societal issue. In Al-Jubeir's speeches, all parties are involved to solve some issues listed in his speeches (See Appendixes). The tool that Al-Jubeir used is represented by persuasive mechanisms conversational principles, and argumentation. The speaker's attempt to persuade others to take a course of action is offered logically and through valid information and by way of drawing analogy. The tool also is to show all parties involved in the issue, the

alternatives of taking an action. The speeches here present these options in a clear way. To effect a change, the speaker tries to persuade the hearers that a change has to be taken (Johnson & Johnson, 2000). The speaker hammers on the hearer's beliefs to cause a change. Al-Jubeir cautions his audience. The caution is for good, for democracy, and for achieving a goal. Al-Jubeir attempts to versify not poetize, to tell the truth, not falsify reality.

### **Chapter Three:-**

#### **Methodology**

#### **Procedures:-**

#### **Data collection:-**

The current study is qualitative in nature. It basically depends on the analysis of persuasion styles in Adel Al-Jubeir's speeches. But this is done in an endeavor to shed light on how far he is successful in conveying political messages of his country in international events and conferences. The study attempted to investigate a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of Mr. Al-Jubeir's five speeches which were collected by the researcher at a number of international places throughout the world. Amongst these places are Munich Security Conference (MSC) in Munich on February 12, 2016, (see appendix 1), Brussels on July 21, 2016, (see Appendix 2), Riyadh, February 12, 2017 (see Appendix 3), Ankara (see Appendix 4), February 8, 2017, and Riyadh, January 24, 2017, (see Appendix 5). The current discourse included also press conferences held with UN Secretary General (UNSG), Turkish Foreign Minister (TFM) and French Foreign Minister (FFM).

#### **Places of the delivered speeches:-**

Munich Security Conference (MSC) is an annual conference that has been taking place since 1963. Wehrkundetagung and MunchnerKonferenz are among the founders of this conference. In the past four decades MSC became the most important forum for the exchange of views. Every year it hosts about 350 senior figures from more than 70 countries from all over the world to conduct an intensive debate on current and future issues. The attendance of this conference includes head of states, ministers, governors and international organizations, high ranking officials, armed forces, scientists, civil society, business and media. This year, the conference was conducted in February.

The venue is the Hotel Bayerischer Hof in Munich. The 52<sup>nd</sup> MSC took place from 12 to 14 February 2016. Six hundred internationals attended the event, including thirty heads of states, seventy foreign and defense ministers, directors of various intelligence agencies and more than seven hundred journalists from 48 countries. The chairman of the conference was Wolfgang Ischinger. The conference talked about nine subjects which are: 1. Conflict between NATO and Russia. 2. Syria and the fight against ISIS. 3. Middle East situation. 4. Future of NATO. 5. North Korea nuclear program. 6. Intelligence Services. 7. Ewald von Kleist Award 2016. 8. Situation in Africa. 9. Refugee crisis. The minister of Foreign Affairs in Saudi Arabia Adel Al-Jubeir presented a speech in this conference. In the speech itself and the other four speeches, he discussed a good number of issues. First, the situation in Saudi Arabia and how it changed in the past seventy years from a primitive society to a developed society. He tackled the situation in Yemen and the Saudi role to re-legitimacy, and dealt with the topic of Syria and ISIS and the situation in the Middle East in general. After that journalists asked him two questions. The first one was about the role of Saudi Arabia in establishing ISIS. The second question was about women rights including women driving. The other two places are Riyadh and Ankara.

#### **About Adel Al-Jubeir:-**

The minister of Foreign Affairs in Saudi Arabia Adel Al-Jubeir was appointed on 29 April 2015 as a successor to the late Prince Saud Al-Faisal. On Monday, August 1<sup>st</sup>, 2016 Al-Asmari (Writer in Al-Jazera Newspaper) described Adel Al-Jubeir as the professional shrewd politician obsessed with diplomacy. He is a man with three decades of experience spent all over the world especially America. Al-Jubeir took over at a time when the world continents were dancing on hot tin. He received his basic education in Germany, then the BA from Texas, USA, then the Master's degree in Political Science from the well-known Georgetown University. Since then, he has been working in politics which has become his craft. He occupied various positions starting from assistant Minister to Ambassador to Saudi Minister for Foreign Affairs.

#### **Methods of analysis:-**

According to Brich (1989), the attempt to analyze a text follows two steps:

1. To fish out the meaning that is intended by the writer so it becomes clear to the reader or hearer.



2. To interpret how the discourse is meant, not what it only means, in the sense that each time the discourse is read new meanings come up. That is why in discourse analysis everything is put in, everything should be involved so that different readings make the discourse clear and clear by way of what it does and not only of what it means. The different readings of the text are contextualized by a set of frames, beliefs, assumptions and backgrounds which we call schema.
3. The analysis followed here is an eclectic one, in the sense that a number of principles are drawn from literature and applied to the structure of Al-Jubeir's speeches. This mainly includes Grice's 1975 maxims together with selected principles from Fairclough, Johnson & Johnson, and Van Dijk's models. The approach that is relevant to this study is Constructive Political Discourse Analysis.

The framework of analysis here has integrated elements from a number of approaches. First, Grice's 1975 cooperative principle with its four maxims is applied. Then criteria from Fairclough and van Dijk are used for the interpretation of the speeches. The analysis tended to show how linguistic mechanisms are used to help specific political functions.

**Criteria include:-**

1. Reiteration
2. Modality
3. Register
4. Intertextuality
5. Topics
6. Presupposition and Implication
7. Pronominal Distribution
8. Nominalization

The study limits itself to those criteria that are applicable to Al-Jubeir's speeches.

The speeches focused on some major issues that are facing the world at the present time and that were discussed at the joint press conferences that Adel Al-Jubier attended.

**1. Reiteration:-**

Reiteration is a form of lexical cohesion device that involves the repetition of a lexical item. Thus repetition, synonym, or super ordinate is a way of linking words in a text and creating coherence, (Salkie, 1995)

**2. Intertextualit:-**

It is a form of weaving texts together and make them come into being. Texts are composed of snatches of other texts, (Fairclough, 1992:84). It is how texts dialogue with other texts. The texts are not only woven together structurally but might be intertextually linked through conventions, genres, styles, or discourse.

**3. Register:-**

This is another shape of text which is built upon lexis, i.e. formal or informal in structure. Register ranges from a short army message to a whole book. Register could show degrees of technicality, language of a specific profession or field (Crystal, 1995).

**4. Modality:-**

Modality means the speaker's inclination or view of the probabilities, possibilities, necessities, vagueness, doubt, obligation or permission of a course of action, (Halliday, 1994). Modality is one of the ways which enable us to refer and depend on the possibility or impossibility of something happening. It is a way of establishing self identity in the sense that it helps to create commitment, both to some course of action or social change, (Fairclough, 2003) According to Van Dijk (2003) propositions could be expressed through modality, for example when saying: It is necessary that, It is possible that, It is known that, etc. Modality reflects some ideological perspectives as well. The modality in "It is necessary that" could legitimize some sort of social law in a society not in the other. If an Arab answers an invitation by saying "I might come", it is meant that he is not coming, but does this out of respect or direct refusal.

**5. Topics:-**

Topics represent the building blocks or the subject matters of a discourse. It tells the reader what the discourse is all about. What is done in DA is to topicalize the information that characterize the text or what the speaker is sending. To de-topicalize is to highlight the bad things so they won't appear on the surface, (Van Dijk, 2003:45).

**6. Presuppositions and Implications:-**

In presenting topics in a discourse some information is left implicit, i.e., understood but not expressed in a discourse. So, the ability of making explicit what is implicit a presupposed is something ideological and is considered a way of showing power (Van Dijk, 2003). Information is left implicit if it is hurting the self-image or the image of the other, (Wilson, 1990).

#### 7. Pronominal Distribution:-

A personal pronoun, for instance, is a grammatical form which refers to the first person speaker or the person spoken to. Pronouns such as *I*, *we*, *you*, they help to clarify functions of social roles that clarify speaker-spoken to relationship (Crystal, 1995). Taken interactionally, the use of the pronoun *I* and *we* establish a political power indicating the power of decision taking. The repetition of *I* or *we* imply authority and good news. On the other political level, *We* establishes solidarity and group unity, (Wilson, 1990).

#### 8. Nominalization:-

It has been argued that the use of nominalization by discourse analysts has become a kind of mode in discussing texts or discourses. The term has become important in discourse analysis and the development of this new genre. Much of this work on nominalization depended on what Michael Halliday has done in the field of linguistics. Discourse analysts took this outcome to use in their attempts to discuss texts and speeches, and accordingly contribute in a reproduction of interpretations and analyses. Still Halliday's work is encouraging efforts in DA until the present time, (Fairclough, 2005; Wodak, 2006, 2007). Leading scholars as Fowler et al. (1979) gave much data as to what nominalization would do to effect on the ideologies of uses of language.

Especially the work of Fowler in 1991, the image of topics like newspaper headlines has changed and readers began to think it over and over to mean other things not familiar to them compared to old use. An example like "attack on protestors" would not seem innocent as it is read in a normal context. In this type of nominalization, the doer of the action has been deleted and left without a subject. What we read or hear is a noun phrase void of a subject. How can we understand this phrase? The only logical conclusion would be looking for a subject. The subject here must be someone or some people or power who performed the attack. The writer of this discourse has intentionally or unintentionally omitted the subject and left the phrase to be discursive in nature and to look nominalized. He might do something else; he would use a passive voice to reach his aim of not announcing a subject, to become a passive like "protestors attacked", (Billing, 2008).

Discourse analysts like Fowler and others who support him believe that in contexts like these, it cannot be an innocent idea to take it for granted that the use is random or normal. It must have been chosen intentionally to point to something ideological. The two terms "nominalization" and "passivization" were taken from linguistics to perform differently in the outside contexts than in linguistic contexts.

Skewing language has become the work of politicians. They are "turning verbs into nouns" (Fowler et al., 1979:14). This is the real meaning of nominalization. This is the process or the transformation of language to suit the aims and objectives of language uses.

If this is done and the verb is turned into a noun or made passive and the agent is deleted, the process is called nominalization or passivization, respectively. It is claimed that this process would convey less information. But in the language of DA, much can be understood, much can be said, and much can be conveyed.

Created from nominalization is the fact that the process itself indicates or keeps a feeling of inequality, i.e. the users of nominalization put themselves aloof and in a super position from normal people whether readers or listeners. Added to the above feeling is that much can be hidden and much can be canceled from the use of nominalization by power people, officials, or writers.

Arising from the use of nominalization are the problems that are related to ideology or what can be interpreted by audience. Halliday's introduction to functional grammar contained what he termed "congruent" and "metaphorical", (Halliday, 1985). What is congruent to Halliday is not to other discourse analysts. Metaphorical use is preferred by power people, which creates problems to the audience. Again the transformation of verbs into names

or noun phrases by well-informed language users has been explained by Maynard (1999). These are some proficient language users who can cognitively move from verb to noun automatically. In passivization, the matter is more problematic, in the sense that the doer of the verb is omitted and this gives the impression that anyone may do the action and accordingly the politician is left defenseless. The audience would be confused and would produce different readings to the same discourse.

#### **Chapter Four:-**

##### **A Discourse Analysis of Al-Jubeir's Speeches:-**

##### **Al-Jubeir and other politicians: A contrast:-**

Politicians function language in general and political language in particular, among other ways of clarification in order to show their audiences what they want to imply, what they mean by what they say.

In politics, the general impact is not to tell the truth. It is a well known fact that politics is the "dirty game". Harold Pinter (2005) contends that politics takes itself away from the kingdom of truth. He believes, by way of much evidence that politicians are not interested in truth as much as they are barn to show power. Pinter agrees completely with George Orwell (1946) in the sense that politicians wish to see people drowned in ignorance and not truth. The politician wants to turn the heads of his people away from logic and throw dust in their eyes so they cannot see any truth. Their back of the donkey face is the speech writers who have become very competent in their industry.

Most politicians claim mercy but actually they are acting brutal. They appear so passionate to their people ( kids, students, youth, workers, employees, servants, etc.) but they are indifferent in reality. They appear to respect all people but they behave differently in the sense that they make fun of their people after they hold the chain. The researcher, among many others, has come the conclusion that the dirtiest speech is the political discourse in which its speaker aspires for power and control on one hand. On the other hand the cleanest discourse is the religions discourse in which its speaker aspires for truth, for the interest of the people and for the welfare of humanity in general. Al-Jubeir's speech is of the latter kind. The first kind is much common. The second is very rare.

The evidence comes from Littell '(1995) comparison. He shows that the language of assault precedes historic assassinations which took the lives of John F. Kennedy, Yitzhak Rabin, and Anwar El-Sadat. Within Littell's comparison, one can see the optimistic scene. He mentions the language of dialogue (which we have here in Al-Jubeir's dialogue). This comfortable language is the language of democracy where we don't find words of assault, vilification, mendacity, and incitement.

##### **Deceptive language:-**

Since the function of CDA is to show people the truth, it should use all possible means for clarification. All people, old or young, educated or not educated, males or females should see the truth. That is why we analyze discourse. CDA is very crucial here and there. But still, people are deceived in some way or another. By way of some advertisements, statements, facial expressions, or passionate candidates, etc. Minds of people can be changed or destroyed. Peace can be jeopardized and heroes can be assassinated. Language here is a source of social practice and social change, (Fairclough 1992, 2003) and a purposeful means of communication, (Schaffner, 1996).

McGregor (2003), and Van Dijk (1988), (1995), (2001), (2006) believe in the power of the word, the spoken word which is capable of showing societal problems and help solve them. The spoken discourse, which is the topic of this study represents the savior from oppression, illegal institutions, corruption and inequality. Here it helps people to resist the oppression of Daesh and its allies.

In Political Discourse Analysis (PDA) Lakoff (1995), and Lakoff and Johnson (1995) use metaphor to highlight political language and make it more influential. He talks about metaphors.

In this study, Daesh is doing evil. Daesh does immoral actions. They move from moral religions instructions. Evil will not continue. In the holy books, songs, psalms, proverbs, wise sayings, and popular ideas, evil doers are the repenters. Evil is a fierce force but leads to the commitment of immoral actions, then to failure.

In the following sections, the researcher is going to fish out the meaning which the speaker was trying to convey to the audience. This process of interpretation will be conducted within the framework of analysis explained in chapter three about methodology although discourse analysts ( Brich 1989 ) believe that each time the text is read a new interpretation with new meanings comes up.

### Interpreting Al-Jubeir's meanings:-

In speech 1, the use of **reiteration** and repetition of phrases like "on region", "dynamic region", "it is a region", "challenges" is clear. Expressions like "I believe" tell us that what is said is what is meant : It tells us that there is a lot of truth in the language of politics as there is a lot of lies and bias. There is no affectation in the lecture on the part of the Minister. The statement "we were a tribal nation, we became a modern nation confirms the authenticity of Al-Jubeir's speech. This is not new within Saudi leaders; King Faisal said it earlier in 1973 during the October 6<sup>th</sup> war. Al-Jubeir documented his speech by statistics and numbers. He mentioned that "life expectancy rates doubled in one generation, from 37 years to over 70. He touched a global issue as well. It is women's education. Education "was nonexistent in 1960, today 55 percent of college students (in Saudi Arabia) are women". There are lots of issues in Al-Jubeir's speech that really deserves attention. Arab discourse analysts can draw lots and lots of interpretations out of this discourse.

In speech 2, Al-Jubeir was immediate and to the point. Immediately after the Iranian consul finished his presentation, Al-Jubeir abruptly replied by giving subsequent shots at the Iranian consul. He enumerated his evidence one after the other. He didn't mention anything that was not based on fact. Look at the way he sits; he sits straight with open face looking at his audience and with no feeling of guilt. The Iranian consul was a kind of narrating events as if he is telling a tale of two cities! He failed to provide one single proof or evidence. He didn't even claim a lie. He was sort of having some sort of waste paper in a basket and wanted to throw them away. Look at the way he sits! Leaning to the table! In all the five speeches, there is a repetition of pronouns like **I**, **We**, **us**, **our**, which indicate authority and responsibility on the part of the Foreign Minister Al-Jubeir.

In press conferences 3, 4, and 5, there is the use of reiteration in "our position", "we all hope", "we are talking about Daesh", "we feel very strongly".

The speeches are cohesive and connected in form. They are also coherent and logical in their ideas . Furthermore, the discourse is interwoven through the **intertextuality** technique. Al-Jubeir has made the speech come into being. He has made them alive . Again, he has caused the two divine texts; the Quran and the Bible dialogue with each other at the proper time and in the proper place. In the middle of Europe and when asked by a news reporter about Daesh being un-Islamic, Al-Jubeir was very convincing in his reply. Together with his own argumentation he used verses from the Quran to support his discussion. So he states that "every religion has perverts and psychopaths who try to hijack it". He mentioned that those hijackers exist in Christianity, Judaism and Hinduism. He urged everyone and all the people not to be mislead or misguided by Daesh or KKK or any deviated organizations who take religion as a cover to their evil doings. Al-Jubeir showed that in the Islamic faith, the Quran reveals that: "you have your faith and I have my faith. And you are free to practice your faith and I am free to practice mine". Moreover, he showed greater signs of tolerance in Islam by coating verses from the Quran. He said: "he who kills an innocent soul is as if he has killed all of humanity. And he who saves an innocent soul, is as if he saved all of humanity". He included verses from the Old Testament which say "and eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth".

The **register** used in Al-Jubeir's speeches is a formal one. It is formal in structure and style. He delivered them in clear native-speaker English. The language flows naturally to appeal to both native and non-native speakers alike. He mentioned the word "region" and identified it with geographical borders (See Appendix 1). He mentioned the civilization, greatness, and history of the region. He gave details about the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, its history, institutions, human rights, civil society organization security, peace, stability, and policy using very specialized political register. In discussing foreign policy, he used very competent register like: "legitimate government", "collapsing", "radical Militia", "ballistic missiles", "no intention of seizing one inch from Yemini territory", "extremists and terrorists", "Iranian constitution", "attack", "American Marines", "shelter terrorism ", "great nation"etc. The speeches 3, 4, and 5 are rich in lots and lots of political register. In discourse 4 and 5, we read "aligned", "resolve issues", "5+1 negotiations", humanitarian aid", "resumption of cease fire", and "sectarian policy". This is very persuasive and convincing to the audience. This contributes to the answer to the second question of this study. Politics is not altogether bad. There is the positive side of it.

The strategies like reiteration, intertextuality and register are clear language signals which aimed at persuading people of Al-Jubeir's presentation points.

Al-Jubeir's use of **modality** helped him to gain success in the sense that he was optimistic in his notes. "The region is looking for its own identity". "I remain convinced and hopeful". "Our region will come out of it". "We will succeed". "A cultural issue that our society will deal with". The degree of possibility is high also in "There is nothing that will prevent us from doing more ...", and in "That's our objective, and we will achieve it". There is an obligation in "we have to deal with what I call the two elephants...". There is determination in "We will not stop until the job is finished", "We wish that Iran would become a great nation", "I look forward", "we feel very strongly", "I have no doubts" (Appendix 5), All these types of modality carry the sense of cautious optimism on the part of the Saudi foreign minister.

Al-Jubeir discussed a good number of **topics** in his speech. These represent the building pillars in his discourse. The umbrella topic is the Middle East which he mentioned in his second sentence. Vital topics include the history of the region, challenges that face the region, Saudi Arabia as a nation, women's education in Saudi Arabia, Saudi Arabia and Yemen, Syria, and Daesh. The topics are arranged logically. They are informative and balanced in their presentation. Al-Jubeir topicalized the issues that he is discussing in a clear, form, and truthful manner in all the speeches. Across the five presentations, he dealt with various topics. In texts 3, 4, and 5, his topics included: US and Saudi relationships, Turkish and Saudi relationships, and French and Saudi relationships respectively. Among other topics are Syria, Iraq, Houthis, Libya, Iran, terrorism, and Middle East issues.

The idea of making **explicit what is implicit** is natural in the speeches. Facts are given explicitly such as the way Al-Jubeir presented his major issues. In discussing the issue of women's driving, he was implicit "This issue is an issue that is a cultural issue...", perhaps because it might hurt the self image. In another issue, Al-Jubeir made explicit what is implicit, when he was asked whether Daesh is un-Islamic. He gave much detail about this ideological case and he was convincing in this respect. He gave evidence from Islam, Christianity, Judaism and Hindu faith.

In answering a question in text 5 about the Iranian president's accusation to the Kingdom's so-called interference in Bahrain Al-Jubeir made it explicit that the Kingdom responded to an ally and a legitimate government whereas Iran supports illegitimate sects in the region such as Hizbulla and the Houthis in Yemen.

#### **Chapter Five:-**

#### **Conclusion and Recommendations:-**

This chapter focuses on the researcher's attempt to find answers to the research questions raised in chapter one. The answers are discussed within the criteria addressed in the methodology of research, i.e. the criteria of analysis. The discourse strategies employed by Al-Jubeir in his speeches confirm his implied message by way of the language he uses. He prepared a true safe comfortable atmosphere to his discourse.

#### **Summary of results:-**

Almost all conditions appeared to be felicitous and suitable. Grice's maxims of quality, quantity, relevance and manner were met with no deviation or violations. He gave proper weight to each topic, no more no less. In his answers to news reporters, Al-Jubeir gave enough information, neither lengthy nor monotonous.

Al-Jubeir's speeches are anomalous to George Bush's speech on Iraq. Bush claims that "we came to liberate Iraq" and in reality he went there to occupy Iraq.

On the country, Al-Jubeir's discourse is truthful, logical, genuine and factual. He tells the truth of Saudi Arabia's being in Yemen. This has been shown clear from text 1 to text 5 in this study. It is "to present a legitimate government from collapsing", and "in response to the request of the legitimate government", and with "no intention of trying to dominate Yemen". Al-Jubeir expresses the intention of the kingdom of not working alone in the region. He wants to show the world that he is working during daylight and in collaboration with regional peace-loving nations like Egypt, Iraq, Sudan and North Africa. He finally expresses his optimism that Daesh "will be defeated" because it is a terrorist organization that has no religion and no morals. He employed Lakoff's metaphor in an attempt to defeat this terrorist organization.

Al-Jubeir's speeches deserve reading and rereading. The researcher sides with Al-Jubeir's caution to people about not making generalizations or stereotypes.

The speeches are cohesive and connected. They are also coherent and logical in their ideas . Furthermore, the discourse is interwoven through the *intertextuality* technique. Al-Jubeir has made the speech come into existence. He has made them alive . Again, he has caused the two divine texts; the Quran and the Bible dialogue with each other.

The persuasive styles like *reiteration, intertextuality and register* are clear language signals which aimed at persuading people of Al-Jubeir's presentation points.

Al-Jubeir's use of *modality* helped him to gain success in the sense that he was optimistic in his notes. This is clear in his statements. "The region is looking for its own identity ". "I remain convinced and hopeful". "Our region will come out of it". "We will succeed". "I say what I say about our positive outlook" (text 5). All these types of modality carry the sense of cautious optimism on the part of the Saudi foreign minister. The second hypothesis of the study is achieved here. Politics is not altogether bad. There is the optimistic side to it.

Especially in his second and fifth speeches, Al-Jubeir was very explicit. He gave up to sixteen topics one after the other as if he knew them by heart which indicates his comprehensive knowledge of his topics. Each point was supported by enough evidence.

Al-Jubeir attempted even to make explicit what was not needed to be explicit. Here he followed the stick and carrot policy. He called Iran "a great nation". He wanted Iran to be a great neighbor as well. What he is sending to the whole world is that although Iran did all these types of terrorism, we still need her to be a good neighbor. The *presupposition* is that Iran practiced terrorism and harbored it, and he gave enough evidence.

The researcher recommends that everybody whether Arab or non-Arab carefully read the speeches again and again. The researcher invites all to take it from the mouth of the shrewd and experienced politician; Adel Al-Jubeir.

The researcher recommends that students majoring in political science read Al-Jubeir's speeches and learn about the persuasive strategies built in his presentations.

In the second speech, Al-Jubeir was shooting bullets. Although the thunderbolts looked detailed and perhaps violating some of Grice's maxims, but in reality they do not. Within the framework of the analysis of this study, and considering the hegemony , importance, and size of the issues tackled here, it can be said that Al-Jubeir has met Grice's 1975 conditions. He was informative through his abundant evidence. It can be said that the first hypothesis is achieved here because in persuading his audience, was not self-sufficient. He gave enough evidence so support his views as a thunderbolt reply to the Iranian consul. What he said was required to let people know the plain truth. He told the truth not falsified. He was clear and he avoided ambiguity. He was very orderly as well. In texts 3, 4, and 5, he put considerable emphasis on the Middle East issues as has been discussed in the previous chapter.

Al-Jubeir 's use *pronominal distribution* was almost balanced and effective. In all the speeches he used pronouns like *we , I , our , us* . This use indicates authority and responsibility in general. It shows political power and the power of taking decisions. Furthermore, these pronouns prepare an atmosphere of group solidarity and political unity. It gives a feeling of closeness between Al-Jubeir and his audience.

The use of nominalization and passivization adds to the depth of Al-Jubeir's discourse. The speeches abound in instances of this sort of political use. He said that the region has 'been connected to the world'. This use of passivization implies a rich and distinguished geographical location that is unique and outstanding. It expresses a history full of civilization and culture as Al-Jubeir already provided earlier in his speech.

There is the metaphor he used when he said 'a region that sits at the crossroads of civilization. Metaphors add more meaning to language and connect the language to the current world. Metaphors make language alive as Lakoff explains. There is nominalization in "the rise of sectarianism" , "the rise of sectarianism", " the rise of religious extremism", and "the rise of terrorism". Nominalization here represents a way out technique to avoid even mentioning the agent in each of these linguistic structures. It expresses the unwanted identity of the other even

though this other belongs to us by name. The reiteration of 'the rise' in each of these phrases gives the impression that we are not responsible for this rise, we do not want it and we are innocent of it.

"A country [Yemen], being taken over by a radical militia" is a type of passivization that indicates peace, happiness, non-alignment, welfare, good neighborliness, and prosperity on the part of the people of Yemen. On the contrary, it implies war, power, traitory, mistrust, and terror on the part of the radical militia. In Syria, there is "the displacement of 12 million", and "the destruction of a nation". Nominalization that expresses an absence of an agent in that noun phrase. This implies that must have been carried out by someone, or some government, or some oppressor, or destroyer. But rhetoric helps and where we find passivization, there is clear evidence that the killer is known. The whipper is there and everybody can point at him. As discourse analysis is about everything, there are many other contexts other than the linguistic context that might help. There are the news correspondents, the photographers, the eyewitnesses, the satellites, the spies, etc who can easily provide evidence.

In his second speech, Al-Jubeir functioned well when he used the negative question technique. "Doesn't the Iranian constitution talk about exporting revolution?" Didn't Iran establish Hezbollah?" Didn't Iran attack more than 12 embassies?" There are many other negative questions of this sort, all represent logical answers and immediate replies that meet with reality with the answer "Yes".

What characterizes the third speech and makes it consistent with the occasion of the visit of the UN Secretary General to the Kingdom is the reiteration of the pronoun "we" on the part of the Saudi Foreign Minister. The repetitive use of "we" brings the whole press conference together in a feeling of hospitality and solidarity. The topics that are dealt with here are almost the same as those dealt with in earlier speeches in this chapter.

In the fourth speech which is a joint press conference with the Turkish Foreign Minister, the reiteration of "we" together with "the Saudi airforce", perhaps show power and equality especially with a powerful country like Turkey. Al-Jubeir combined his diplomacy with his counterpart the TFM and extended a consensus to the United States President Trump.

In the fifth speech, Mr. Al-Jubeir used unprecedented political language, up to the knowledge of the researcher, that it puts him on a standard equal to the other politicians he held press conferences with. In this last text, there is the use of passivization in "Metro that is built by Alstom", indicating absence of a political figure but a company. "Saudi men and women's experience in the US has been positive" is a passive statement in which the agent is deleted to imply generalization and to help keep self image and the image of the other intact. There is nominalization in "resumption of ceasefire" in Syria, "national transition council" also in Syria, "arriving at a mechanism", "the delivery of humanitarian aid", "restoring America's presence in the world", "containing Iran".

These types of passivization and nominalization techniques in the political context create curiosity on the part of the audience. If heard or read in a normal context, that would have been perhaps possible to figure out in a straightforward way. In a political context, the audience would look for an agent to each nominalized phrase. That is why there is one, two, three, or more than a reading to political discourse. There must be someone or some power who would resume ceasefire, form a national council, arrive at a mechanism, deliver humanitarian aid, restore America's presence, or contain Iran.

## **Appendix 1: Speech 1:-**

**Time :12 to 14 February 2016.Place : Munich. Duration of speech: 19 min. 21sec:-**

Good afternoon everyone, thank you very much for this kind invitation. I see the topic is the Middle East and I would like to offer a more optimistic note than the one we usually read about or hear about.

I believe that our region is a dynamic region, it is a young region. It is an intermediate region, both historically, between ancient Rome and the modern world, as well as geographically, between the Orient and the Occident.

It is a region that has tremendous resources, a lot of young people, which means a lot of energy. It is a region that is increasingly connected to the world; it is a region that has a lot of wealth, a lot of entrepreneurship.

It is a region that sits at the crossroads of civilization between Asia, Africa, and Europe. And so it is a region that by any measure should have the attributes for greatness. It is a region that has historically been connected to the world

in every way, from the old Nabataean civilizations, to the civilizations of Egypt and Babylonia, up until the modern age.

The problem, however, is that our region faces many challenges. Challenges of underdevelopment, challenges of extremism, challenges of terrorism, challenges of trying to find its identity in the sense that each country is looking for its own identity. It has gone through tremendous upheavals over the past few years, beginning with the events in Tunis, and then Egypt, Syria, Libya, Yemen, Iraq, and other places.

I believe that the rise in sectarianism and the rise of religious extremism and the rise of terrorism are all our challenges that we all have to deal with; we can't deal with them alone. But I do believe, and I remain convinced and hopeful, that in dealing with those challenges, our region will come out of it in a much better place than it was going into it.

And so I don't want to belabor this point, I want to talk a little bit about Saudi Arabia.

Saudi Arabia is a nation of 30 million people, including noncitizens. Saudi Arabia is a nation with a very young population. Saudi Arabia is a nation with tremendous resources, whether minerals, oil, of course.

Saudi Arabia is a nation that has tremendous financial resources, that has first class infrastructure, that has stable government, and geographic location. It has many friends in the world.

Saudi Arabia is a nation that has a history of pragmatism and proportion and balance, in both its internal as well as external policies. And it is a country that, if it has one constant, that constant is change.

We were a tribal nation, we became a modern nation. Within one generation we were able to transform our country in ways that very few other countries were able to do.

Life expectancy rates doubled in one generation, from 37 years to over 70. Infant mortality rates dropped from the level of the least developed countries in the world to the level of European countries in one generation. And the education went from 95 percent illiteracy to 100 percent literacy in one generation. I don't believe that there are many countries in the world that were able to do this.

Women's education, which was nonexistent in 1960, today 55 percent of college students in my country are women. It's unheard of and yet the image of Saudi Arabia is one of an insular country – a country that lives in a different age – because women don't drive.

This issue is an issue that is a cultural issue that our society will deal with on its own terms and in its own ways. But if we look at the overall picture, we are a country that is dynamic and moving forward – a country that evolves in every area.

I mentioned to you the social and the economic changes that have happened in my country. Politically, we are evolving. Our government is institutionalized, we developed government institutions, we developed a legislative branch. 20 percent of the members of our consultative council are women.

We developed human rights organizations and civil society organizations, and this is just the beginning. There is nothing that will prevent us from doing more in terms of our ideology.

We are a country that has no ambitions beyond its borders; we have enough land, people, resources. We are a country that is focused on its internal development and improving the lot of its people.

We are a country that is seeking security, peace, and stability in our area and, by extension, the world. That's who we are and that's what our policies aspire to.

And we have dealt with the challenges in our region this year in ways that the world maybe is not used to. But that's because, frankly, there was a vacuum. And if nobody's willing to do something, then the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and its allies had to step in and do something.



We acted in Yemen to prevent a legitimate government from collapsing and from the country being taken over by a radical militia allied with Iran and Hezbollah, which was in possession of heavy weapons, ballistic missiles, and an air force.

We did so in response to the request of the legitimate government. We have no intention of seizing one inch of the Yemeni territory. We have no intention of trying to dominate Yemen. We want to preserve Yemen. Remove the threat to us and our neighbors and help Yemen get back on its feet.

In Syria, we are working to bring about change, political change if possible, to what is happening in Syria to remove a man who is responsible for the murder of 300,000 people, the displacement of 12 million, and the destruction of a nation.

A man who is the single most effective magnet for extremists and terrorist in the region. That's our objective, and we will achieve it.

We're trying to work with other countries in the region, whether it's Egypt, whether it's Iraq, whether it's Sudan, whether it's countries in the Maghreb (North Africa) to try to help them deal with their economic issues as well as deal with extremism and terrorism – and we will succeed.

Again, I have no doubt. We don't have an ideology we're wedded to, we have pragmatism we adhere to and that we pursue our policies by.

So I think when we look at our country, when we look at the region today, the two areas that stand out the most in reading the newspapers is Daesh and Yemen.

I want to say a little bit about Daesh. Daesh is a terrorist organization composed of psychopaths who have no religion and no morals. They attract other psychopaths and it's a cult. And it will be defeated.

But in order to defeat Daesh, we have to deal with what I call the two elephants in the room. One of those elephants is Bashar al Assad.

We cannot defeat Daesh in Syria unless we bring about change in Bashar al Assad. He is the man who helped create it by releasing radicals from his jails, by allowing Daesh to operate without attacking them, by even trading with them.

He is the man that allowed them to become what they are and unless and until there is a change in Syria, Daesh will not be defeated in Syria. Period.

We have an international coalition of which my country was a founding member that has been bombing Daesh in Syria for 15 months and it's still around. So when Assad goes, the fertile environment in which Daesh operates in Syria will be removed and we can deal with them.

The second elephant in the room is implementing the reforms that were agreed to in Iraq in 2014 that would bring the Sunni community into the fold that would create an equitable system between Sunni, Kurd, Shia, and Caledonians – all Iraqis. That also will pull the rug out from under Daesh in Iraq and allow the country and its allies to defeat it.

Everything else we do is putting scotch tape on an open wound. We've got to deal with the source of it. Those are the two main sources.

Yemen, I'm more optimistic about because the legitimate government of Yemen is now in control of three quarters of the country.

The humanitarian assistance in the areas that are controlled by the government is flowing effectively. The humanitarian suffering that exists in the Houthi Saleh controlled areas is a consequence of the Houthis and Saleh hijacking their people and starving them, and laying siege on their towns in order to score political gains. But that too will come to an end, it takes time.

We will not stop until the job is finished. Our objective for Yemen is a new Yemen, a stable Yemen, a united Yemen, a Yemen that will be open to reconstruction and development that will then result in a prosperous Yemen that will be a good neighbor to us.

And so with this, I've said enough so maybe I'll stop here and take some questions. (Applause.)

Moderator: Thank you very much Mr. Minister. Again, we are already in overtime, so maybe two short question. Who is the first?

I see someone in the back. Could you identify yourself, please? It's hard to see faces from here because of the lights. Audience Member: I'm Crispin Blunt [inaudible]... in London. Foreign Minister, I hate to raise another elephant in the room. Both you and the prime minister in Iraq and His Majesty, King Abdullah before, all talked about Daesh being un-Islamic. Isn't, and I'm quoting here from an article in The Atlantic by Graeme Wood, whom you're certainly familiar with: "The reality is that the Islamic State is Islamic. Very Islamic. Yes, it has attracted psychopaths and adventure seekers, drawn largely from the disaffected populations of the Middle East and Europe. But the religion preached by its most-ardent followers derives from the most coherent, and even learned, interpretations of Islam." And the article obviously goes on to advise us to base our strategy [inaudible]. And I invite you to comment on it.

Foreign Minister: Every religion has perverts and psychopaths who try to hijack it. ISIS is as much Islamic as the KKK is Christian. Don't they have a cross? Don't they do everything in the name of religion and Christ? Don't they believe that Christ compels them to lynch and kill people of African descent? Can one really say that the KKK is a Christian organization? There are other groups that one can point to. There are other massacres that were committed in the name of keeping certain country or regions clear of non-Christians.

There are people like this also in the Jewish faith that have nothing to do with Judaism. There are people like this in the Hindu faith that have nothing to do with Hinduism. For anyone to argue that Daesh is Islamic, is preposterous. In the Islamic faith, the Quran reveals that: you have your faith and I have my faith. And you're free to practice your faith and I'm free to practice mine. What greater sign of tolerance and acceptance do you have than this? In the Islamic faith it says, he who kills an innocent soul is as if he has killed all of humanity. And he who saves an innocent soul, is as if he saved all of humanity. What more, what better example of compassion and mercy do you have than this? So if you look at what Daesh says and you say it's in the scriptures, doesn't The Old Testament say "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth?" If somebody does that today, would you say they were Christian or Jewish?

So, I caution people, because it seems to have become almost novel, not novel, it's become the flavor of the day. To try to read things into Daesh, or into Islam, that are not there. The Islamic religion and Islamic civilization, was the civilization that preserved the history of Greek and Rome and passed it on to the West. Western civilization would not exist without the Islamic Arab civilization. The Islamic civilization and the Islamic Arab civilization was the civilization that connected China with Europe. So it was global. The point I made earlier on, about being an intermediate civilization, this is what I mean. So if Islam was intolerant and Daesh represented Islam, would Islam have preserved Aristotle and Socrates, and passed it on to the West? Would Islam have connected Eastern Civilization with Western Civilization? Of course not.

So I urge you, all of you, to be careful when it comes to making generalizations, or to accepting generalizations that have no basis in fact. Thank you. (Applause.)

Moderator: Thank you. Final question. Is that Ann-Marie Slaughter?

Audience Member: Hi, Anne-Marie Slaughter. The President of New America. Thank you very much for addressing the issue of women in your country. I think you are right to see that this is an increasing issue for many in the world. And that it should be addressed openly. I just wanted to make sure I heard you correctly. Because what I heard you say, was that there is nothing in your culture that prohibits, or retards, the advancement of women. Did I hear that right?

Foreign Minister: What I was saying is that, in our faith, when it comes to some of the issues like women driving, that this is not a religious issue, this is a societal issue. When it comes to issues like education, this is not religious issue, this was a societal issue. But we dealt with it. And we went from no schools for women in 1960, to universal education, to where today, 55 percent of college students in Saudi Arabia are women. I can give you another statistic, but it would embarrass me as a Saudi male. More than 60 percent of graduate students in Saudi Arabia are women. Some of our top doctors and engineers and lawyers and businesspeople are women. So the opportunities are there.

It's not... the, the issue is one that is evolving, just like it is evolving in other countries. America, one of the world's great democracies, gained its independence – my mathematics is not very good – 220 years ago, 1776, 250 years ago almost. It took 100 years before women were given the right to vote. It took another 100 years before a women was elected Speaker of the House. I'm not saying give us 200 years. I'm just saying be patient. And when it comes to societal change, in every society people tend to look at where they are now and they think everybody should be with us. Again I will quote America, maybe because I spent so much of my life there. America was independent in 1776. The Republic was founded, what, two decades later? It took almost 80 years before slavery was abolished. It took 100 years before there was a civil rights movement. And it took another three decades before you had, before you had real racial equality in America.

Things take time. Now you hope that in the modern world with technology and with communications, this process is accelerated. But it takes time. And we must acknowledge this and accept this. We can't expect to rush things over night, otherwise we wouldn't be who we are.

Moderator: Thank you so much Mr. Minister. Let's give a hand to the Foreign Minister of Saudi Arabia. And I certainly hope to be able to welcome you back next year. You should consider this a standing invitation from now on. Thank you very much.

## **Appendix 2: Speech 2:-**

**Time: Saturday 23 July 2016. Place: Brussels. Duration: 13min. 57sec.**

BRUSSELS: Foreign Minister Adel Al-Jubeir gave a fitting reply to the consul general of Iran during a lecture at Egmont Research Center of the Foreign Ministry of Belgium in Brussels, after the consul alleged the Kingdom supported terrorism.

Al-Arabiya broadcast a part of the speech of the Iranian consul general, in which he said: "I believe that saying that Al-Qaeda has any relationship with Iran is a joke. Nobody has forgotten that Bin Laden was a Saudi national and he had strong political and economic relations with the Kingdom. They have also not forgotten that from among 19 people who participated in 9/11 attacks, 15 were Saudi nationals. People sitting in this hall also know which countries who have supported Daesh for several years are."

Responding to this allegation, Al-Jubeir said: "I did not say anything which is not backed by facts. Doesn't the Iranian constitution talk about exporting revolution? Doesn't the Iranian constitution talk about taking care of deprived Shias? Didn't Iran establish Hezbollah? Didn't Iran attack more than 12 embassies inside Iran violating all international laws? We never attacked them. Iran did. Didn't Iran engineer, plan and implement attacks on residences of the American forces in Alkhobar in 1996? Yes, they did.

The officer in charge of this operation was your military attaché in Bahrain. The person who made the bomb was from Hezbollah of Lebanon. The explosives came from Lebanon's Bekaa Valley. The three main leaders of the operation ran away and has been living in Iran since then."

Al-Jubeir continued: "When there were explosions in Riyadh in 2003, Saif Al-Adel was in Iran with Saad Bin Laden, Al-Qaeda's propaganda official, as well as another four or five commanders. We asked Iran to hand them over. But they refused our demand. Some of them are still in Iran."

"The order for bombing the residential complexes of Riyadh in 2003 was given by Saif Al-Adel, commander of Al-Qaeda's operations. He was then staying in Iran. We have recordings of telephone conversation. We did not create this information. Ronald Regan used to say: The facts are stubborn. They are actually stubborn because it is not possible to get around facts. Hezbollah is a terrorist organization. It is clear that it has attacked embassies. The

embassies do not explode themselves. There must be somebody behind it. Diplomats do not kill themselves by firing bullets on themselves three times. There is a person responsible for this,” he added.

Al-Jubeir added: “Iranian agents have links with terrorist attacks in Europe and South America. We did not create these facts. This is the world and this is the proof. We wish that Iran would become a great neighbor. But this depends on both sides. If you want the world to deal with you, then there is a requirement of giving up hostile expansionist policies and return to international norms and practices.”

Addressing the Iranian consul directly, the foreign minister said: “If you don’t want Saudi officials criticizing Iran, then do not behave in a way which attracts criticism. So far your history is full of death and destruction, noncompliance with international law and the principles which have existed since the emergence of the United Nations, particularly those related to good neighborly relations and noninterference in the affairs of others.”

### **Appendix 3: Speech 3:-**

**Time: February 12, 2017. Place: Riyadh. Duration: 22min.08sec:-**

**Minister Al-Jubeir:** First of all I would like to welcome H.E. UN Secretary-General António Guterres in his first visit to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia where he met with the Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King Salman bin Abdulaziz, and HRH the Crown Prince, Deputy Premier, and Minister of Interior Prince Mohammed bin Naif as well as HRH Deputy Crown Prince, Second Deputy Premier and Minister of Defense.

He also visited King Salman Center for Relief and Humanitarian Aid to see the efforts carried out by the Center to deliver aid to those in need. I have also met with H.E. at the Ministry and he would visit a number of sites here in Riyadh before leaving the Kingdom.

The meetings were positive and constructive as we appreciate the UN's role in providing humanitarian aid and its effort in building capacities and resolving conflicts. We talked about the UN's expertise in the 1950s and 1960s when the UN provided Saudi Arabia with assistance in relation to water, medical field, vaccinations, education, and development. This is a matter we appreciate and value and it is one of the reasons why Saudi Arabia is one of UN's most supporting countries.

We discussed the situation in Syria, in Iraq, in Yemen, in Libya, the importance of resolving issues of Islam-phobia and extremism. We talked about ways of activating the role of the United Nations Counter-Terrorism Centre (UNCCT), which was established through a donation from the late King Abdullah bin Abdulaziz. Talks – as I have said- were positive.

We congratulate H.E. on his new post and looking forward to working with H.E. and with the UN and all its agencies in the various fields to work for peace, security and humanity. And I give the floor to H.E.

### **UN Secretary General:-**

Thank you very much, Minister I want to express my deep gratitude and appreciation to His Majesty the custodian of the two Holy Mosques , to Their Royal Highnesses the Crown Prince and the Deputy Crown Prince and to His Excellency the Minister of Foreign Affairs for the very warm hospitality that I was granted here in Saudi Arabia, Saudi Arabia is an important pillar of stability in the region and in the world but it is a country that is living a transformational period with its vision for 2030, that corresponds with 2030 agenda for sustainable development that United Nations are promoting everywhere in the world. and I want to express my strong hope for the success of the transformational agenda of Saudi Arabia strengthening its capacity to play a more and more important role as one of the pillars of multilateralism in today's world.

Indeed there is a very strong cooperation between Saudi Arabia and the United Nations and as His Excellency the minister said that cooperation has been particularly important in relation to counter terrorism enabling United Nations and we will be also reforming our counter terrorism capacity, enabling United Nations to play an increasing role in supporting member states in developing the capacities and the tools that necessary to fight terrorism effectively and at the same time to fight the forms of violent extremism that feed terrorism in the world. and I would like to say that when one looks in to today's world we see terrorism being fueled by many aspects but there is one that is particularly worrying for me, the lack of political solutions in several situations. See Syria, it's very important to fight Daesh, it is very important to combat terrorism in Syria, but we will never be successful in fighting terrorism in Syria if an inclusive political solution is not found for the Syrian people. And at the same time one of the things

that fuel terrorism is the expression in some parts of the world of Islamophobic feelings and Islamophobic policies and Islamophobic hate speeches, these sometimes the best support that Daesh can have to make it some propaganda. So we need to have a comprehensive approach to fight terrorism including creating the conditions for societies (.....) multiethnic, multi religious, multicultural to be inclusive to be cohesive investing in the conditions to make diversity richness not a threat. At the same time I want to express my deep appreciation for the work the that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has done helping the Syrian opposition to come together to present a united delegation to the Geneva conference. This is a very important step for a political solution to be possible for the Syrian conflict. We also share our concern in relation to the risks of situations in several countries hoping namely in the case of Iraq, that after the liberation of Mosul a truly inclusive reconciliation is possible and that all the groups that constitute the state of Iraq are able to live to gather to respect each other and to create conditions for all of them to participate in a untied state of Iraq in which all can feel that its their country and all can feel they are treated equally and the same applies to several other similar situations in the world, to have comprehensive political solutions bringing people to gather is essential from Libya to Yemen to Syria to Iraq. We have the opportunity also to have a very important discussions and a very constructive discussions in relation to the possible future political solutions for Yemen for Libya. `And I want to express once again my deep appreciation for the hospitality that was granted to me and for the very substantive that was possible during this visit.

#### **Q&A:-**

##### **Q.1. (Katie Paul-Ruiters):-**

Thank you so much for the presentation, I have a question for Mr. Al-Jubeir, I am wondering if you can bring us up to date with certain aspects of the Saudi-US relationship. I understand that you were in Washington and New York recently, so I am wondering if you can tell us who you met there and what was discussed and speaking of Syria if Saudi Arabia continues to support the armed Syrian opposition after the fall of Aleppo and if that something the United States continues to be onboard with. If there is any progress on JASTA, and then finally the CIA Director Mike Pompeo was in Saudi Arabia recently and so I wander if you can discuss a little bet about what was addressed in that as well, thank you so much.

##### **Minister Al-Jubeir:-**

I think that was 4 in 1 we should get a discount. The US-Saudi relationship as of always maintained is a historic and tragic relationship that has deep roots that goes back 8 decades with each passing decade the relationship has grown broader, stronger and deeper. We the two countries have seen the coming and breaking of many storms and each challenge that they have overcome, the relationship has grown stronger. Today I would say the Saudi-US relationship is excellent, we see eye to eye when it comes to the situation in Lebanon, in Syria, in Iraq, in Yemen, in Libya, we see eye to eye when it comes to the danger of Iranian interference in the affairs of other countries, we see eye to eye when it comes to fighting terrorism in particular Daesh and Al Qaeda, we see eye to eye when it comes to maintaining open ceilings and preventing forces such as the Houthi and or Iran from interfering with the freedom of navigation in some of the world's most important passage ways and we see eye to eye when it comes to the importance of trade and investment, so yes I would say the US-Saudi relationship is excellent and there is a lot of shared world view and there is an identical position on the major challenges facing the region and also a knowledge of the players, the senior administration officials are known to Saudi Arabia and we have had dealings with them in their previous roles wither in government or out of government, we feel very comfortable with them and so I expect that we will be to very effectively deal with the challenges in the area and serve the interest of both countries. So that's on one side.

With regards to Syria, Saudi Arabia does not provide military support to the Syrian opposition, Saudi Arabia provides military support to the Syrian opposition as part of coalition of countries led by the United States there is no individual Saudi effort to do so and the coalition that support for this moderate Syrian opposition is something the coalition as a whole will take, we believe that the moderate opposition has an important role to play, we believe that they need to be able to defend themselves as well as be able to fight against Daesh and Al Qaeda and decisions with regards to the support and the level of support and the intensity of support, are the decisions that are made as part of the coalition as a whole we have our opinion we express our opinion, but the coalition when it came together several years ago made a decision that we have to all agree that we move in unison, so yes we expect the support to continue and we except that the talks in Geneva will lead to the implementation of the Geneva1 declaration and security council resolution 2254 and lead to political transition in Syria .

with regards to the CIA Director Mike Pompeo's visit to Saudi Arabia, it shouldn't come as a surprise, the US and Saudi Arabia have as i mentioned extensive ties we have extensive challenges that we are working on in counter terrorism and security and maritime security and a whole gamut of issues and it's not unusual for the CIA Director to come to Saudi Arabia quit often as it is for our security officials to go to the US quit often and the discussion generally sent around the challenges that our interests are common interest and the best ways of dealing with those challenges and that's about as much as I can talk about discussions involving the US CIA director in Saudi Arabia.

With regards to JASTA this is an American issue. It is the United States that has the biggest footprint in the world and t is the United States that would be subject to any negative consequences as a result of the erosion of sovereign immunities and I believe that there is serious thought about the need to amend it, this view was expressed to the US by I believe over 90 countries who have concerned about the erosion of the principle of sovereign immunities and what it does to International order and so I would expect that the US will take steps in order to ensure that this important principle to the international order is maintained. Thank you.

**(Awadh Al-Qhtani- Al- Jazirah Newspaper):-**

Your Excellency Minister, Ali Saleh and Houthis militia are stating that the negotiations are dead, what is the position of the coalition countries and that of the UN?

Ministry Al-Jubeir: If Houthis-Salehare stating that the negotiations are dead then this is because of their behavior. More than 70 agreements were made with Houthis-Saleh and they did not meet any of these agreements. We have made agreements with regards to many issues and they have not abide by any of them.

How did the Yemeni crisis start? It started with Insurgent attacks carried out by Houthis-Saleh. GCC countries proposed the GCC initiative that resulted in a transitional government. The Yemeni government and our brothers in Yemen have established the National Dialogue conference that included all constituents of the Yemeni community to come out with a unified vision about the future of Yemen. They have made huge effort and came out with a vision of a new Yemeni government, upon which the government will be established rights for all the components of the Yemeni community, they reached the stage where they worked on a new constitution for Yemen to be voted on and result in elections by virtue of this new constitution to form a fixed government.

They moved from Saada, occupied Imran, thenSanaa. They then carried out a coup and overtook the ministries and government establishments where they moved to Taaz and Adan. They legitimate President was in Sanna in semi-confinement then fled to Adan. They overtook the Presidential Palace in Adan and that government was on the verge of being toppled.

He request assistance by virtue of UN Articles, the coalition countries responded to his request and intervened in Yemen. So the issue began with the coup carried out by Houthis-Saleh.

The war continues in Yemen because of their refusal to abide by the will of the international community and UN Security resolution 2216, which explicitly states that they withdraw from these cities and surrender their heavy and medium weapons. It states that Houthis-Saleh withdraw from the ministries they have occupied, implement the GCC Initiative, the outcomes of the National Dialogue Conference, and UN Security Council resolution 2216. The picture is clear.

All efforts exerted by the UN Special Envoy – which are highly appreciated- failed because of Houthis-Saleh and because of the legitimate government or the coalition members. We always say actions speak louder than words, what we have seen from Houthis-Saleh are all words and the actions we have seen are very negative. A coup, looting of humanitarian aid, besieging cities and villages that resulted in starvation of the Yemen. And they are responsible for that recruitment of children in war. So this is the problem in Yemen.

We hope that Yemen can come out of this tragedy and we are working on continuous delivery of humanitarian aid into all places in Yemen. We are working on establishing a plan to rebuild Yemen. There is a significant amount of money allocated by GCC countries to rebuild Yemen. And we are very keen to restore security, integrity, unity, and stability of Yemen and Yemeni people. We want nothing for them but in to be well. This is the vision of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and coalition members, which is a positive vision while Houthis-Saleh's vision is negative. Thank you.

**UN Secretary General:-**

You know I am a catholic, and Catholics believe in resurrection so if negotiations are that they can always resurrect, and I do believe that they need to for very simple reason the suffering of the Yemeni people, I was high commissioner for refugees for 10 years and I went to Yemen several times, and I've seen the generosity of the Yemeni people, they received being a very poor country refugees from Somalia granting them (.....) sharing everything with them, and to see these people that is so generous suffering so much is something that really breaks my heart, so whatever we can do to make resurrection of the need for people to be able to negotiate to be able to come to a solution for the Yemeni people is something that we'll always be available to (.....).

**Q.3. (Asmahan Al-Ghamdi- Riyadh Newspaper)-**

my question to H.E. the Minister: we know that the UN Special Envoy is exerting tremendous efforts to reach a political settlement of Yemen's crisis, but what is the kind of support UN if providing for its Special Envoy to implement UN resolution 2216 and discuss a political settlement a political settlement of Yemen's crisis. Another question, the coalition complains that some of the international organizations are not present in some provinces in Yemen like the Port of Hodeidah, which results in looting humanitarian aid, so what is your plan to overcome this stage

**UN Secretary General:-**

First of all one of the reasons I'm traveling in the region is exactly to be able to support our envoy in his work and his work is of course to try to do everything in line with international law and with international resolutions for a solution to be possible to end the suffering of the Yemeni people and of course we very much regret anything that is done anywhere in which humanitarian aid is diversity humanitarian aid is for the people that suffer humanitarian aid for those that really need it and so we are very Keen in always appealing to all parts to any conflict not to use humanitarian aid for purposes that are not humanitarian and we will always condemn any form of intervention that will lead for that deviation to take place.

**Q.4. (Khalid Al-Amri- AlArabia TV):-**

Your Excellency UN Secretary-General are there any demands to change the UN Special Envoy by any of the parties, whether by the legitimate government or the rebels? A question to H.E. the Minister was there a decrease in the level of international support of the coalition's military operations in Yemen?

UN Secretary General: My answer is very simple our envoy has my full support and i believe that he is doing an impartial work and is doing it an professional way and independently of other people may think, he has my full support.

**Minister Al-Jubeir:-**

Before I answer the question. I emphasize the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia's respect of the efforts exerted by the UN Special Envoy and we value these tremendous efforts, our trust in him, and we hope that is able to succeed in this difficult mission, and we are willing to provide him with all the support he needs. With regard to a decrease in the level of international support in Yemen, we did not see that. The operations in Yemen are not random. These are operations that are carried out by virtue of UN Security Council Resolution 2216 and upon a request from the legitimate Yemeni government. We did not see any decrease in the level of support.

**Q.5. (Gadanfar Ali Khan –Arab News):-**

your excellency I represent Arab News the English daily of Saudi Arabia my question is directed to the His excellency you in chief, there have been inner calls for the last several years that there is a substantial reforms in the UN system and this is for the last ten years like, i would like to know that under your leadership what changes you perceive and what kind of call you perceive for Saudi Arabia within the framework of those reforms, thank you.

**UN Secretary General:-**

What I perceive and what I want is a very open and loyal cooperation between Saudi Arabia and the UN as I said we can see the Saudi Arabia to be a key global player and a key pillar of multilateralism and we want to have with Saudi Arabia a very constructive and positive relationship

**Appendix 4: Speech 4:-**

**Time: February 8, 2017. Place: Ankara. Duration:12.min, 48sec:-**

**Q&A:-**

**Q1: (TahaOuda - Saudi TV):** My question is to His Excellency Mr. Adel Al-Jubeir. Your Excellency, can we say that this meeting is a new milestone on the road to a strategic partnership between the two countries? Especially that there is an understanding and convergence of views on a number of regional issues between the Kingdom and Turkey, and there are also sensitive issues that require both parties to meet in order to solve them. That's my question to you your Excellency. And for Your Excellency Minister Davutoglu .....[Turkish text].

**Minister Al-Jubeir:** Thank you very much for your question. No doubt, today's meeting—where leaders of both countries [inaudible], and which groups have been working on for several months, and now that we were able to hold the first meeting of the Coordinating Council of the two countries—I believe it is without doubt a significant milestone in building or strengthening existing strategic relations between the two countries. And we expect, God willing, that the efforts of this Council will strengthen relations in all fields, whether security, military, cultural, commercial, education, agriculture or other areas that serve both countries' interests and the interests of the two brotherly peoples. We look forward, as I mentioned, to more cooperation between the two countries. The two countries are of the leading countries in the region, and the two biggest economies in the region. [The two countries] have a shared vision in addressing the challenges and risks in the region, and there is an existing cooperation between the two countries in all fields. And we seek to strengthen this cooperation to be able to deal with the challenges facing the region in order to find security, stability and peace in the region; and to serve the interests of both countries and serve international security and peace. Thank you.

**Turkish Minister Davutoglu:** I agree with my brother, Adel Al-Jubeir, on what he said. First of all, we have to explain to everyone that this matter is to normalize our relationship and move it to a higher level. And through this coordination, we will address the various issues between our two countries, and we will take necessary decisions in a coordinated manner between our two countries, and [take decisions about] special issues in this region. Everyone has expectations from of this relationship, and we also have interests—whether we, as Turkey or Saudi Arabia, we all have our interests in this relationship. Thus, we have to do our best to coordinate better in order to perform this duty between our two countries. And I want to make it clear that the decisions we have made during this meeting are important decisions, and we will benefit even more from future meetings. As you mentioned, the [Turkish] President will pay an extended visit to Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and others, and we always say that we see the Gulf states, starting with Saudi Arabia, as a guarantee for our stability and peace in the region. Thus, the visit of Mr. Recep Tayyip Erdogan, the President of our country, is to normalize relations and to improve them with these countries, and it will also be beneficial for talks about topics related to the region.

**Q2: (TRT World):** I want to ask Mr. Al-Jubeir first, as for the Syrian crisis, and finding a radical solution there, Turkey played an important role. As for the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, especially within the framework of the Astana talks, will we see the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in these talks and meetings, and will you play a bigger role and take larger steps in these issues? I also, would like to ask the Foreign Minister, Mr. Recep Tayyip Erdogan and Mr. Trump had a phone call, did they talk about Al-Bab? They discussed some of issues and that there are recent developments in that area, are there specific agenda about this issue?

**Minister Al-Jubeir:** With regard to the Syrian crisis, the Saudi and Turkish positions are identical. Saudi Arabia and Turkey were among the founding members of the Friends of Syria Group, which held its first meeting in Paris, and includes 10 countries that support the moderate Syrian opposition. Our position (54) is to create a transitional body authority, to have a ceasefire, and to allow humanitarian aid throughout Syria. Our position is to maintain the unity of Syria, and its security and independence; and to allow the Syrian people to build a state that represents them and achieves their ambitions. That is what we are pursuing, but unfortunately there are interventions in Syria by Iran and Hezbollah, which complicated the search for a peaceful solution in Syria. But we are still working with the international community and with the international group to support Syria in order to implement Geneva Declaration 1 and Security Council Resolution (2254). And we all hope that the talks in Astana will lead to an agreement on the mechanism of the ceasefire and allowing humanitarian assistance in all areas of Syria.

Regarding security cooperation between Saudi Arabia and Turkey, cooperation exists. The Kingdom supports Turkey's efforts in confronting terrorism, and Turkey supports the Kingdom's efforts in confronting terrorism. We believe that the PKK and Kurdish Democratic Union Party (PYD) are terrorist organizations that have no place, and we support any efforts to eliminate terrorism anywhere in the world.

With terrorism in Syria, we are talking about Daesh, al-Qaeda and other terrorist organizations. Saudi Arabia believes in, and it is a founding member of, the international coalition to fight Daesh in Syria. The Saudi Air Force



continues operations over Syrian airspace to target terrorist organizations there, and these processes are on-going, and we are looking forward to working with Trump's administration to intensify efforts to eliminate Daesh and to work with brotherly countries, mainly Turkey, in this area.

**Minister Davutoglu:** Thank you for your question. Last night in Turkey, Mr. Recep Tayyip Erdogan, President of the Republic, as well as President Trump had a phone call and they discussed strengthening relations between the two countries, and both parties explained what can be done in this area. And there were also talks about issues in the region, and they also assessed the combat and the fight against terrorism in the region and the fight against Daesh. We have, as you know, aligned positions on the fight against Daesh in Syria, and this is a common goal between us and the United States. And Mr. Recep Tayyip Erdogan explained to Mr. Trump what Turkey has done during the latest period in fighting Daesh, and what can be done in the next stages. And, as you know, we have three key cities in the next phase: Al-Bab, Al-Raqqa and Mosul in Iraq. These are strategic cities for Daesh, and therefore we will continue to try to eradicate Daesh in these three cities. We have agreed with Mr. Trump and with the United States on joint cooperation to resolve this issue, and you know that Turkish troops along with the free Syrian troops have gone a long way. And with the air support from the coalition, we hope that this process gets completed as soon as possible. Then, we will have an Al-Raqqa operation, and our goal is to partner with the proper authorities in order to eradicate Daesh.

#### **Appendix 5: Speech 5:-**

**Time: 24 January 2017. Place: Riyadh. Duration: 33,min.14,sec:-**

Saudi Foreign Minister Adel Al-Jubeir: In the beginning, I would like to welcome my friend and colleague H. E. French Foreign Minister, Jean-Marc Ayrault, in his first visit to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Welcome Your Excellency. The Saudi-French relations- as you know- are historic and strategic relations that were established in 1926.

Over the past decades the positions of the two countries are aligned in relation to many issues. The challenges the region encounters whether in Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, Yemen, Libya, terrorism, financial issues, trade and economic, the peace process in the Middle East, and Iran's interference in the affairs of the countries of the region. We see that the positions of the two countries are very very aligned and compatible, which is a rarity between two friendly countries.

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is one of France's most important trade partners. And vice versa, France is the third largest investor in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. We value France's position with regards to the peace process. We congratulate France on the success of the peace conference that was held in Paris a few days ago, which included more than 70 countries to reaffirm the importance of working to resolve this issues based on the two-state solution and establishing a Palestinian State with East Jerusalem as its capital.

We also value France's historic position in Lebanon, its position regarding the Syrian crisis and in Iraq. And France's strong position in the 5+1 negotiations with Iran, France's position towards Yemen, France's positions towards Libya. These are all issues we talked about.

Today's morning, the Custodian of the two holy Mosques received H. E. the talks were very positive. They reaffirmed the Kingdom's keenness towards its relations with France and France's keenness towards its relations with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Once again I welcome my friend and colleague His Excellency the FM and give him the floor to speak and we will answer two or three questions after His Excellency's speech.

#### **French Foreign Minister, Jean-Marc Ayrault:-**

Thank you very much my friend and colleague Adel Al-Jubeir for his reception. Since my appointment as Foreign Minister we had several meetings and had many discussions either bilateral talks like today in my first visit to the Kingdom and also meeting continuously in Paris as well as meetings at international organizations. All of this explains the type of dialogue and the level of dialogue and trust.

I have also noticed that Adel Al-Jubeir who is also a partner and is always willing. We discussed a number of issues of concern after my audience with the Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques.

Our relationship with Saudi Arabia is strategic and we want to enhance and strengthen. We are both determined to defeat terrorism and bring about peace in the region and the countries that are suffering from terrorism. We know that both our countries are threatened and are victims of terrorism.

To us, the fight against terrorism is before anything else is the fight against Daesh and Al-Qaeda. I have indicated the necessity of collaboration to fight extremism. This is what is done by the Kingdom and us in our French community. But we have to better coordinate this endeavor at the international level. We have to eradicate the terrorist networks that are existing and have not yet vanished. And also to work on drying up terrorism financing sources within the framework of the funding of terrorism. Within the international framework there is an international coalition led in participation with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and this team is doing an excellent job. I have also seen that the views on a significant number of issues align and are compatible. Liberation of Mosul, the center of Daesh, and to move forward with this fight to reach Al-Riqqa in Syria. I have conveyed to my colleague our commitment to the operations in the field and our trust in the ability of Arab forces to liberate these cities.

But in addition to the military aspect, what is important is that if we want Daesh to lose and end in final defeat, we are in the need for political solutions that involves all different and diversified sectarian groups and this is true, especially in Iraq where we see a particular segment of the fabric of the community not involved in the government back then.

There is danger-there remains the danger of extremism and to us this is a central issue. The national reconciliation is a must and it is necessity.

With regards to Syria, we are aware of the horrific and tragic situation and the killing of thousands as well as the displacement of millions and the destruction of the country. We want to reach a permanent ceasefire and to deliver humanitarian aid to the suffering people then reach a political solution.

This is an aspect that we share the same outlook, working in light of Geneva-1 communique and UN Security Council Resolution 2254 which should be the basis for the political transition. Today there is a meeting at Istana, we wish success of this meeting. But at least for an issue of priority, which actual cessation of military operations, I do not know if an agreement will be reached. We hope so, but what we are saying is that the negotiations in Geneva should be resumed as soon as possible within the framework of the United Nations and under its auspices.

We also discussed the situation in Yemen and we support the United Nations efforts and its Special Envoy in order to reach a political solution. To us this is the only way: a truce and political dialogue as soon as possible without overlooking the humanitarian situation. We talked about this issue many a times and this morning. I have thanked Adel Al-Jubeir and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for the Kingdom's participation in the conference we have held on January 15th on the peace process.

The final statement allowed for reaffirming the importance of the Arab Peace Initiative launched by the Kingdom in 2002, which remains the current issue. This initiative is a reminder of the international community's traditional position, which is re-emphasize that there is no peace solution without establishing a Palestinian states that lives in peace side by side with Israel. And this does not take place except through means of negotiations between the two parties and through us organizing this conference in Paris. What we wanted to do is to indicate the necessity and urgency of this matter and not to lead people to misery and violence. And the necessity of resuming negotiations along the 67 borders with Jerusalem as the capital of the Palestinian State.

Relationship with the Kingdom of course has an economic dimension, it is an intensive relationship, and the Kingdom is France's first economic partner in the region. And in the first ten months of 2016, we still have not received final figures, but for the first ten months of 2016 our exports increased by 20% compared to 2015, which is something we are working on making it constant.

There is a contract to purchase airbus planes that was announced last week for 2017. And this is a promising sign. This morning I was very pleased to have visited Riyadh Metro that is built by Alstom, is one of the biggest and best French companies, which is building half of the lines not all of them also with the participation of Saudi companies in civil engineering. But I was told that this is the biggest Metro workshop in the world, which reflects the

Kingdom's aspiration in the area of facilities and infrastructure and also French companies' ability to respond to these needs.

So this was a symbolic visit there are also other projects launched by the Kingdom and we are willing to participate in these projects, and particularly we place our work entirely within the framework of the strategy announced by HH Deputy Crown Prince and we will have a chance to discuss this matter in detail this afternoon.

I visited King Abdulaziz City for Science and Technology and discussed the matter of research, technology, start-up companies, and diversified economy the Kingdom wants to develop. And I have seen a practical representation of what 2030 Vision is, even if it involves a number of elements that requires improvement and diversification of the Saudi economy.

We are ready to work with Saudi Arabia, we are willing for more political and strategic cooperation and to work together to resolve conflicts, overcome crisis, and enhance peace as well as build a balanced world that opens horizon for the youth. And this is true from the economic, the educational, and the cultural perspectives. The French-Saudi strategic partnership exists, it is strong in a fluctuating and changing world with political decisions such as the Brexit, and restoring the balance of power. It is important to have stable power and the Kingdom is one of those stable powers. And the French-Saudi strategic cooperation is also one of factors of stability.

Q&A:

**Q1: Bader Al-Rubayn (Al Jazeera):-**

My question to H.E. Foreign Minister Adel Al-Jubeir. Your Excellency the current Syrian opposition- Syrian regime negotiations that are held in Astana, Kazakhstan. My question is what is the Saudi position towards these negotiations and also is there a Saudi-Turkish in that regard?

**\Saudi Foreign Minister Adel Al-Jubeir:-**

the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia's position is that it supports any efforts that lead to cease fire and facilitate the delivery of humanitarian aid into Syria and any efforts the leads to the resumption of cease fire on the basis of Geneva-I Declaration and the United Nations Security Council resolution 2254, which states that there should be a National Transitional Council to manage the affairs of the country and takes Syria to a new future. The talks in Astana between the fighting parties and the regime are for the purpose of arriving at a mechanism to cease fire and facilitate the delivery of humanitarian aid and then move to Geneva discussions or political talks under the umbrella on the basis of the points of references I just mentioned. Saudi-Turkish coordination is very solid and ongoing and we support- as I said- the efforts that leads to taking Syria out of the crisis it is currently living.

**Q2: Ian (Journalist):-**

Good afternoon, generally speaking, how do you see the policy of President Trump towards Saudi Arabia and the Middle East? A similar question to Minister Al-Jubeir you expressed your optimism towards some of the President Trump's positions such as his position towards Iran. But at the same time he spoke of prohibiting Muslims from entry into the States as well as his National Security Advisor who made harsh statements about Islamic extremism and Islamic hysteria, etc. thank you.

**French Foreign Minister, Jean-Marc Ayrault:-**

There is a new President in the United States who gradually started working and until the new Administration is completed, we will discover the practical aspects of his policy, especially the United States' international policy. Of course we have many questions and queries.

I spoke about Iran's nuclear deal, but there are other questions. The first question is about the United States' commitment to the war against terrorism and this is the topic of the hour. Also other issues such as the other regional files that I talked about in my opening speech inclusive of the Israeli-Palestinian file. What is the United States' position towards the future of the Paris agreement on climate and transformations in the field of energy? This is vital for the future of the universe. And how would the US trading policy and trade initiatives look like in the future. All of these questions are present as well as relationships with Russia and Ukraine. I have sent a message to the American Administration and to our future colleague Rex Tillerson.

Adel and I have already talked about this matter. I am willing to meet with him and exchange viewpoints with him as soon as possible. The matter is not to re-conduct the American elections. It is not our business to interfere in the internal affairs of the United States. But the United States is a great nation and has responsibility towards the world even if it is defending the interest of its people. Yet this cannot be achieved unless there is a multilateral approach at least, in our opinion, in international policy. It is vital that we talk with each other.

Germany will head the G-20 the first international conference held early February and I believe the new US Secretary of State will attend. But we are ready to speak with him prior to that conference and speak frankly and trustfully. France and the United States have been allies for a very long time and therefore we have shared values. We sometimes disagree and it is in the best interests of everyone that we discuss these issues directly without falling for the trap of doubts but by remaining faithful to our view of the world I have mentioned.

Saudi Foreign Affairs Adel Al-Jubeir: Let me begin by saying that the US- Saudi relationship is a very long relationship and a very strategic relationship. It is very multi-faceted. We have very strong ties and have had for decades in the area of security, in the military field, in the political field, in the economic field in the investment field, and the people-people relationship. Half of the Saudi young men and women who are studying abroad in the government of scholarships and their numbers is roughly around 200 thousands- half of them are studying in the United States. Their experience there has been phenomenal. It has been positive. They have acquired skills and knowledge that they will bring back to their country in order to further and advance our nation.

I believe that the US people have spoken when they elected President Trump as their President. And we all have to respect the will of the American people. We look forward to working with Trump's administration to further the bilateral relationship and to further-- and to deal positively with the challenges --Nemours challenges whether we are talking about Syria or Iraq or Yemen, Libya, fighting terrorism, dealing with the global financial issues, the energy.

The positions that President Trump has articulated are ones that we are completely in accordance with: restoring America's presence in the world is something we- and all of the American- welcome because the lack of an American engagement leads to a vacuum. And vacuum in the international system will be filled with evil forces. And we all have to work double down and fight and push back against those evil forces at great cost. So an America that is engaged, is an America that plays a positive role in the world, something we welcome.

The President Trump has stated as his objective the defeat of Daesh. We and every civilized country in the world support this goal. And we look forward to working with the Administration on realizing this objective. He has spoken about containing Iran and limiting its ability to cause mischief and making sure that Iran abide to the letter with the nuclear agreement that was signed. Exactly this is our position. And we look forward to working with them in this area.

He has made his objective to rebuild traditional alliances or alliance with traditional American allies. And this is something we also welcome.

So we look forward to working with the Trump Administration. And we are very positive about the future of the Saudi-US relationships. And we look forward as I said to working with Trump Administration.

When you look at the individuals that President Trump has appointed or nominated for key positions whether we are talking about General Mattis for the Defense Department, General Kelly for Homeland Security, Mike Pompeo for CIA, Rex Tillerson at the State Department. When we are talking about Mr. Wilbur Ross at the Commerce Department, Steve Mnuchin at the Treasury Department. These are very very impressive individuals they are highly capable. They are highly experienced and they have a very realistic and a wise view of the world and of America's in it.

So once again I say we are very very optimistic about the Trump Administration. And working closely with Administration to deal with the many challenges, not only in our region, but in the world.

**Q3: AbdulhadiHabtour (Al-Sharq Al-Awsat):-**

French Foreign Minister during the recent French elections some of the candidates accused Saudi Arabia of supporting extremism and terrorism. How do you comment on these accusations and its impact on the French-Saudi relations, especially since you are aware –through the Saudi-French coordination committee, of the Kingdom's efforts in fighting terrorism?

A question to H.E. Foreign Minister Adel Al-Jubeir concerning the statements that were made a few days ago by the Iranian's President where he said that the problem with the Kingdom revolves around the Kingdom's interference in Yemen and Bahrain and he also said that there were a number of attempts to mediate between the countries and restore their relations with one another. How do you comment on these statements? Thank you.

Saudi Foreign Minister Adel Al-Jubeir: Let me also wrap up one item to the last question that you asked. We have also—I say what I say about our positive outlook. Because we have had contact with the Trump Administration to review on these issues. And we feel very strongly.

In terms of the statements you mentioned which belongs to General Flynn. General Flynn is an individual we know from his time Defense Intelligence Agency and from his time as Central Command. He is an American patriot. He is a man concerned about the security of the United States. And he is a man who believes in working very closely with American Allies, including the United States. So again I personally look forward to working with General Flynn and with all our colleagues in the American Administration. I have no doubts whatsoever that the—that our ability to overcome the challenges will be tremendously enhanced the closer we work together.

On the subject of the Iranian President's statements, the mediation between Saudi Arabia and Iran, and the so-called Kingdom's interference in Bahrain, interference in Bahrain, Bahrain is an ally and a brethren country who requested support from the Kingdom and United Arab Emirates. We provided the support because it is our duty.

Concerning Yemen, the Kingdom responded to a request put forth by the legitimate government and intervened in Yemen on the basis of the Security Council resolution 2216 to protect the legitimate government against a coup that was carried out by Houthis and Saleh. Do not forget that the Kingdom and other GCC countries proposed the Gulf Initiative that aims to rescue Yemen from that crisis. A transitional government was formed with President Mansour AbdrabuHadi as its president. The National Yemen Dialogue was established and included all various entities in Yemen, who put forth a vision for the future of Yemen. A committee was formed to produce a Yemeni constitution which will be presented to the Yemeni people to approve it. Then elections will be held to elect a permanent government in Yemen.

All of these are positive steps but the movement of Houthis from Saada and occupied Amran, occupied Sana, and took over the legitimate government in Yemen, and carried out a coup, then moved to Taaz and Aden attempting to take out the legitimate President. The Kingdom interfered upon a request from the legitimate government in Yemen and also to prevent a revolting radical group allied to Iran and Hezbollah from taking over Yemen, who is in possession of an air force and ballistic missiles, posing a threat to the Kingdom and the countries in the region. So the Kingdom's interference is very legitimate.

I believe that the source of the problems between the Kingdom and Iran started with the Iranian revolution-Khomeini's 1979 revolution. It is when Iran adopted a sectarian policy, when Iran sought to create a rift in the Islamic world between the different sects, when Iran adopted the policy of sponsoring terrorism, when Iran established Hezbollah- a terrorist militia in Lebanon, by attacking embassies, assassinating diplomats, carrying out terrorist attacks not only in the region, but also in Europe, South America and other areas. That is the source of the problem. The actions Iran is committing in Syria are war crimes.

What is Iran is doing in Iraq is a very huge interference in the affairs of an Arab country. Iran's smuggling of weapons and ammunitions and planting terrorists cells in the countries of the region- including the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, are against international norms and laws. Iran provides Houthis with weapons. There were a number of ships that were apprehended that contained ammunitions and missiles sent to the Houthis. There were elements of Iran's Revolutionary Guards in Yemen, Iraq, and Syria. These are the problems that started with Iran.

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia did not commit any act of aggression against Iran. We did not blow up their embassies, we did not assassinate their diplomats. Those acts are not the values we uphold. The Kingdom of Saudi

Arabia is always reaching out in friendship to neighboring countries. We hope that Iran would be able to change its ways and its policies to conform to international norms, values, and ethics on the basis of adopting a policy of non-interference in the affairs of others and respect the principle of good neighborliness so that we can have the best of relations with Iran. Ultimately, it is in our and their best interest to co-exist in a peaceful manner and have no differences or confrontations. But as they say, one hand cannot clap.

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has tried to establish relations with Iran. Iran continues its policy of aggression towards the Kingdom since the Khomeini's 1979 revolution and sadly will not let go of these policies. If Iran wants to have the best relations with the Kingdom and the countries in the region, it has to adopt reasonable policies based on the principle of non-interference in the affairs of others and the principle of good neighborliness.

French Foreign Minister, Jean-Marc Ayrault: of course, there is a lot of criticism. If I am here today, it is because of my convictions. France's conviction that in this unstable- sometimes in a state of war- region of the world, our conviction that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is a stable and responsible country, which explains the Saudi-French strategic partnership. As I said, we are facing a destabilizing threat and this threat is -first and foremost- terrorism. Terrorism affects Saudi Arabia as much as it has affected France and other countries. And recently you have had terrorist attacks. There is cooperation between the intelligence of the two countries, and from Saudi Arabia and France not many know that.

There were initiatives, specially a new coalition that includes 40 countries proposed by an initiative from Saudi Arabia. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is also participating in the international coalition targeting – like France- terrorists. The Saudi authorities, especially the Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, have condemned terrorism. Also the highest religious authority in the Kingdom- the Kingdom's Grand Mufti- deemed Daesh and Al-Qaeda as the number one enemy to Islam, indicating that Muslims are the first victims of extremism and we must always remember that. There are reforms that have been adopted over the past few years since 2014 for example fighting the funding of terrorism, all the donations that are sent abroad within the framework of Zaka should be disclosed so that they are not used to finance terrorism. I say this because many people know this, even in France. This law complements existing procedures that are adopted to fight money-laundering in specific cases. And I know that the Ministry of Interior is vigilant and diligent in this respect.

Finally, I believe that a lot of work is being done. We spoke about countering radicalism or religious extremism. That the spread of religious extremism can be done through internet and can affect our societies, especially the youth. Work is being done now to eradicate this extremism even through international cooperation. We are very concerned about what is taking place here. And this is a matter that is not very well known, including setting up parameters to regulate the conduct of preachers to avoid extremists who may tarnish Islam or cause the youth to follow a misleading path.

Lastly, as I have said earlier, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is in the process of developing the country within the 2030 vision to make the Kingdom strong and diversified, not only economically but also make it a country that is open to the modern world. And the topics we always discuss in utmost frankness and respect including the issues of gender equality and human rights. I have met with representative who came to France and I have met with them, members of the Saudi Shoura Council and there were many questions about the conduct of the affairs of the society and the current ongoing discussions circulating it. For that reason it is important to come to Riyadh to understand and better learn these issues and then talk about them with an informed background, because talking without having the information does not allow for progress and from that perspective, my visit was useful.

## **Appendix 6: Grice's Maxims:-**

### **Maxim of quantity:-**

"Make your contribution as informative as required."

"Don't make your contribution more informative than required."

### **Maxim of quality:-**

"Be truthful."

"Don't say what you believe to be false."

"Don't say what you lack adequate evidence for."

**Maxim of relation:-**

"Be relevant."

**Maxims of manner:-**

"Be perspicuous."

"Avoid obscurity of expression."

"Avoid ambiguity."

"Be brief."

"Be orderly."

**Criteria of Analysis: Following Fairclough & Van Dijk:**

1. Reiteration
2. Intertextuality
3. Register
4. Modality
5. Topics
6. Presuppositions and Implications
7. Pronominal Distribution
8. Nominalization

**References:-**

1. Al-Sowaidi, B., Banda, F., and Mansour, A. (2015). Doing Politics in the Recent Arab Uprising: Towards a Political Discourse Analysis of the Arab Spring Slogans. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 1-25.
2. Arabnews, The Middle East Leading English Language Daily, Saturday 23 July 2016. Retrieved from: <http://www.arabnews.com/node/958321/Saudi-arabia> on April 26, 2017. And from: <http://youtube/FqSzIxxkspBQ>
3. Billing, M. (2008). The language of critical discourse analysis: *Discourse & Society*, Vol. 19, 6, 783-800.
4. Birch, D. (1989). *Language, Literature and Critical Practice: Ways of analyzing Text*. London and New York: Routledge.
5. Chilton, P., & Schaffner, C. (1997). Discourse and politics. In T. A. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction*. London: Sage.
6. Chilton, P., & Schaffner, C. (2002). Introduction: Themes and principles in the analysis of political discourse. In P. Chilton & C. Schaffner (Eds.), *Politics as text and talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse* (pp. 1-41). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
7. D'Amato, A. Anthony (1989). *Introduction to Law and Legal Thinking*. Editions Anthropos. Paris. England.
8. Dillon, G. L., Doyle, A., Eastman, C. M., Kline, S., Silberstein, S., & Toolan, M. The Rhetorical Construction of a President. *Discourse and Society* 1 (2): 189- 200.
9. Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. New York: Routledge.
10. Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
11. Fairclough, N. (1995a). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.
12. Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power*. Pearson Education Limited.
13. Fairclough, N. (2005) 'Critical Discourse Analysis', *Marges Linguistiques* 9: 76-94.
14. Farrelly, M. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis in Political Studies: An Illustrative Analysis of the 'Empowerment' Agenda*. *Politics*, Vol. 30, 2, 98-104.
15. Fish, S. (1980). *Is there a text in this class? The Authority of Interpretative Communicaties*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
16. Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the News*. London: Routledge.
17. Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G. and Trew, T. (1979). *Language and Social Control*. London: Routledge.
18. Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.
19. Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
20. Halliday, M. A. K. (1983). Foreword to Cummings and Simons.
21. Halliday, M. A. K. (1985a). *Spoken and Written Language*. Geelong: Deakin University Press.
22. Halliday, M. A. K. (1985b). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
23. Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Arnold.
24. Harris, S. 1991. Evasive action: How politicians respond to questions in political interviews and campaign effect. *Annu. Rev.* 2000.51:149-169.

25. Hasan, Ruqaiya. (1971). *Rime and Reason in Literature*. In Seymour Chatman (ed.), *Literary style: a symposium*. New York: Oxford University Press.
26. Herman, V. (1995). *Dramatic discourse. Dialogue as Interaction in Plays*. London and New York: Routledge.
27. Hunston, S. and Thompson, G. (Eds). (2001). *Evaluation in Text*.
28. . In P. Scannell (ed) *Broadcast talk: 76-99*. London: Sage.
29. Jakobson, R. (1960). *Closing Statement; Linguistics and Poetics*. In Sebeok T.A. (ed.), *Style in Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
30. Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1995). *Creative constructive controversy: Intellectual challenge in the classroom*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.
31. Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (2000). Civil political discourse in a democracy: The contribution of psychology. *Journal of Peace Psychology*, 6, 291-317. [Electronic version]. Retrieved December 22, 2006, from <http://www.co-operation.org/pages/contro-pol.html>.
32. Keyser, Samuel Jay. (1980). "Wallace Stevens: Form and Meaning in Four Poems." In Marvin K. L. Ching, Michael C. Haley, and Ronald F. Lunsford. (eds.), *Linguistic Perspectives on Literature*. London: Routledge.
33. Klebanov, P. B., Diermier, D., and Beigman, E. (2008). *Lexical Cohesion Analysis of Political Speech. Political Analysis*, Vol. 16, No. 4, Special Issue, pp. 447-463.
34. Lakoff, G. (1991). *Metaphor in politics: An open letter to the internet from George Lakoff*. Retrieved December 22, 2006, from Center for the Cognitive Science of Metaphor Online Web site: <http://www.uoregon.edu/~uophil/metaphor/lakoff-1.htm>
35. Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M., (1980, [1995]). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press .Retrieved from <http://www.press.uchicago.edu/Misc/Chicago/467716.html>
36. Lakoff, G.(1995).*Metaphor, morality and politics. Or, why conservatives have left liberals in the dust*. Retrieved from <http://www.rockridgeinstitute.org/research/lakoff/newschool.pdf>
37. Littell, F. H.(1995). "The Language of Assault vs the Language of Dialogue". **The Christian Ethics Today Foundation**, December 1995 (Issue 4 Page 23). Retrieved from <http://christianethicstoday.com/cetart/index.cfm?fuseaction=Articles.main&ArtID=259>
38. Maynard, S. K. 1994. *Images of Involvement and Integrity: Rhetorical Style of a Japanese Politician*. *Discourse and Society* 5(2): 233-261.
39. Maynard, S.K. (1999) 'On Rhetorical Ricochet: Expressivity of Nominalization and da in Japanese Discourse', *Discourse Studies* 1: 57-81.
40. Mazrui, A. (1975). *The political sociology of the English language*. The Hague: Mouton.
41. McGregor, S. (2003).[Critical Science and Critical Discourse Analysis](#). Vol. 15, No. 1.
42. Orwell, G. (1949). *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London: Secker & Warburg. Retrieved from Oxford University Press. Oxford.
43. Pinter, H.(2005, December).*Art, truth, & politics*. Retrieved From <http://www.Nobelprize.org>. [http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel\\_prizes/literature/laureates/2005/pinter-lecture-e.html](http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/2005/pinter-lecture-e.html)
44. Praitmoko, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis of susilobanbangyudhoyono's speech*. Semarang: Dian Nuswantoro University.
45. Ranney, A. (1975). *The governing of men* (4<sup>th</sup>ed.) Hinsdale, IL: The Dryden Press.
46. Rylance, S. and Simons, J. (2001). *Literature in Context*. Palgrave: Macmillan.
47. Salkie, R. (1995). *Text and Discourse Analysis*. London and New York: Routledge.
48. Schaffner, C. (1996). *Editorial: Political speeches and discourse analysis*. [Electronic version]. *Current issues in language & society*, 3, 201-204. Retrieved December 21, 2006, from <http://www.multilingual-matters.net/cils/003/0201/cils0030201.pdf>.
49. Seidel, G. 1988b. *Verbal strategies of the collaborators. A discursive analysis of the yudhoyono's speech*. Semarang: Dian Nuswantoro University.
50. Shanto, Adam. (2000). *New perspective and evidence on political communication and campaign effect*. *Annu. Rev.* 2000.51:149-169.
51. Stubbs, M. (1993). *Words and phrases*. Oxford: Blackwell.
52. Thompson, G. and Hunston, S. (2001). *Evaluation: An Introduction*. In
53. Transnational Publishers, Inc. Irvington-on-Hudson. New York.
54. Van Dijk, T. (1993a). *Principles of critical discourse analysis*. *Discourse & society*,4, 249-283.
55. Van Dijk, T. A. (1995) *Discourse analysis as ideology analysis*. Retrieved December 26, 2016 from <http://www.discourse.org>.
56. Van Dijk, T. A. (1996). *Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.



57. Van Dijk, T. A. (1998b). What is political discourse analysis? In: Jan Blommaert & Chris Bulcaen (Eds.), *Political linguistics*. (pp. 11-52). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
58. Van Dijk, T. A. (2001, April). Political discourse and ideology. Retrieved from <http://www.discourse-in-society.org>
59. Van Dijk, T. A. (2003). Ideology and discourse: A multidisciplinary introduction. Retrieved December 21, 2006, from Teun A. van Dijk Web site: <http://www.discourses.org/UnpublishedArticles/Ideology%20and%20discourse.pdf>
60. vanDijk, T. A. (2006). *Politics, Ideology, and Discourse*. Spain: Elsevier Ltd.
61. Wodak, R. (2006) 'Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis', in J.-O. Östman and J. Verschueren (eds) *Handbook of Pragmatics*, pp. 1-24. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
62. Wodak, R. (2007) 'Pragmatics and Critical Discourse Analysis: A Cross-disciplinary Inquiry', *Pragmatics & Cognition*, 19: 203-25.
63. Yule, G. (1997). *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.