Identity and Power Relation in the Discourse

To the Allies of America

Abd. Muqit

State Polytechnic of Malang, East java Indonesia, Indonesia

Identity reflects one's identity in society and shows his/her role among the others in social practice. It can be seen from his/her position, role, and function within community around him/her. Along with the identity, power relation asserts the identity in its application. This research investigates the identity and power relation of Osama bin Laden represented in his discourse *To the Allies of America*, using the pronoun. The topic of identity is chosen because it marks his uniqueness, strong conviction, and belief on his religion, Islam, and his Arabness to the same Muslims and the westerners. The power relation reveals the ways he commits and realizes his opposition against the US (United States) and its allies by strengthening his identity as a hero for the Muslims and as the most dangerous terrorist in contemporary era for the westerners. The object of this research is the discourse entitled *To the Allies of America* which contains the background and reasons why Osama and his groups attack the US and its allies in some parts of the world. This research is in the area of CDA (critical discourse analysis). The theories used in this research are Fairclough's (1989), Van Dijk's (2000), Winterowd and Murray's (1998), and Suleiman's (2003). The method used in this research is Creswell's (2009). This research finds out the identity of Osama as the representative of the Arab warrior, the religious man, and the responsible man. In contrast, the west points out Osama's identity as the terrorist, killer, and hypocrite. The power relation covers the power relation between himself and God, the power relation between himself and the US and the allies, the power relation between himself and other Muslims. This research also discloses that the identity can strengthen the power relation and it strengthens the identity respectively. It concludes that the identity and power relation can occur together with having different role but they support each other.

Keywords: identity, power relation, critical discourse analysis

Introduction

CDA (critical discourse analysis) is an approach in analysing the discourse from a combination of social and cultural view using linguistic forms as its representation. It suggests that that discourse does not only discover the linguistic features, but it also associates with some social cultural matters that are enlisted through topics being explored, such as social relation, group, identity, group relation (power), solidarity, and ideology. In other words, it investigates the discourse beyond the linguistic features. It reveals the form and function of the text, it relates to the way it is produced and consumed, and the relation of this to wider society in which it takes place (Richardson, 2007, p. 37). This comments that the text does not exist in such a way, but it implies

some backgrounds and reasons that motivate it being released by considering the environment of the social and cultural condition.

In social and cultural representation, identity becomes the most important principle to manage the society and its activities. It guides the social activity within in-group and out-group members of the community. In this practice, the power relation plays a vital role functioning as a medium to transfer the representation of the identity by strengthening its type and function which automatically color the power relation.

The representation of the identity and power relation can take places in many aspects of the linguistics features. One of them is pronoun. The pronoun is a part of the SFL (systemic functional linguistics). It is used to denote the participants who involve in the discourse and their roles and functions. They are implicitly and explicitly stated in the pronoun representation. The pronoun “I”, “we”, and “they”, for instance, are seen as an ordinary matter in daily conversation. They just have functions as subjects in a sentence or sentences. The pronoun “I” becomes the easiest pronoun, because it appears more often than the other pronoun members during the conversation. The pronoun “we” represents a subject of plural concept (the speaker and the others include in the pronoun “we”) and the pronoun “they” represents the third person for the plural pronoun. For the daily talk, they do not have any explicit meaning and purpose outside them.

Consequently, they become trivial things. One, as a doer of every activity, sometimes does not care much about the nature of his/her daily communication. He/she thinks that his/her communication is just an ordinary matter for social interaction. It does not imply any special value, and it is not more than a social medium for achieving a certain purpose. Thompson (2003, p. 9) stated that communication can be seen in such a well-integrated part of our day-to-day existence that we tend to take it for granted, rarely pausing to consider what it involves or just how impotent it is to us. This confirms that behind the topic and nature of our communication, there are valuable messages directed to many aspects of our life dimensions.

Of course, the hidden meaning of “we” and “they” are metaphorically because they are directed to special agents (doers of action) in political world. Knowing the hidden purpose behind the verbal statement makes the speaker and listener involved in the communication become aware of the function of the messages.

In a rhetorical discourse, the pronoun “I”, “we”, and “they” may have specific meaning directed to a group of people. They can occupy a group who support an idea or reject it. It depends on the purpose of the speaker. Rhetorically, they reflect powerful subject on the others on the action in discourse depending on the context they are put and used.

The context of the power inside the pronoun shows the metaphorical and metonymical agent in which it is directed by the speaker or user of the discourse. It is understood by analyzing how the discourse is embodied in the appropriate pronouns to clarify the intended message.

This research investigates the identity and power relation reflected in the pronoun enlisted in a speech text of Osama bin Laden entitled *To the Allies of America*. It is a text of Osama bin Laden in exploring his background and reasons in attacking the US (United States) and its allies. The identity is taken as the object of this research because it plays very principle role in Osama bin Laden’s principle and movement against the US’ domination (Burek, 2011, p. 1). Meanwhile, the power relation is the object of this research as it functions to show the role he is playing in exploring the identity. This research takes Osama as the center of this research because he is the terrorist leader in this century. Having the label, in contrast, he becomes a knight (Riedel, 2008, p. 37). For some Muslim countries that is assumed to protect the ideology, need, and

freedom of the Muslims. For non-Muslim countries (out-group), Osama successfully presents some logical ideologies and ideas by explaining the reasons in attacking the US and its allies. Osama, in contrast, is said to be a key leader of the world terrorism in the 21st century (Perl, 2004, p. 1) in the view of the western countries.

Theory

Identity

De Fina, Schiffrin, and Bamberg (1970, p. 10) stated that the most general perspective, one that provides a very basic way of thinking about identity, is “social constructionism”, the assumption that identity is neither a given nor a product. Rather, identity is a process that: (1) takes place in concrete and specific interactional occasions; (2) yields constellations of identities instead of individual and monolithic constructs; (3) does not simply emanate from the individual, but results from processes of negotiation, and entextualization that are eminently social; and (4) entails discursive work. The identity presents the nature of identification or characteristic that reflects personality. This is very important to show the power relation. It produces the identity, but it does not depend on the power relation. In reference to this, the identity may also be applied to social group, called social identity.

Social identity is understood as one’s sense of characteristic in referring to their group membership(s). As it is proposed by Tajfel that the groups (e.g., social class, family, football team, etc.) become an important source of pride and self-esteem. Groups present it a sense of social identity: A sense of belonging to the social world (Retrieved from <http://www.simplypsychology.org>).

This results in two opposing assumption: the in-group represented by pronoun “we” and “us”, in order to increase our self-image, we enhanced group is reflected by the pronoun “they” and “them”. The demarcation of the two groups can produce a general hypothesis stating that the in-group will discriminate against the out-group to enhance their self-image. Moreover, the in-group members tend to seek and find negative aspects of an out-group. Tajfel presents two types of category by referring to the cognitive process on the tendency to group things together. People prefer exaggerating the differences between groups and also exaggerating the similarities of things in the same group (Retrieved from <http://www.simplypsychology.org>).

Suleiman (2003, p. 6) proposed the notion of the national identity by introducing five principles which he called the five “fundamental features” of national identity: a historic territory or homeland, common myths and historical memories, a common mass public culture, common legal rights and duties for all members, and a common economy with territorial mobility for members. What Smith (1991) claimed is aiming at pointing the in-group membership into the wider scope of national by figuring the five elements in which they are elaborating the basic principle of the group identity previously mentioned.

Power Relation

Power relation is a relationship between one group and another group that underlie ideologies. Power is a complex and an abstract concept, and an infinitely important influence on our lives. Power is defined as the ability of its holder to exact compliance or obedience of other individuals to their will (Thomas et al., 2004, p. 10). This definition elaborates that the power is used by someone who has more powerful position than the others by using language as the medium to apply it. They use it as a manifestation of their power because language is a reflection of how people in society see each other (Blaska, 1991, p. 1). This idea brings a concept

that language exposes an activity of people and their role to others in making interaction. So, it can be understood that language denotes the people's beliefs (ideology) and status (power) reflected in the language which they are applying.

Thus, if power is defined here in terms of the control, one group has over (the actions of the members of) another group, ideologies function as the mental dimension of this form of control. That is, ideologies are the basis of dominant group member's practice (say discrimination). They provide principles, by which these forms of power abuse may be justified, legitimized, condoned, or accepted (Blaska, 1991, p. 35).

The notion of power related to the ideologies is social power. It is the power of one group over another group. This power may be defined in terms of control (Blaska, 1991, p. 36). It is about the control of action. Since the discourse is also a form of action, such control may also be exercised over discourse and its properties: its context, its topic, or its style, and because such discourse may also influence the mind of the recipients, powerful groups may-indirectly, also control the mind of other people. In terms of our cognitive theory, this means that powerful discourse may influence the way we define an event or situation in our mental models, or how we represent society in our knowledge, attitudes, and ideologies. Power needs a "power base", such as scarce social resources forces, money, real estate, knowledge, information, or status. One of the important social resources of much contemporary power is the access to public discourse. Who controls public discourse, indirectly controls the minds (including the ideologies) of people, and therefore also their social practices. We shall often encounter this relation between social power, discourse, the mind, and control. In a more critical approach to power, we are especially interested in power abuse or dominance, and how ideologies may be used to legitimate such dominance.

Power is about relation of difference, and particularly about the effects of differences in social structures. The constant unity of language and other social matters ensures that language is entwined in social power in a number of ways: language indexes power, expresses power, is involved where there is contention over and a challenge to power. Power does not derive from language, but language can be used to challenge power, to subvert it, to alter distributions of power in the short and long term. Language provides a finely-articulated vehicle for differences in power in hierarchical social structures. Power is signaled not only by grammatical forms within a text, but also by a person's control of social occasion by means of the genre of a text. It is often exactly within the genres associated with given social occasions that power is exercised and challenged (Van Dijk, 2006, p. 29).

Language, therefore, is no longer seen as merely reflecting our reality, but as central to creating reality. Our words are never neutral, they carry the power that reflects the interests of those who speak or write (Taiwo, 2007, p. 1). Seeing this point, Thomas et al. (2004, p. 12) suggested that discourse structures create power relations in terms of how we negotiate our relative status through interaction with others. Van Dijk (2006, p. 27) explained the typology of the ways power in discourse, level of discourse and power, and dimension of power.

In reference to power in discourse, Van Dijk (2006, p. 27) suggested some ways the power relation is enacted through the discourse called a typology. It mentions the typology of the ways power in discourse. The typology of the ways power is enacted by discourse as a form of social interaction:

(1) Direct control of action is achieved through discourses that have directive pragmatic function (elocutionary forces), such as command, threats, laws, regulations instructions, and more indirectly by

recommendations and advice. Speakers often have an institutional role, and their discourses are often backed by institutional power;

(2) Persuasive discourse types, such as advertisements and propaganda, also aim at influencing future actions of recipients. Their power is based on economic, financial, or in general, corporate or institutional resources and exercised through access to the mass media and to wide public attention;

(3) Beyond these perspective discourse forms, future actions may also be influenced by descriptions of future or possible events, actions, or situations; for instance, predictions, plans, scenarios, programs, and warnings, sometimes combined with different forms of advice. The power groups involved here are usually professionals (experts) and their power basis often the control of knowledge and technology;

(4) Various types of sometimes widespread and, hence, possibly influential narrative, such as novels or movies, may describe the (un)desirability of future actions, and may have resource to a rhetoric of dramatic or emotional appeals, or to various forms of topical or stylistic originality. The power groups involved here from what we called the symbolic elites.

Pronoun

The choice of pronoun is tied with relationships of power and solidarity (Fairclough, 1989, p. 127). A pronoun is a word that takes the place of a noun or another pronoun (Winterowd & Murray, 1988, p. 332). A noun or a pronoun that the pronoun replaces and refers to is called the antecedent of the pronoun. Pronouns can be divided into five classes: personal, relative, interrogative, demonstrative, and indefinite pronouns (Winterowd & Murray, 1988, p. 334).

A personal pronoun refers to one or more persons or thing (Winterowd & Murray, 1988). Except for the pronoun “you”, the personal pronouns have separate singular and plural forms (Winterowd & Murray, 1988).

	Singular	Plural
First person:	I/me/my/mine	we/us/our/ours
Second person:	you/your/yours	you/your/yours
Third person:	he/him/she/her/it his/hers/its	they/them/their/theirs

The person of a pronoun indicates the relationship of that pronoun to the speaker. The first-person pronouns (“I”, “me”, “we”, and “us”) refer to the speaker or to a group of which the speaker is a part. The second-person pronouns refer to the person or persons being spoken to. And the third-person pronouns refer to persons or things other than the speaker or the speaker’s listeners (Winterowd & Murray, 1988). Although the possessive pronouns, such as “my”, “your”, “his”, “her”, “their”, “our”, and “it”, are considered adjectives but they are classified into pronouns. Winterowd and Murray (1988, p. 398). They stated that not count the possessive pronouns, such as “mine”, “our”, and “his”, as adjectives, they are considered pronouns.

CDA

CDA applies the view of functionalists in seeing the language use (discourse). As stated above that the functionalists assume that discourse should be studied as “language in used” (Richardson, 2007, p. 23). Brown and Yule (1983, p. 1) elaborated that the analysis of discourse is, necessarily, the analysis of language in use. As such, it cannot be restricted to the description of linguistic forms independent of the purpose or

functions which these forms are designed to serve human affairs. It denotes that analysis is not only seeing it from the linguistic forms, but also a reflection of society in the discourse. It shows that there is a demarcation between the formalist and functionalist. The formalist refers to the discourse analysis realm. The functionalist, on the other hand, sees the language from its function as the medium to express reality of life. In other words, the functionalist is in the field of CDA. It sees discourse from outside perspective, its social function.

CDA covers that discourse, language use spoken or written, is as a form of social practice. As the social practice form, it investigates the activity reflected in the language use as a reflection of the certain situation, place, institution, and social structure. That activity shaped them and it shapes them. There are two intertwined process between discourse activities, called discursive event, with the condition around it. Fairclough and Wodak (1997, p. 55) saw the CDA in the following statement:

Critical discourse analysis sees discourse—language use in speech and writing—is a form of social practice. Describing discourse as social practice implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and situation(s), institution(s) and social structure(s) which frame it. A dialectical relationship is a two-way relationship: the discursive event is shaped by situations, institution and social structures, but it also shapes them.

The statements suggest that discourse is a representation of social practice. As the realization of this, discourse has a dialectical relationship with situation, institution, and social structure. This means that discourse shapes them and they shape the discourse. In other words, the discourse forms the situation, institution, and social structure and automatically it is formed by them.

CDA does not have a unitary theoretical framework and it is not specific direction research. It does not specifically denote to specific field of study. It is interdisciplinary research. Weiss and Wodak (2004, p. 12) claimed that CDA has never been and has never attempted to be or to provide one single or specific theory, and one specific methodology is not characteristic of research in CDA. This statement implies that CDA consists of many related theories in one project. It has characteristic that CDA research is based on various discipline. In agreement with its critical theory predecessors, CDA emphasizes the need for interdisciplinary work in order to gain a proper understanding of how language functions in constituting and transmitting knowledge, in organizing social institutions, or in exercising power (Weiss & Wodak, 2003, p. 14).

SFL

Functional grammar or known as SFL is a systemic grammar, which contains a functional component, and the theory behinds it is called systemic. Halliday concentrates exclusively on the functional part of grammar that is the interpretation of the grammatical patterns in term of configurations of functions (Malmkjaer, 1991, p. 190). He stated that SFL is relevant to analysis of text, where by text, Halliday means everything that is said or written. Halliday's functional grammar begins from the premise that language has certain functions for its users as social group, so that it is primarily sociolinguistic in nature (Malmkjaer, 1991, p. 190). SFL relates to the three dimensions of context, field, tenor, and mode. Field is defined in term of on-going activity (topic), tenor is about interaction (relationship), and mode is the kind of text being made (Butt et al., 2000, p. 5).

One of the main assumptions about text that we make is that it is multifunction. There are three such functions: the ideational, the interpersonal, and the textual (Malmkjaer, 1991, p. 191). Ideational meaning is

the representation of experience. Our experience of the world that lies about us, and also insides us, the world of our imagination. It is meaning in the sense of content. The ideational function of the clause is that of representing what in the broad sense we call “process”: actions, events, processes of consciousness, and relation (Malmkjaer, 1991, p. 191). Interpersonal meaning is meaning as a form of action: the speaker or writer doing something the listener or reader by means of language. The interpersonal function of the clause is that of exchanging roles in rhetorical interaction: statements, questions, offers and commands, together with accompanying modalities, etc. (Malmkjaer, 1991, p. 192). Textual meaning is relevance to the context: both the preceding (and following) text and context of situation. The textual function of the clause is that of constructing a message (Malmkjaer, 1991, p. 192). Language serves the textual functions by which elements of it are responsible for making discourse appear “as text” while signaling its relevance to the context in which it appears. Through the textual function, language forges links with the presumed extra-linguistic conditions of its occurrence as well as with other texts which have occurred or will occur in that context.

Method

The source of data in this research is a speech text of Osama entitled *To the Allies of America*. This speech text is taken as the source of data because it is a response of Osama toward the negative stigma directed to him by the allies governments. They accuse him by killing the innocent people and civilians of the allies. Osama furthermore released that in this speech text, the data are words, phrases, and sentences. In line with these data, Heigham and Croker (2004, p. 320) explained that this research is categorized into qualitative because the data are not in the form of numbers.

This research, precisely, covers the way in which the identity and power relation are manifested in the pronouns.

The instrument of this research is the researcher himself. In qualitative research, the researcher is the primary research instrument. As the instrument, the researcher collects the data and interprets them (Heigham & Croker, 2004, p. 11). The researcher employs a deep involvement in the process of the data processing until the end of the process and conclusion. In analyzing the data, the researcher becomes the main measurement of device (Perry, 2005, p. 149). It means that the researcher has a main function in conducting the analysis from beginning until the end of the analysis. Perry (2005, p. 149) stated that the analysis of verbal data is not quite straightforward because that analysis of the verbal data is initiated at the beginning of the data-collection process which continues throughout the study. This process involves the researcher interacting with the data in a symbiotic fashion.

In doing the analysis, the researcher employs the content analysis. It is an analysis of the manifest and latent content of a body of communicated material (as a book or film) through classification, tabulation, and evaluation of its key symbols and themes in order to ascertain its meaning and probable effect (Krippendorff, 2004, p. xvii). To apply the content analysis, the researcher follows the steps of analysis shown by Creswell (2009, p. 184). They explain the steps of analysis for qualitative data using inductive model. The steps involve: organizing and preparing the data for analysis, reading through all the data, coding the data or beginning detailed analysis with a coding process, using the coding process to generate a description of the setting or people as well as categories or themes for analysis, interrelating theme/description, and making an

interpretation or meaning of the data.

Findings and Discussion

Identity of Osama

It has been known that Osama bin Laden is characterized and portrayed differently. The Muslims argue that Osama bin Laden is a hero and a knight, because he helps the same Muslim against the US and its allies. His concern and help to other Muslims make them enthusiastic and appreciate his struggle against the US. The identity of Osama in the view of the westerners, the allies people, on the other hand, reflect that he is a barbarian man, killer, terrorist, and fanatic. He is labelled as hypocrite using the religion as the mask of his personal desire and terrorism.

The discourse entitled *To the Allies People* discloses the identity of Osama variously. The identity is best explained in details below.

A religious person. Osama is described as the religious person. The religiosity is seen from his frequency in expressing the word and name of “God” for the whole life. He considers God as the saint, powerful, authority, determiner, helper, etc.. The God for him is the guarantor of human’s life. As a Muslim, he refers his actions, life, and future to God. Every time he talks many things, he always mentions the name of God. By expressing this word “God”, he shows the identity of the Muslim. For the Muslims, the word “God” is a symbol of belonging to a specific religion, Islam. A good Muslim can be witnessed from the frequency of expressing the word “God” accompanied with his actions and behaviors that follow the God’s ways and rules. He states that: “For he is the guarantor of that and well capable of it. Our final prayer is thanks to God, lord of the worlds” (Lawrence, 2005, p. 175).

The statements suggest that God has great authority in this universe. He determines everything in this world. Because of this, people have to render their bodies and souls just for him. The people are powerless and God is a powerful one. This one is indicated by the use of “he” to represent “God”. The pronoun “we” reflects the speaker, Osama, and other Muslims to have a duty to provide their everything in this world for “him”. In his opinion, what people do, what people wish, and what people have are just for the sake of God’s orders and commands. It is an obligatory for the Muslims including himself to guide and render their whole life in the name of God. This depiction of Osama leads him to have a label of the religious person mainly in the view of the Muslims.

A responsible person to other Muslims. Osama has a wonderful consideration to the same Muslims all over the world. He always takes part and involves in every injustice that happens to his brothers in religion. He shows this concern by giving direct action in the intruders of the Muslims. He shows an example by saying that Australia is the intruder. It is attacked by him because the country involves in the Afghan war and the separation of East Timor from Indonesia in which Indonesia is considered to be brothers in religion. He states:

We warned Australia beforehand not to take part in the war in Afghanistan, as well as about its disgraceful attempts to separate East Timor, but it ignored the warning until it woke up to the sound of explosions in Bali. (Lawrence, 2005, p. 174)

The statements highlight that Osama gives great concern to his Muslim brothers. The pronoun “we” indicates that he is in the same population and group with other community, the Muslims, although they are from different areas. Australian’s involvement in the process of the East Timor separation from Indonesia. His

responsibility is marked by his attack to Australia using the hand of his group, the AL Qaida's connection in Indonesia, to bomb the Australians who are enjoying their holiday in Bali. The attack for them is aimed at giving a reciprocal action to the allied countries in which Australia is a part of it. His attack is directed to the Muslims in particular that he has a good concern to the same Muslims and to the west and allies in general that he does not keep silent without any action to what happened to his Muslim brothers.

To be a hero. Osama becomes a hero for the Muslims. In their perceptions, Osama always protects the Muslims from the injustice derived from other people either Muslim or non-Muslims. He tries hard to defend them and struggles to fulfill their needs and the rights by giving protection in form of reaction and response to every action directed to the Muslims. It is realized by his statement entitled "the reciprocal treatment to get the justice". He states:

The road to safety begins with the cessation of hostilities, and reciprocal treatment is a part of justice. (Lawrence, 2005, p. 173)

How long will fear, killing, destruction, displacement, orphaning, and widowing be our sole destiny, while security, stability, and happiness is yours? (Lawrence, 2005, p. 175)

The statements inform that Osama provides himself as a defender of the Muslims, at the time, there is not any Muslim who defend his Muslim brothers from the catastrophic life under the western countries' domination. Upon his presence as a Muslim protector, he is named the hero. This idea is shown by the pronoun "our". It highlights his identity and characteristic on the Muslim society.

A strong and independent personality. Osama is viewed as the person having a very strong and independent characteristic that can discover and manage the truth. He is bravely struggling to what he is thought to be well and true. In achieving it, he is not afraid to any thing. He is just afraid to his God, the Almighty Allah. This principle leads him to be a saint by rendering all his efforts against the US and its allies to God by seeking His appreciation (in Arabic is called "Ridho"). He states:

What Bush—the pharaoh of the age—is doing, killing our sons in Iraq, and what America's ally Israel is doing, using American aeroplanes to bomb houses in Palestine with old men, women, and children in them, was enough for the sane leaders among you to distance themselves from this criminal gang. (Lawrence, 2005, p. 173)

This Rumsfeld, the butcher of Vietnam, is responsible for the deaths of two million, as well as injuries to many others. (Lawrence, 2005, p. 174)

And as for Cheney and Powell, they have reaped more murder and destruction in Baghdad than Hulagu the Tatar. (Lawrence, 2005, p. 174)

The statements indicate that Osama has a strong personality. He labels the former president of the US Bush with "the Pharaoh of the age", Cheney and Powell are labeled as "the more sadistic than Jengis Khan", and Rumsfeld as the "butcher of Vietnam". The labels show the negative sense for the labels owner. The person who labels them indicates that he is a great person with having a wonderful personality. The speaker represents himself with the pronoun "we" to indicate that he is together with other people, the Muslims. The pronoun "you" is directed to the allies people and the pronoun "they" refers to the names given the labelization.

However, the westerners have different view in seeing Osama. For them, he is as the murderer and terrorist (El Farra, 1996, p. 1). He is the leader of the deadliest terrorist in contemporary era (Hasyim, 2001, p. 1). The perception of the west to Osama is automatically related to Islam in general. As it is stated that it was therefore primarily fear, hostility, and prejudice that colored the western view of Islam and conditioned its

attitude. Islam beliefs were enemy's beliefs and as such suspect if not false (Hasyim, 2001, p. 2).

In line with the identity attributed to him, Osama prefers showing his identity by referring to the religious identity. He does not denote the identity of nationalism, but he directs to the Muslim identity. It is intended to show that he is stateless legally, although he is a truly Arab man coming from Arabia. The Arabia's government makes him the number one enemy that should be jailed. For him, the identity of being a Muslim is more strategic than the Arab man identity.

The Power Relations Reflected in the Discourse

The power relation which is depicted in the discourse *To the Allies of America* can be classified into three types: the power relation between Osama and the God, the power relation between Osama and the allies people, and the power relation between Osama and other Muslims.

The power relation between Osama and the God. Osama has a relationship with his God. This relationship marks the position of him in front of his God. He acknowledges that the God is a very powerful. He determines the life of his creatures, human beings. He can protect them, guide them, and bless them. He can also punish them by their sins and deeds. With this acknowledgement, he admits that the God is every thing and the super power.

In contrast, he perceives himself as the powerless in front of the God. The God determines his life. This belief suggests that he has to ask protection and guidance from the God. He states:

Finally, I call upon God to help us achieve the victory of his religion and to continue the jihad for him until we meet him and he is content with us.

For he is the guarantor of that and well capable of it. Our final prayer is thanks to God, lord of the worlds. (Lawrence, 2005, p. 175)

The statements clarify that the God has unlimited power over his creatures, the human beings. He is the most powerful provider of the people's life. Osama admits that the God is the guarantor of the whole life in this universe. He is the owner of the world.

The position of the speaker, on the other hand, is weak. Therefore, he asks the God to help him in achieving his desire to get victory from the infidels. Osama expresses the word "peace" be upon those who follow true guidance. This expression shows that he has more powerful position than the other members of his group. By praising the other members means that the speaker has more powerful status compared to others. He is very tolerance with the same Muslims. It is shown by his statement in helping his Muslim.

The power relation between Osama and the allies people. The power relation between Osama and the allied people is determined by his role in controlling the ideas within the discourse. He has a unique relationship. On one occasion, he considers himself in the same level with them. On other occasion, he puts himself in a higher position than the allies people.

He puts himself in the same position with allies people by referring to the attack on them as the response toward their governments' policy in the fighting the Muslims. He states:

The events that have taken place since the attacks on Washington and New York, like the killing of the Germans in Tunisia, the French in Karachi, the bombing of the giant French tanker in Yemen, the killing of marines in Failaka and of the British and Australians in the Bali explosions, the recent operation in Moscow and various other operations here and there: These are all reactions in kind perpetrated by the zealous sons of Islam in defense of their religion and in response to the order of their Lord and their Prophet. (Lawrence, 2005, p. 173)

The statement argues that Osama has the same position with the allies people. So, his response and reply to the allies people indicate that he has the same right and position than them. He exercises the reciprocal action over the allies people is motivated by his purpose to sustain the existence of the Muslims.

In other side, he is more powerful than the allies people. It is seen by its statements questioning the allies people using the interrogative sentence with imperative contents. He states:

Why are your governments allying themselves against the Muslims with the criminal gang in the White House?

Do not they know that this gang is the biggest murderer of our age?

Why are your governments, especially those of Britain, France, Italy, Canada, Germany, and Australia, allying themselves with America in its attacks on us in Afghanistan? (Lawrence, 2005, p. 174)

The statements cover the power of Osama in stating his ideas on the attack of the allies people toward the Muslims. He questions them the reason why their governments involve in the attack against the Muslims. The interrogative moods are expressed by the speaker who has a great role and position in an organization. In this case, Osama is the leader of the AL Qaida organization in which the allies people are afraid of its.

To assure that he is more powerful than them is by saying that Australia treats the Muslims unfairly. That's why it becomes the target of the jihadist. He states this matter in a declarative mood describing that the speaker has a great position and role in the social structure, the AL Qaida organization. He states:

We warned Australia beforehand not to take part in the war in Afghanistan, as well as about its disgraceful attempts to separate East Timor, but it ignored the warning until it woke up to the sound of explosions in Bali. (Lawrence, 2005, p. 174)

The statement underlines that the speaker chooses the declarative mood by saying that the Australian government involves systematically in the Iraq war and the case of the separation of East Timor from the Islamic country, Indonesia. The choice of word or scheme of "warned" and "ignore" indicates the speaker has the high position.

To show his power over the allies people, he orders them to think logically by looking at the victims on the Muslims because of their governments during the war. He states:

If it pains you to see your victims and your allies' victims in Tunisia, Karachi, Failaka, and Oman, then remember that our children are murdered daily in Palestine and Iraq.

Remember our victims in the mosques of Khost, and the deliberate murder of our people at weddings in Afghanistan.

If it pains you to see your victims in Moscow, then remember ours in Chechnya. (Lawrence, 2005, p. 174)

The statements point out that the speaker has a very powerful position over the listeners, the allies people. He uses the imperative statements by repeating the word "remember" for three times. The imperative models of the statements show that the speaker, Osama, has the very important role in his society and among other people.

The power relation between Osama and other Muslims. The power relation between Osama and other Muslims is marked by own way direction. It means that his struggle against the US and the allies governments shows the relationship between himself with other Muslims. He puts his position in higher level than them. He notes that he owns the same Muslims by referring to the pronoun "our" and "ours". The pronouns indicate that there is a solidarity relationship between the speaker and other Muslims, but it is in a different role. He makes himself as the representative which symbolizes that he has greater role and function compared with them. He states that the victims which happen in some Muslim countries are owned by him in the sense of having a relationship for the same destiny against the US and its allies. He states:

Our people have suffered murder and torture in Palestine for nearly a century.

If it pains you to see your victims and your allies' victims in Tunisia, Karachi, Failaka, and Oman, then remember that our children are murdered daily in Palestine and Iraq.

Remember our victims in the mosques of Khost, and the deliberate murder of our people at weddings in Afghanistan.

If it pains you to see your victims in Moscow, then remember ours in Chechnya. (Lawrence, 2005, p. 174)

The statements emphasize his position and role among the Muslims, including his organization, the AL Qaida.

To show his domination in the AL Qaida organization and over the Muslims, he mentions himself with the pronoun "we" and the Muslims with the pronoun "them". He also uses the pronoun "I" to assert his role and position in front of the allies people. He states:

But as soon as we defend them, the world gets agitated and joins forces against the Muslims under the false and unjust pretext of fighting terrorism.

How long will fear, killing, destruction, displacement, orphaning, and widowing be our sole destiny, while security, stability, and happiness is yours? (Lawrence, 2005, p. 174)

Finally, I call upon God to help us achieve the victory of His religion and to continue the jihad for Him until we meet him and he is content with us. (Lawrence, 2005, p. 173)

The statements highlight that Osama bin Laden becomes the leader of the Muslims and the AL Qaida. He uses many words to reflect his position. The words used by him to represent his power are "our" and "I". The pronoun "our" reflects the solidarity among the Muslims. Meanwhile, the pronoun "I" shows his domination over them.

Conclusion

This research finds out the identity of Osama as the representative of Arab warrior, religious man, and responsible man. The identity which he represents is based on the religious aspect and it does not reflect the nationality identity. In contrast, the west and its allies point out his identity as the terrorist, killer, and hypocrite. The power relation reflected in the discourse covers the power relation between Osama and the God, the power relation between Osama and the allies people, the power relation between Osama and other Muslims. The identity and power relation can happen together and they support each other.

References

- Blaska, J. (1991). *The power of language: Speak and write using "first person"*. Retrieved from <http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/dss/information/upload/PeopleFirstLanguage-2.pdf>
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Burek, J. (2011). *Osama bin laden: How long will it take to kill his ideology*. Retrieved from <http://www.cs.monitor.com>
- Butt, D., Fahey, R., Feez, S., & Spinks, S. (2000). *Using functional grammar: An explorer's guide*. Sydney: Macquarie University.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach* (3rd ed.). California: Sage Publication.
- De Fina, A., Schiffirin, D., & Bamberg, M. (1970). *Discourse and identity*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- El Farra, N. (1996). *Arab and the media*. Retrieved from <http://www.calstatela.edu/faculty/sfischo/Arabs.html>
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (Vol. 2, pp. 258-284). London: Sage Publication.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *Introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hasyim, A. S. (2001). The world according to Osama bin Laden. *Naval War College Review*, 11V(4).

- Heigham, J., & Croker, R. A. (2009). *Qualitative research in applied linguistic: A practical introduction*. New York: MacMillan.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis an introduction to its methodology*. London: Sage Publication.
- Lawrence, B. (2005). *Messenge to the world: The ststatementd of Osama Bin Laden*. New York: Verso.
- Malkmkjaer, K. (1991). *The linguistics encyclopedia*. London: Rutledge.
- Perl, R. (2004). *Terrorism and national security: Issues and trends*. New York: CSR.
- Perry, Jr. F. L. (2005). *Research in applied linguistics: Becoming a discerning consumer*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publisher.
- Richardson, J. E. (2007). *Analyzing newspapers: An approach from critical discourse analysis*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Riedel, B. (2008). *The search for Al-Qaida, its leadership, ideology, and future*. Washington D. C.: Brooking Institution Press.
- Suleiman, Y. (2003). *The Arabic language and national identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd..
- Taiwo, R. (2004). Language, ideology, and power relation in Nigerian newspaper headlines (pp. 233-335). In S. Awouni (Eds.), *The domestication of English Nigerian*. Logos: University of Logos Press.
- Thomas, L., Wareing, S., Sighn, I., Peccei, J. S., Thornborrow, J., & Jones, J. (2004). *Language, society and power: An introduction*. New York: Routledge.
- Tompson, N. (2003). *Communication and language*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2000). *Ideology and discourse: A multidisciplinary introduction*. Universitat De Catalunya, Open University.
- Weiss, G., & Wodak, R. (2003). *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinary*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Winterowd, W. R., & Murray, P. Y. (1988). *English writing and skills*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.