



Est.1994

JCL

Journal of the College of Languages
An Open Free Access, Peer Reviewed Research Journal

<https://jcolang.uobaghdad.edu.iq>

P-ISSN: 2074-9279
E-ISSN: 2520-3517
No. (51)2025
PP.99-124

A Critical Discourse Analysis of the 2021 Lebanese-Saudi Diplomatic Crisis

¹ Shawqi Khudhayir Ismail (PhD Candidate) ² Sundus Muhsin Ali Al Ubaidy

¹ University of Diyala, College of Education for Humanities, Diyala, Iraq

² University of Baghdad, College of Arts, Baghdad, Iraq

Corresponding E-mail: shawqi983@gmail.com

(Received on 13/6/2024 - Accepted on 9/9/2024- Published on 2/1/2025)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36586/jcl.2.2025.0.51.0099>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Abstract

The current study aims at investigating the discourse of the press war around the Lebanese- Saudi crisis of late October 2021. This diplomatic and press war created a splash on Arabic and international media. The nature of the published press releases took both sides of the crisis. This study delves into the written media war between the two countries in terms of Van Dijk's social-cognitive framework. The critical theme in Van Dijk's framework is based on the concept of manipulation. The analysis is conducted by selecting two articles from daily newspapers published in Lebanon and Saudi Arabia. The study is a qualitative attempt to account for the strategies used by the media to reproduce the discursive reality of the diplomatic crisis between the two countries. The findings of the study revealed that the main manipulation strategies used in this discourse are targeting the cognitive level of short term memory by means of negative lexical selection of the other part rather than the positive representation of self.

Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis; Social-cognitive framework.

Introduction

The Lebanese- Saudi diplomatic crisis began by comments by George Kordahi, a former TV host-turned-politician, in an interview recorded on Aug. 5, 2021 in an online show affiliated with Qatar's Al Jazeera network. Kordahi - named minister of information in the Lebanese government that took office in September 2021- called the war on Yemen futile and said Yemen was subjected to an aggression and that Houthis were defending themselves. The critical comments by Kordahi on the Saudi-led war in Yemen led Saudi Arabia in late October to expel Lebanon's envoy to the kingdom, recall its ambassador and ban all imports from Lebanon, dealing a new blow to the country's ailing economy. Other Gulf states that are historical allies of Lebanon, including the United Arab Emirates and Kuwait, took similar punitive diplomatic measures.

Kordahi said that his remarks were personal views made before he was a minister, and that he was committed to government policy. "I am against Arab-Arab wars ... accusing me of hostility to Saudi Arabia is rejected" (Reuters 2021). This crisis led to a press war between the Gulf countries and some of Lebanon political parties.

This study is a critical discourse analysis of this press war. It tries to identify the powerful political groups of this crisis as well as the main cognitive and discursive strategies used by them to reproduce the facts and dominate the public discourse. Van Dijk posits that a discourse analytical approach is essential, given that the majority of manipulation transpires through text and speech. Additionally, the subjects of manipulation are humans, and this manipulation generally involves influencing their cognitive processes; thus, a cognitive perspective can elucidate the mechanisms of manipulation. Furthermore, since manipulation is a type of interaction that involves power dynamics and power abuse, a social approach is equally significant (Van Dijk, 2006, p.360). This study provides an account for those levels of analysis by establishing the theoretical basis and explaining the concept of manipulation proposed by Van Dijk. After that the study formulates its questions based on the proposed framework to achieve the aims of the critical analysis.

Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) is a relatively recent approach of studying language in context. It takes into consideration the various environments around the production and the reception of language. Al- Utbi , (2019) states that CDA is of linguistic origins. It emerged from various disciplines such as critical linguistics as well as in sociolinguistics, text linguistics, and applied linguistics (p.24). As implied by their respective designations, CDA and DA (Discourse Analysis) are distinct concepts. Rogers (2004, p.3) asserts that CDA diverges from other discourse analysis methodologies by encompassing not only the description and interpretation of discourse within its context but also providing an explanation of the mechanisms and purposes underlying discourses. Thus, the critical stance in is much more related to the discrete devices utilized in re/producing the social reality. This is why Fairclough (2001), defines CDA as “a form of critical social science geared to illuminating the problems which people are confronted with by particular forms of social life, and to contributing resources which people may be able to draw upon in tackling and overcoming those problems” (p.125).

There is a range of approaches to CDA that tackle different variables affecting the production and interpretation of discourse. The main approaches are Fairclough’s socio-cultural, Van Dijk’s socio-cognitive, and Wodak’s discourse-historical. All three approaches highlight different aspects of the relationship between discourse, society, and power, emphasizing the ideological dimensions and the importance of context in understanding discourse practices. The current study adopts Dijk’s socio-cognitive approach to CDA. This approach perceives discourse as a form of social practice. However, it does not focus on discursive practice. Van Dijk rather concentrates on social cognition as the mediating part between text and society. *Amoussou & Allagbe (2018, p.15) argue that* to Van Dijk, the study of discourse triangulates between society/ culture /situation, cognition and discourse/language. Social cognitions, he states, are "socially shared representations of societal arrangements, groups and relations, as well as mental operations such as interpretation, thinking and arguing, inferencing and learning" (Van Dijk, 1993, p.257).

Theoretical Framework

This study adopts the theoretical multidisciplinary framework of Van Dijk (2006) which is based on his previous efforts (1998, 2001) that led to the triangulated framework which approaches CDA from social, cognitive and discursive aspects. Van Dijk (2006) opposes that manipulation is a multi-layered phenomenon encompassing social, cognitive, and discursive-semiotic dimensions. Socially, manipulation involves interactions and power abuses between groups and social actors. Cognitively, it pertains to the influence on participants' minds. Discursively and semiotically, it operates through text, speech, and visual messages. He asserts that these approaches are irreducible to one another and advocates for an integrated theory that explicitly connects these distinct dimensions of manipulation (P.361).

3.1 Manipulation

The critical framework proposed by Van Dijk (2006) is based on the notion of manipulation as the critical concept that the observer has to look for when conducting a critical analysis. According to Van Dijk the term 'manipulation' is used as it is the final product of the abusive use of social power by means of discursive practices that will affect the mental representations, opinions, beliefs and ideologies of individuals and societies. Therefore, the nature of manipulation is eventually cognitive (p.360).

As an operational concept, manipulation can be distinguished from persuasion based on the knowledge and availability of alternative options to the recipients. According to Wodak (1987), the key distinction is that in persuasion, interlocutors are free to believe or act as they choose, based on their acceptance of the persuader's arguments. In contrast, manipulation typically assigns recipients a more passive role, rendering them victims of manipulation. This negative consequence occurs when recipients cannot discern the manipulator's true intentions or fully understand the implications of the advocated beliefs or actions. This scenario is particularly likely when recipients lack the specific knowledge required to resist manipulation (p.397).

3.2 Manipulation of Society

Socially, manipulation is defined as illegitimate domination confirming social inequality. It is one of the discursive social practices of dominant

groups geared towards the reproduction of their power. Such dominant groups may do so in many (other) ways as well, e.g. through persuasion, providing information, education, instruction and other social practices that are aimed at influencing the knowledge, beliefs and (indirectly) the actions of the recipients (Van Dijk, 2006, p.367)

Social power abuse requires special access to, or control over, scarce social resources. One of these resources is preferential access to the mass media and public discourse, a resource shared by members of 'symbolic' elites, such as politicians, journalists, scholars, writers, teachers, and so on (Van Dijk, 1996, p.103).

3.3 Cognitive Manipulation

Cognitively, manipulation as mind control involves the interference with processes of understanding, the formation of biased mental models and social representations such as knowledge and ideologies. The way discourse may influence the mind involves complicated processes that can only be managed in real time by applying efficient strategies. (Van Dijk, 2006, p. 365). Van Dijk (2006) proposes three strategies that can affect the mental processing of discourse (ibid., p.366).

3.3.1 Manipulation of Short Term Memory

The first strategy is manipulating short term memory or (STM)-based discourse understanding. Van Dijk (2006) argues that discourse in general, and manipulative discourse in particular, involves processing information in short term memory (STM), which results in 'understanding' (of words, clauses, sentences, utterances and non-verbal signals) for instance in terms of propositional 'meanings' or 'actions'. Specific features of discourse, such as its visual representation, may affect the management of "strategic understanding" in STM, so that readers pay more attention to some pieces of information than others. Manipulation in such a case may reside in drawing attention to information A rather than B, the resulting understanding may be partial or biased, for instance when headlines emphasize irrelevant details, rather than expressing the most important topics of a discourse. If dominant groups or institutions want to facilitate the understanding of the information that is consistent with their interests, and hinder the comprehension of the information that is not in their best interests (and vice versa for their

recipients), then they may typically engage in these forms of STM-based manipulation of discourse understanding (ibid:367).

3.3.2 Episodic Manipulation

The second type is episodic manipulation which is aimed at more stable results, and hence focuses on long term memory (LTM). Knowledge, attitudes and ideologies, personal memories are parts of our LTM. They define our life history and experiences, and form our representations that are traditionally associated with 'episodic' memory. The memory of communicative events is stored in episodic memory, as specific "mental models" with their own schematic structures. Van Dijk (2006) argues that understanding text and talk is related to more complete models of experiences. It is not merely associating meanings to words, sentences or discourses, but constructing mental models in episodic memory by including personal opinions and emotions associated with an event. Mental model is the basis of future memories and learning, such as the acquisition of experience-based knowledge, attitudes and ideologies (ibid).

Van Dijk (2006) expects that manipulation may target the formation, activation and uses of mental models in episodic memory. He proposes that if manipulators are aiming for recipients to understand a discourse as they see it, it is vital that the recipients form the mental models the manipulators want them to form, thus restricting their freedom of interpretation or at least the probability that they will understand the discourse against the best interests of the manipulators (Van Dijk, 2006:367).

The strategy used by manipulators is to discursively emphasize those properties of models that are consistent with our interests (e.g. details of our good deeds), and discursively deemphasize those properties that are inconsistent with our interests (e.g. details of our bad deeds). Blaming the victim is one of the forms of manipulation in which dominant groups or institutions discursively influence the mental models of recipients, for instance by the re-attribution of responsibility of actions in their own interests. Any discursive strategy that may contribute to the formation or reactivation of preferred models may thus be used in manipulative discourse use (ibid).

3.3.3 Manipulating Social Cognition

Van Dijk (2006) believes that the most influential form of manipulation does not focus on the creation of specific preferred mental models but on more general and abstract beliefs such as knowledge, attitudes and ideologies. Manipulation focuses on the formation or modification of more general, socially shared representations about important social issues (ibid).

Cognitive processes of manipulation assume that LTM not only stores subjectively interpreted personal experiences as mental models, but also more stable, more permanent, general and socially shared beliefs, sometimes called 'social representations' (Augoustinos and Walker, 1995; Moscovici, 2001). Sociocultural knowledge forms the core of these beliefs, and allows us to meaningfully act, interact and communicate with other members of the same culture. The same is true for the many social attitudes and ideologies shared with other members of the same social group.

Van Dijk (2006) proposes that the general goals of manipulative discourse are the control of the shared social representations of groups of people because these social beliefs in turn control what people do and say in many situations and over a relatively long period. In this sense, manipulation is a discursive practice that involves both cognitive and social dimensions. One of these strategies is generalization, in which case a concrete specific example that has made an impact on people's mental models, is generalized to more general knowledge or attitudes, or even fundamental ideologies (p. 368).

3.4 Manipulative Discourse

Discursively, manipulation generally involves the usual forms and formats of ideological discourse. Van Dijk (2006) believes that the 'same' discourse may be manipulative in one situation, but not in another situation. That is, the manipulative meaning of text and talk depends on the context models of the recipients including their models of the speakers or writers, and their attributed goals and intentions. Manipulative discourse typically occurs in public communication controlled by dominant political, bureaucratic, media, academic or corporate elites. This means that further contextual constraints prevail, namely on participants, their roles, their

relations and their typical actions and cognitions (knowledge, goals). In other words, *discourse is defined to be manipulative first of all in terms of the context models of the participants*. That is, as critical analysts, we evaluate discourse as manipulative first of all in terms of their context categories, rather than in terms of their textual structures (p. 373).

According to Van Dijk (2006), CDA especially focuses on the ways discourse structures may influence specific mental models and generic representations of the recipients, and especially how beliefs may thus be manipulated. He proposes the following manipulation strategies on the discursive level that might affect the mental models and representations (Van Dijk 1984, 1991, 1993 cited in 2015, p.473-74; 2016, p.373):

1. Overall interaction strategies
 - a. Positive self-presentation
 - b. Negative other-presentation
2. Macro speech act implying Our 'good' acts and Their 'bad' acts, e.g. accusation, defense
3. Semantic macrostructures: topic selection
 - (De-)emphasize negative/positive topics about Us/Them
4. Local speech acts implementing and sustaining the global ones, e.g. statements that prove accusations.
5. Local meanings Our/Their positive/negative actions
 - a. Give many/few details
 - b. Be general/specific
 - c. Be vague/precise
 - d. Be explicit/implicit
6. Lexicon: Select positive words for Us, negative words for Them
7. Local syntax
 - Active vs. passive sentences, nominalizations: (de)emphasize Our/Their positive/negative agency, responsibility
8. Rhetorical figures
 - a. Hyperboles vs euphemisms for positive/negative meanings
 - b. Metonymies and metaphors emphasizing Our/Their positive/negative properties
9. Expressions: sounds and visuals
 - a. Emphasize (loud, etc.; large, bold, etc.) positive/negative meanings

- b. Order (first, last: top, bottom, etc.) positive/negative meanings

The relation between the cognitive strategies and their implications in discursive structures can be illustrated in table (1) below.

Table 1: cognitive and discursive strategies (inspired by Van Dijk 2006)

Cognitive strategies	Discursive structure strategies
A. STM manipulation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Visual effects 2. Headlines 3. Topic selection 4. Lexical selection 5. Emphasis 6. Order of information
B. LTM (Mental Model) manipulation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Positive / negative actions 2. Blaming 3. Speech acts 4. Presupposition and implicature 5. Rhetorical 6. Passive / active (responsibility)
C. Social Cognition	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Generalization 2. Positive/negative representation 3. Level of detail

Research Questions

In the light of the framework presented above, the current study attempts to answer the following questions after analyzing the selected texts:

1. Who are the social players behind the control of the narrative in the crisis?
2. What are the cognitive manipulation strategies used in this discourse?
3. What are the discursive strategies used in the selected texts that achieve manipulation?

Methodology

The current study is a qualitative analysis. It will analyze randomly selected newspaper articles from the local newspapers of Lebanon and Saudi Arabia. The critical discourse analysis will adopt the triangulation framework of Van Dijk (2006).

5.1 Data collection

The selected data is intended to give a view of the narrative presented in the introduction from the perspectives of the two sides of the crisis. The selected data includes two randomly selected articles from two daily newspapers of the two countries involved in the diplomatic crisis. On Lebanon side, an article on the political section by Hasan Illaik in Al Akhbar daily newspaper, issue of November 1st, 2021 was selected (Lebanese Text LT henceforth). On the Saudi side, an article by Mohammed Assaed on the section of 'writers and articles' in October, 31st 2021 issue of Okaz daily newspaper was selected ([link](#)) (Saudi Text ST henceforth).

5.2 Analysis

The following analysis of the data selected in the previous section will follow the framework of Van Dijk (2006) and the strategies presented in Table (1) above. The analysis will compare both articles in terms of the proposed strategies.

5.2.1 Lebanese Text LT

The social power conflict identified by the LT writer projects that the struggle for power is between the regime of Saudi Arabia and the people of Lebanon as an extension to the freedom seeking people represented by their elected government. It becomes evident that the discursive strategies employed are closely intertwined with cognitive strategies designed to influence the reader's perception and understanding. By examining how specific discursive elements such as headlines, lexical choices, emphasis, and rhetorical devices are strategically used, we can better understand how these contribute to the broader cognitive goals of shaping memory, perception, and social cognition. The table below highlights the use of the main strategies in the text.

Table 2: Highlights of LT Analysis

Cognitive Strategies	Discursive Structure Strategies	Examples from Text
A. STM Manipulation	1. Visual Effects	Not directly applicable in a text format.
	2. Headlines	The title "بلى، السعودية تخشى جورج "قرداحي" serves as an eye-catching headline, setting a confrontational tone.
	3. Topic Selection	Focus on Saudi Arabia's influence over Lebanon and its reactions to George Kordahi's comments.
	4. Lexical Selection	Use of strong, negative terms like "جنون النظام السعودي"، "جرائم آل سعود" to provoke emotional responses.
	5. Emphasis	Repeated focus on Saudi Arabia's negative actions and failures, particularly in Yemen and Lebanon.
	6. Order of Information	The text begins with an overview of Saudi Arabia's political failures, followed by specific examples.
B. LTM (Mental Model) Manipulation	1. Positive/Negative Actions	Saudi Arabia is depicted exclusively in a negative light, emphasizing its oppressive actions.
	2. Blaming	Direct blame is assigned to Mohammed bin Salman for Lebanon's and Yemen's issues.
	3. Speech Acts	Use of assertive statements to critique Saudi policies and actions.
	4. Presupposition and Implicature	The text implies Saudi Arabia's actions are inherently negative, without explicit statements.
	5. Rhetorical Devices	Rhetorical questions like "يصعب العثور على جريمة كبرى... ولم يكن لآل سعود فيها نصيب" to emphasize Saudi

		culpability.
	6. Passive/Active (Responsibility)	Actively assigns responsibility to Saudi Arabia for negative outcomes in the Arab world.
C. Social Cognition	1. Generalization	The text generalizes Saudi Arabia's negative influence across different historical and geopolitical contexts.
	2. Positive/Negative Representation	Consistent negative representation of Saudi Arabia, with no counterbalancing positive aspects.
	3. Level of Detail	Provides detailed accounts of Saudi actions in Lebanon, Yemen, and other historical events to support claims.

5.2.1.1 STM (Short-Term Memory) Manipulation

The headline of LT, "بلى، السعودية تخشى جورج كرداحي" (Yes, Saudi Arabia Fears George Kordahi), serves as a powerful tool for manipulating the reader's short-term memory. The headline is designed to be immediately attention-grabbing, setting the tone for the article by framing Saudi Arabia in a defensive and fearful position. This headline acts as a cognitive anchor, influencing how the subsequent information is processed. The visual effect, while not literal in a textual format, is created through the vivid language that prompts readers to visualize the conflict between Saudi Arabia and George Kordahi. This helps in cementing the narrative in the reader's short-term memory, making the article's message more memorable and impactful.

Lexical choices in LT are deliberately charged with emotion and negativity, using terms such as "جنون النظام السعودي" (the madness of the Saudi regime) to shape immediate perceptions. These word choices are not neutral; they are intended to evoke specific emotional responses, such as anger or distrust, towards Saudi Arabia. By repeatedly emphasizing Saudi Arabia's political failures and aggressive tactics, the text ensures that these negative impressions remain at the forefront of the reader's mind. The strategic repetition of these themes throughout the article reinforces the reader's immediate recall of Saudi Arabia's negative actions, effectively manipulating short-term memory to focus on these aspects.

The order in which information is presented in LT is another key discursive strategy linked to short-term memory manipulation. The text begins by outlining Saudi Arabia's alleged intentions and failures, particularly Mohammed bin Salman's attempts to influence Lebanon's political landscape. By front-loading the article with these negative points, the text ensures that the reader's initial and primary impressions are aligned with the narrative of Saudi culpability. This structuring of information is designed to create a cognitive bias, where the reader is more likely to recall the negative aspects of Saudi Arabia when reflecting on the article.

5.2.1.2 LTM (Long-Term Memory) Manipulation

Positive/Negative Actions and Blaming: The consistent portrayal of Saudi Arabia as engaging in negative actions is a strategy aimed at manipulating the reader's long-term memory. By repeatedly attributing blame to Saudi Arabia for regional instability and Lebanon's political challenges, LT seeks to embed this narrative into the reader's mental model of the region. The cognitive strategy here is to create a lasting association between Saudi Arabia and failure or aggression, which the reader is likely to carry forward beyond the immediate reading of the text. This approach ensures that Saudi Arabia is remembered not just for individual actions but as a general antagonist in the broader geopolitical landscape.

Speech Acts and Presupposition/Implicature: The use of assertive speech acts in LT, such as declaring that "محمد بن سلمان يريد تغيير النظام السياسي" (Mohammed bin Salman wants to change the political system), works to solidify the reader's long-term beliefs about Saudi Arabia's intentions. These statements are presented as facts rather than opinions, leaving little room for alternative interpretations. The presuppositions and implicatures embedded in these speech acts—such as the notion that Saudi Arabia's involvement in Lebanon is inherently harmful—are intended to shape the reader's broader understanding of Saudi Arabia's role in the region. This strategy manipulates the reader's long-term memory by embedding these ideas as truths, influencing how future information about Saudi Arabia is processed and recalled.

Rhetorical Devices and Responsibility Assignment: Rhetorical devices, such as analogies and rhetorical questions, are employed to strengthen the long-

term impact of the text's arguments. For instance, by questioning Saudi Arabia's involvement in multiple regional conflicts, LT not only critiques the kingdom's actions but also encourages the reader to internalize these critiques as part of a broader narrative of Saudi misdeeds. The active assignment of responsibility for these issues to Saudi Arabia further reinforces this cognitive strategy, ensuring that the reader's mental model includes a clear and consistent image of Saudi Arabia as a destabilizing force. This manipulation of long-term memory is crucial for the text's broader objective of shaping the reader's understanding of regional politics.

5.2.1.3 Social Cognition

Generalization and Representation: LT employs generalization as a discursive strategy to influence social cognition, particularly in how the reader perceives Saudi Arabia's role in the Middle East. By linking Saudi Arabia's current actions in Lebanon to a long history of regional interference and aggression, the text creates a generalized image of the kingdom as a perpetual antagonist. This strategy is designed to influence the reader's social cognition by reinforcing stereotypes and encouraging the reader to view Saudi Arabia's actions through a lens of suspicion and distrust. The consistent negative representation of Saudi Arabia across various contexts serves to entrench these views in the reader's social framework, shaping how they perceive future events involving the kingdom.

Level of Detail: The level of detail provided in LT about Saudi Arabia's actions is carefully curated to support the cognitive strategy of manipulating social cognition. By offering detailed accounts of Saudi Arabia's alleged involvement in various conflicts, the text provides the reader with a seemingly comprehensive narrative that supports the negative portrayal of the kingdom. This detailed approach helps to establish credibility and encourages the reader to accept the narrative as well-researched and factual. As a result, the reader is more likely to integrate these views into their social cognition, influencing how they interpret and discuss Saudi Arabia's role in regional politics.

5.2.2 Saudi Text ST

The analysis focuses on how the text employs cognitive strategies and discursive structures to shape reader perception, particularly in its portrayal

of Lebanese political factions and Saudi Arabia's role in the Middle East. The text's narrative is constructed to defend Saudi Arabia's actions while criticizing the fragmentation and perceived failures within Lebanese politics..

Table 3: Highlights of ST Analysis

Cognitive Strategies	Discursive Structure Strategies	Examples from Text
A. STM Manipulation	1. Visual Effects	Not directly applicable in a text format.
	2. Headlines	The headline "لبنان.. إعادة تدوير النفايات السياسية!" is provocative and sets a critical tone towards Lebanese politics.
	3. Topic Selection	Focus on the alleged transformation of Lebanon into a fragmented region, with critiques aimed at various groups.
	4. Lexical Selection	Strong, critical language such as "إعادة تدوير النفايات السياسية"، "الطائنين على"، "كراهية ضد السعوديين"، and "العروبة".
	5. Emphasis	Emphasizes the negative influence of various Lebanese factions and figures on Saudi Arabia and the Arab identity.
	6. Order of Information	Begins with a discussion on regional fragmentation and ends with a stark warning about the ongoing conflict.
B. LTM (Mental Model) Manipulation	1. Positive/Negative Actions	Positive portrayal of Saudi Arabia as a successful, unified state; negative portrayal of Lebanese factions as divisive.
	2. Blaming	Blames various Lebanese groups, such as Hezbollah and supporters of George Kordahi, for undermining Arab unity.

	3. Speech Acts	Assertive statements condemning the actions and attitudes of Lebanese political figures and intellectuals.
	4. Presupposition and Implicature	Implies that Lebanese factions are conspiring against Saudi Arabia and Arab unity.
	5. Rhetorical Devices	Uses metaphors like "إعادة تدوير النفايات السياسية" to describe the recycling of harmful political ideologies in Lebanon.
	6. Passive/Active (Responsibility)	Actively assigns responsibility to Lebanese figures for promoting anti-Saudi sentiment and divisiveness in the region.
C. Social Cognition	1. Generalization	Generalizes the actions of specific Lebanese individuals and factions as representative of broader anti-Saudi sentiments.
	2. Positive/Negative Representation	Strongly positive representation of Saudi Arabia and its efforts to maintain Arab unity; negative depiction of Lebanese politics and culture.
	3. Level of Detail	Provides detailed criticism of Lebanese factions, historical context of anti-Saudi sentiments, and examples of figures like George Kordahi.

5.2.2.1 STM (Short-Term Memory) Manipulation

Headlines and Visual Effects: The headline of ST, "لبنان.. إعادة تدوير النفايات السياسية" (Lebanon: Recycling Political Waste!), is a striking example of how headlines can be used to manipulate short-term memory. The headline is sarcastic and provocative, immediately drawing the reader's attention to a critical view of Lebanese politics. The phrase "إعادة تدوير النفايات السياسية"

(recycling political waste) creates a vivid visual metaphor, prompting the reader to envision Lebanese politics as a cycle of corruption and ineffectiveness. This metaphorical language effectively captures the reader's attention and sets the tone for the article, influencing how the reader will process the subsequent information.

Lexical Selection and Emphasis: ST makes strategic use of lexical choices to reinforce its critique of Lebanese factions while subtly defending Saudi Arabia. Terms like "ثقافة الاستعلاء" (culture of arrogance) and "المتكرون للمعروف" (those who deny goodwill) are employed to characterize certain Lebanese figures and factions negatively. This choice of words is intended to evoke a sense of frustration and disdain towards these groups, shaping the reader's immediate perception of the political situation in Lebanon. By emphasizing these negative traits, the text ensures that these impressions are prominent in the reader's short-term memory, influencing how they interpret the rest of the article.

Order of Information: The order in which information is presented in ST is carefully structured to guide the reader's interpretation of events. The text begins with a critique of Lebanon's internal issues, framing the country's political landscape as deeply flawed and riddled with corruption. This is followed by a discussion of Saudi Arabia's role, which is portrayed in a more positive light, as a successful and unified state. By starting with the negative aspects of Lebanese politics and then contrasting them with Saudi Arabia's stability, the text influences the reader's short-term memory to favorably view Saudi Arabia's position. This structuring ensures that the reader's initial focus is on Lebanon's shortcomings, making the subsequent defense of Saudi Arabia more persuasive.

5.2.2.2 LTM (Long-Term Memory) Manipulation

Positive/Negative Actions and Blaming: ST manipulates long-term memory by consistently portraying Lebanese political factions in a negative light while presenting Saudi Arabia as a positive force. The text highlights the failures and corruption within Lebanon, attributing the country's political fragmentation to these factions. By repeatedly associating these factions with negative actions, such as betrayal of Arab unity, the text aims to create a lasting negative impression of these groups in the reader's mind. Conversely,

Saudi Arabia is depicted as a successful and resilient state, which has managed to maintain its unity and stability despite regional challenges. This positive portrayal is intended to embed a favorable image of Saudi Arabia in the reader's long-term memory, influencing how they perceive future actions by the kingdom.

Speech Acts and Presupposition/Implicature: The speech acts in ST are assertive and confident, designed to shape the reader's beliefs about the roles of Lebanon and Saudi Arabia in the region. Statements like "السعودية الدولة الوحيدة التي شكّلت وحدة ناجحة وصامدة" (Saudi Arabia is the only state that has formed a successful and resilient unity) are presented as undeniable truths, reinforcing the narrative that Saudi Arabia is a bastion of stability in a turbulent region. The text presupposes that the reader accepts the inherent superiority of Saudi Arabia's political model over Lebanon's, subtly suggesting that Lebanon's problems are self-inflicted and that Saudi Arabia's actions are justified. This manipulation of presuppositions and implicatures serves to shape the reader's long-term understanding of the regional dynamics, embedding these ideas as part of their broader worldview.

Rhetorical Devices and Responsibility Assignment: ST employs rhetorical devices such as metaphors and analogies to reinforce its arguments and influence the reader's long-term perception. The metaphor of "recycling political waste" is particularly powerful, as it encapsulates the text's critique of Lebanese politics in a single, memorable image. This metaphor not only criticizes the repetitive and ineffective nature of Lebanese political practices but also positions them in stark contrast to Saudi Arabia's perceived progress and stability. Additionally, the text actively assigns responsibility for Lebanon's political failures to its internal factions, absolving Saudi Arabia of any blame and instead portraying it as a victim of Lebanese dysfunction. By doing so, ST seeks to embed a narrative in the reader's long-term memory that positions Saudi Arabia as a successful state unfairly maligned by failing neighbors.

5.2.2.3 Social Cognition

Generalization and Representation: ST uses generalization as a discursive strategy to shape social cognition, particularly in how the reader perceives Lebanese politics and Saudi Arabia's role in the Middle East. The text

generalizes the actions of Lebanese political factions, portraying them as universally corrupt and self-serving. This generalization is intended to create a negative stereotype of Lebanese political actors, influencing how the reader perceives the country's entire political system. In contrast, Saudi Arabia is represented positively, as a unified and successful state that stands in opposition to the fragmentation and failure seen in Lebanon. This positive representation is intended to influence the reader's social cognition by encouraging them to view Saudi Arabia as a model of stability and success in the region.

Level of Detail: The level of detail provided in ST about the failures of Lebanese factions and the success of Saudi Arabia is carefully curated to support the text's broader narrative. The text provides specific examples of Lebanese political mismanagement, while offering a more general but consistently positive portrayal of Saudi Arabia's political achievements. This selective detailing is designed to reinforce the reader's belief in the superiority of Saudi Arabia's political model, while simultaneously deepening their disdain for Lebanese politics. By providing enough detail to make its arguments credible, but not so much as to overwhelm the reader, ST effectively manipulates social cognition to align with its narrative.

Results

In comparing the Lebanese Text LT by Hasan Illaik and the Saudi Text ST by Mohammed Al-Saaed through Van Dijk's CDA framework, distinct differences emerge in the cognitive strategies and discursive structures employed.

- LT uses a direct and confrontational headline, paired with emotionally charged language (the madness of the Saudi regime) to position Saudi Arabia negatively and evoke strong reactions. ST opts for a sarcastic, metaphorical headline, (recycling political waste), critiquing Lebanese politics while subtly defending Saudi Arabia. The language is critical but less emotionally charged than in LT.
- LT focuses on Saudi Arabia's influence in Lebanon, emphasizing its political failures and portraying the kingdom as a destabilizing force. ST shifts focus to Lebanese internal issues, highlighting the country's

political corruption and fragmentation, while presenting Saudi Arabia as a stable and successful state.

- LT uses assertive language to blame Saudi Arabia, particularly Mohammed bin Salman, for regional instability. ST directs blame towards Lebanese factions, portraying them as the cause of Lebanon's decline, while defending Saudi Arabia's actions.
- LT employs rhetorical questions and analogies to reinforce Saudi Arabia's negative role, framing it as the main antagonist. ST uses metaphors, like "recycling political waste," to critique Lebanese politics and absolve Saudi Arabia of responsibility, positioning it as a victim of Lebanese dysfunction.
- LT generalizes Saudi Arabia's actions across various contexts, constructing a narrative of the kingdom as a malign force. Lebanese resistance is portrayed positively. ST generalizes the corruption of Lebanese factions, contrasting them with Saudi Arabia's unity and success, reinforcing a positive image of the kingdom.

Conclusions

Throughout the analysis of both texts, the study reached at the following conclusions:

1. The main social powers behind the crisis were the regional players and international superpowers. i.e., Iran and the United States which had a little mention in the selected texts
2. Both texts are characterized by excessive lexical selection strategies that highlight the negative side of the other party rather than highlighting their positive side.
3. The long term memory manipulation in this discourse is of a historical nature. The techniques used by both writers is achieved by exploiting historical events and linking them to the current crisis.
4. The essence of the negative representation in the manipulation of Arab discourse is agency to non- Arab countries and organizations as well as the appeal to post-colonial concepts like freedom of speech.

References

- Al- Utbi, M. I. Kareem (2019) "A Critical Discourse Analysis of Hate Speech". In *Journal of the College of Languages. Baghdad: University of Bagdad*. (39): p.p. 19-40.
<https://doi.org/10.36586/jcl.2.2022.0.45.0001>
- Amoussou, F. & A. Allagbe (2018). "Principles, Theories and Approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis". *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)* 6 (1), pp 11-18 .
<http://dx.doi.org/10.20431/2347-3134.0601002>
- Augoustinos, M. and Walker, I. (1995) *Social Cognition: An Integrated Introduction*. London: Sage.
- Moscovici, S. (2001) *Social Representations: Explorations in Social Psychology*. New York: New York University Press.
- Reuters (2021) <https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/lebanon-pm-says-ministers-criticism-saudi-is-not-govt-position-2021-10-27/>
- Rogers, R. (2004). *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). "Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis". In *Discourse & Society*. London: SAGE Publications., 4(2): 249- 283
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1996). "Discourse, power and access". In Carmen R. Caldas-Coulthard and Malcolm Coulthard, eds., *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge, pp. 84–104.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998) *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2001) "Multidisciplinary CDA: A Plea for Diversity", in Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer (eds) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, pp. 95–120. London: Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006) *Discourse and manipulation*. In *Discourse & Society*. London: SAGE Publications., 17(2): 359–383

Van Dijk, T. A. (2015) *Critical Discourse Analysis*. In Tannen, D.; Hamilton, H. & Schiffrin D. (eds.) *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. 2nd ed. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Wodak, R. (1987) “‘And Where Is the Lebanon?’ A Socio-Psycholinguistic Investigation of Comprehension and Intelligibility of News’, *Text* 7(4): 377-410.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research*. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 121-138). London: Sage.

تحليل الخطاب النقدي للآزمة الدبلوماسية اللبنانية السعودية عام 2021م

1طالب الدكتوراه شوقي خضير اسماعيل ، 2سندس محسن علي العبيدي
1جامعة ديالى / كلية التربية للعلوم الانسانية
2جامعة بغداد / كلية الآداب

المستخلص

تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى التحقيق في الخطاب المتعلق بالآزمة اللبنانية-السعودية في أواخر أكتوبر 2021. أثارت هذه الحرب الدبلوماسية والإعلامية ضجة في وسائل الإعلام العربية والدولية. تتناول هذه الدراسة الحرب الإعلامية المكتوبة بين البلدين من منظور الإطار الاجتماعي-الادراكي لفان دايك ولذي يقوم على مفهوم التلاعب في الذاكرة الاجتماعية و الإدراكية . تم إجراء التحليل من خلال اختيار مقالتين من الصحف اليومية المنشورة في لبنان والسعودية. تعد الدراسة محاولة نوعية لحساب الاستراتيجيات التي تستخدمها وسائل الإعلام لإعادة إنتاج الواقع الخطابي للآزمة الدبلوماسية بين البلدين. ووجدت الدراسة أن الاستراتيجيات الرئيسية للتلاعب المستخدمة في هذا الخطاب تستهدف المستوى المعرفي للذاكرة قصيرة المدى من خلال اختيار سلبي للمفردات المتعلقة بالطرف الآخر بدلاً من التمثيل الإيجابي للذات.

الكلمات الدالة : الانموذج الاجتماعي- الادراكي، تحليل نقدي، خطاب

Appendix

1. Lebanese Text LT

Hasan Illaik. Al Akhbar daily newspaper, issue of November 1st, 2021

بلى، السعودية تخشى جورج قرداحي

[حسن عليق](#) جريدة الاخبار اللبنانية (الإثنين 1 تشرين الثاني 2021)

لجنون النظام السعودي تجاه لبنان أسباب ودوافع شتى.

أولاً، يريد محمد بن سلمان تغيير النظام السياسي. هذا الاستنتاج ليس وليد قراءة سياسية، بل هو ما قاله وزير الخارجية السعودي، فيصل بن فرحان، لـ«رويترز» أول من أمس.

ثانياً، يريد ابن سلمان معاقبة لبنان لأنه (أي ابن سلمان) تخلى عن العمل «في الساحة اللبنانية لأن استثماراتنا فيها خاسرة»، على ما قال لمسؤولين عرب وغربيين، آخرهم كان رئيس الحكومة العراقي مصطفى الكاظمي. بمعنى آخر، قرر ابن سلمان الانسحاب من لبنان، وقصر دوره فيه على دعم للقوات اللبنانية وشخصيات هامشية، ووسائل إعلامية، في مقابل مقاطعته السلطة كما عملية تشكيلها. ما قام به على مدى سنوات هو عملياً حرّك نتيجة خسارات فريقه المتكررة، كما فشله في إحداث تغيير لمصلحته، حتى لو كانت محاولة التغيير على شاكلة عملية انقلابية نفذها يوم 4 تشرين الثاني 2017، وانتهت إلى هزيمة نكراء له. وبعد أربع سنوات على تلك المحاولة الفاشلة لتغيير النظام في لبنان أو جرّه إلى حرب أهلية، تشكلت حكومة ليس لابن سلمان فيها أي نصيب. والأخير لديه مرشح واحد لرئاسة الحكومة، هو نواف سلام. الآخرون، في نظره، يتنافسون في السوء، من سعد الحريري إلى نجيب ميقاتي كما سائر

ثالثاً، يريد وليّ العهد معاقبة لبنان، بسبب ما يراه دوراً لحزب الله في اليمن. والحرب على الجار الأفقر لمملكة ابن سعود، هي الطلقة التي رماها ابن سلمان على قدميه، في بداية عهده وزيراً للدفاع. أرادها نصره الذي يخلد اسمه في التاريخ، كقائد للسعودية الجديدة، فإذا بها مهانته الكبرى التي لن تقارقه طالما بقي حياً. وفي كثير من الأحيان، يقوم بخطوات هدفها «فش خلقه» لا أكثر، ليعوّض النقائص التي تصيبه جراء فشله في حسم الحرب لمصلحته.

يمكن إضافة الكثير من الأسباب والدوافع والذرائع، لإثبات أن التصريح الذي أدلى به الإعلامي جورج قرداحي قبل توزيره، عن حرب اليمن، ليس سوى ذريعة للهجوم السعودي على لبنان. وبعد تصريحه وزير خارجية ابن سلمان في اليومين الماضيين عن أن «تعاملنا مع لبنان ومع حكومته الحالية ليس مُنتجاً ولا مفيداً»، لم يعد أحد يحتاج إلى إثبات أن تصريح قرداحي «المنبوش» لم يكن أكثر من مطية لابتنزاز لبنان وأهله وتهديدهم. لكن ما تقدّم لا يعني أن تصريح قرداحي، وخاصة لجهة قوله إن حركة أنصار الله في اليمن تقاوم عدواناً على بلادها، ليس أحد أسباب جنون النظام السعودي. فهذا النظام تمكّن على مدى عقود، بفضل إنفاق عشرات مليارات الدولارات، من شراء غالبية النخب السياسية والإعلامية والدينية والثقافية في العالمين العربي والإسلامي.

يصعب العثور على جريمة كبرى، أو حرب أهلية، أو حرب استعمارية، وقعت في بلاد العرب والمسلمين، على الأقل منذ الحرب العالمية الثانية، ولم يكن لآل سعود فيها نصيب إلى جانب المعتدين: من إعدام أنطون سعادة، إلى محاربة الوحدة العربية ولو كانت فكرة، إلى قتال جمال عبد الناصر فيما هو يخوض حرب الاستقلال والتحرير في فلسطين وغيرها من الأرض العربية، إلى معاداة جميع قوى المقاومة للاحتلال، إلى حرب اليمن في الستينيات، إلى حرب صدام حسين على إيران، إلى الحربين الأفغانيتين، والحرب الأهلية اللبنانية، إلى حصار العراق ثم غزوه وما تلاه من مأس، إلى الحرب السورية وانبعث داعش...

وخارج العالم العربي، لا يمكن تبرئة النظام السعودي من تغطية حرب الإبادة التي شنها سوهارتو في أندونيسيا، على الشيوعيين، وأوقعت أكثر من 500 ألف قتيل في سنتين، ولا من الكوارث التي حلت بباكستان منذ ما قبل انقلاب ضياء الحق على ذو الفقار علي بوتو... ولعل أبرز جرائم آل سعود تجسّد في إعادة بعث التكفير ورعايته ومأسسته ومدّه بكل أسباب الحياة والانتشار، في القرن العشرين، في طول العالم الإسلامي وعرضه، من أندونيسيا شرقاً إلى نيجيريا والصحراء الغربية غرباً، منذ ستينيات القرن الماضي على الأقل. وتمتدّ ارتكابات آل سعود إلى خارج بلاد العرب والمسلمين، حيث لا مصلحة لهم، لا مباشرة ولا بصورة غير مباشرة، فتراهم يمولون حروب واشنطن السرية في أميركا اللاتينية (تجربة الكونترا في نيكاراغوا، على سبيل المثال لا الحصر).

رغم السجل الجرمي الحافل لآل سعود، فإنهم تمكّنوا، بشراء الذمم والتهديد والابتزاز، من تقديم أنفسهم بصورة معاكسة لواقعهم. النظام الذي يتبنّى مذهباً دينياً موعظاً في الإقصاء، يروّج لنفسه بصفته راعي الوسطية. والعائلة الحاكمة التي تبتز الشعوب والدول بعمل أبنائهم فيها، وتمول الحروب في بلادهم، تسمّي نفسها «مملكة الخير». والحرب اليمنية، بكل ما فيها من جنائيات على الحقوق الإنسانية والسياسية والثقافية، بات اسمها «إعادة الأمل». المال السعودي، في الغرب قبل الشرق، اشترى صمت العالم. وأي مدافع عن حقوق الإنسان، ومنظر للبيرالية، ومبشّر بالقيم الكونية في عالم ما بعد الحرب الباردة، يمكنه، بلا أدنى خجل، أن يعمل في صحيفة يملكها النظام السعودي، محاضراً في الأخلاق. هذا الواقع ثمنه عشرات مليارات الدولارات التي أنفقها آل سعود على الدعاية وشراء الذمم. لكن، في الوقت عينه، يدرك نظام الرياض تمام الإدراك مدى سوء صورته، كإدراكه هشاشة السور الذي بناه لحماية هذه الصورة. ولأجل ذلك، تراه يخرج عن طوره متى خرج سياسي لانتقاده. وهو لا يتورع عن ملاحقة ما هو دون التصريح السياسي. السفراء السعوديون في الدول العربية يسألون أصحاب وسائل الإعلام المرئية منهم، عن «لايكات» عاملين فيها، متى كانت تعبيراً عن الموافقة على قول ينتقد آل سعود أو يسيء إليهم. يتدخلون في مقابلات، فيما هي تبث على الهواء مباشرة، للاعتراض على عبارة قالها ضيف، ويطلبون من صاحب التلفزيون أو مديره الاعتذار فوراً... وإلا ينقطع التمويل (شهدت، قبل سنوات، حادثه مشابهة على الهواء مباشرة).

حرب اليمن هي كعب أخيل صورتهم في زمننا هذا. وهم تمكّنوا من تدبّر أمرهم في الغرب، بالمال وبدورهم المُعين للولايات المتحدة، وحليفاتها إسرائيل، في العالم العربي والإسلامي. ويستطيعون التعايش مع المستوى المنخفض للنقد الذي يرتفع في وجههم من حين لآخر على ضفتي الأطلسي. لكن ما لا يمكنهم قبوله، مطلقاً، هو انكسار حاجز الخوف منهم، «باللغة العربية». هم

مستعدون للقتل والحرب والحصار، لإسكات الصوت الناقد لهم. قبل أشهر، منعوا توظيف الزميل جاد غصن في مؤسسة تابعة لهم في دبي، بسبب مواقف «غير حادة» وجدوا فيها ما يسوؤهم. ويلاحقون، أمنياً، أقرباء لصحافيين يرفعون الصوت ضدهم. هم يخشون أي صوت معارض، كما أي رأي لا يكرر دعايتهم ضد خصومهم وأعدائهم. وبعد إطباقهم الذي يكاد يكون شاملاً على الإعلام العربي، يوجهون للعاملين فيه رسالة مفادها أن الترقّي المهني والاجتماعي «ممنوع عليكم ما لم تخضعوا لسردياتنا». من هذا المنطلق، يخيفهم جورج قرداحي، في تصريحه عن أنصار الله (الحوثيين)، وخاصة أنه وجه إعلامي شهير في العالم العربي، وغير معروف بمواقفه السياسية المعادية لهم، ولا يمكنهم رميه بتهم «المجوسية» و«الرافضية» و«موالاة إيران». إعلامياً، جورج قرداحي ابن مؤسساتهم الإعلامية. وما يخيفهم أكثر من تصريحه، رفضه الاعتذار منهم والاستقالة تكفيراً عما يروونه ذنباً. ولأجل ذلك، يريدون تأديب لبنان، وجعله عبرة لباقي الدول العربية، إذ يُمنع على أي مسؤول رسمي عربي أن يقول للملك إنه عار. من هذا المنطلق، يصبح نقدهم واجباً، وذكر محاسن أعدائهم وخصومهم مستحباً. لمحاربة آل سعود، لا تحتاج إلى محاجة فكرية، وإن كانت مطلوبة في كل المعارك. يكفي قول كلمة لا تروقهم، وإبقاء ذكر جرائمهم حاضراً. تكفي كلمة حق في وجه أكثر السلاطين جوراً في العصر الحديث.

2.Saudi Text ST

Mohammed Assaed, October, 31st 2021 issue of Okaz daily newspaper

لبنان.. إعادة تدوير النفايات السياسية ! محمد الساعد
جريدة عكاظ (الاحد 31 أكتوبر 2021 23:42)

هناك من يدفع بضاورة لتحويل لبنان إلى إسرائيل أخرى في المنطقة، فالشكل الجديد للإقليم كما يريد صانعه يجب أن يكون إقليمياً مختلطاً وشعوبياً بامتياز، أي أن الإقليم العربي الذي لطالما تعنى بنفوذ العرب من البحرين إلى تطوان سيختفي تماماً، وستكون هناك دولة عبرية ومارونية وكثير من الأقليات التي لديها الدعم والدافع للانفصال، المثير أن قوام تلك الدويلات هو الهوية الدينية أو المذهبية، أي أن العقد السياسي والاجتماعي يبدأ وينتهي من الفتوية الدينية المنغلقة.

التيار «العوني الماروني» في الطريق لإنشاء دولة مسيحية تطل على البحر الأبيض المتوسط، ذات هوية فرنكوفونية، وفي شمال سوريا هناك دويلة تركمانية تتشكل في رحم سوريا، إضافة لدويلة علوية في عمق الشام. الملفت في ملف قضية وزير إعلام لبنان جورج قرداحي أن تصريحاته سيئة السمعة وضعت مزيداً من البارود في بندقية حزب الله الموجهة ضد المملكة ودول الخليج، فالحزب وحلفاؤه يتبنون خطاباً معادياً للسعودية يصب في صالح مشروع الدويلات المختلطة منذ عقود، وللتذكير هذا المشروع ليس مشروع حزب الله فقط، فقد ورثه الحزب عن تيارات لبنانية سابقة وسيورته لآخرين من بعده لاحقاً، فقد كان البعثيون والناصريون والقوميون السوريون. يضعون السعودية على رأس قائمة الاستهداف منذ الخمسينات الميلادية، وكانت الصحف والمجلات والمؤلفات الصادرة من بيروت تنشر أعنف الهجمات، والشعراء ينشدون أفحج القصائد.

أما لماذا السعودية فلأنها الدولة الوحيدة التي شكّلت وحدة ناجحة وصامدة منذ أكثر من 300 عام في هذا الشرق المليء بالتضاد والخصومات، ولأن مشروعها العروبي يرفض أي تدخل أو هيمنة من دول التخوم الأعجمية. بدأ ذلك متزامناً مع ظهور البترول في الصحراء العربية، البترول أعطى «البدو» القادمين من الجزيرة العربية أفضلية وتفوقاً رسخاً هوية أجدادهم الأمويين والعباسيين الذين شكلوا حضارة تفوقت على حضارة وثقافة الرومان والفرس في العراق والشام. انفتح السعوديون وبقية دول الخليج على لبنان التي قدّر لها أن تكون محطة «ترانزيت» لخطوط الطيران بين الخليج وأوروبا وأمريكا، ولولا ذلك لبقيت بيروت عاصمة مهملة لا تزيد أهمية على القرداحة السورية، ذلك الانفتاح حمل عشرات الآلاف من أبناء السعودية والخليج إلى بيروت في طريقهم لأوروبا، وهناك بدأوا بالتعرف على بيروت المليئة بالأضواء، وبالعكس أيضاً جاء مهاجراً وباحثاً عن العمل في الجزيرة العربية مئات آلاف من اللبنانيين.

كان ظهور البترول قدر السعودية ودول الخليج، وفي الوقت نفسه غصة وقفت في حلق الكارهين المنتشرين في بعض العواصم منذ أكثر من ستة عقود حتى اليوم وغير قادرين على تجاوزها، جورج قرداحي هو نفسه غسان كنفاني، ونزار قباني وكثير ممن أعياهم الحسد وأضناهم التعالي، ففي بيروت ومقاهي الضاحية تشربوا الكراهية ضد السعوديين وأنتجوها.

قرداحي هو مثال صارخ لثقافة الاستعلاء والتنمر الثقافي التي يحملها البعض ممن التحقوا بوظائف في الخليج أو عملوا لصالح شركات ومؤسسات سعودية في الداخل والخارج، المتنكرون للمعروف يعتقدون أن لديهم السلطة الثقافية لتحديد ما هو الصح والخطأ في حياة السعوديين، ولديهم الجرأة لنقد القرارات والحياة الاجتماعية والتراث والمكونات. بالتأكيد أننا وهم ننتمي لثقافتين مختلفتين تماماً - ثقافة عربية خالصة، وثقافة مستعربة لم تهضم عروبته وقيمها-، لكن ذلك لا يخولهم إفراس القبح علينا، فجورج وأمثلة من الطائنين على العروبة، لا إشكال لديهم في التحالف مع الشياطين وأدواتهم في المنطقة، ما دام ذلك التحالف يحقق لجورج ونزار وغسان وكل أعداء المشروع العربي في الشرق آمنيات إسقاط أبناء الجزيرة والاستيلاء على ثروتهم وإنهاكهم.

مخطئ تماماً من يظن ولو لوهلة أن هذه آخر الأخطاء، وأن جورج آخر الأعداء، بل إن الكثير الكثير سيتبعونه في الأيام والأشهر والسنوات القادمة، إنه صراع أزلي بين الرياض الواقعة ضد التقنيت والفنوية، وبين منخرطين في إعادة تدوير الرومان، وإنتاج إيوان كسرى أنو شروان من جديد.