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ABSTRACT

The present study investigates the possibility of utilizing the four strategic functions of political discourse initiated by Chilton and Schaffner (1997) to analyze media discourse. The paper is concerned with how Cable News Network (CNN) employs the four strategic functions within its media discourse to convey its media message to its readers, reflecting the concept of ‘Self’ and ‘Other’. Hence, this research contributes to the realization of strategic functions notion in media discourse, in general, CNN’s news discourse, in particular, by analyzing presupposition and the hidden ideologies behind. It seeks to answer the following question: Can strategic functions be established and utilized within the media discourse to convey ideological media message to the recipients? van Dijk’s theory of Ideological Square (1998) will be utilized to clarify CNN’s presentation of positive ‘Self’ and negative ‘Other’ (in and out groups). Wodak’s historical discourse approach for CDA (2009) will be integrated to provide the readers with the needed background information to understand the text. Fairclough’s 2-dimentional approach for CDA (1995) will be employed to organize the process of analysis. The linguistic analysis of CNN’s news text that concerns with Arab-spring Yemen approves that the strategic functions concept can be detected within media discourse.
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INTRODUCTION

The Arab spring can be defined as a wave of demonstrations and protests spread in Arab world at the end of 2010 and early start of 2011 and this is called as “the Arab spring” (Ashley, 2011) or known as “the Arab awakening” (Aljazeera, 2011a & b). It began, in Tunisia, with the event of self-immolation of Mohammad Bouazizi on 18/Dec./2010 rejecting the powerful elite’s corruption and their ill-treatment of people and violation of human rights (Fahim, 2011). This led to shake the Arab long-standing dictatorships in whole Arab homeland as in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, Yemen, Bahrain and Syria. At that time, the Arab world was facing very difficult social, economic and political circumstances. This wave of Arab spring has its deep impact, influence and consequences on the Arab nation. News channels dealt with this wave trying to follow up and Cable News Network (CNN) is among. Powers, (2012). The importance of the study may reside in this point as it throws light on one of the prominent world news channels, analyzing its online news stories linguistically and ideologically. Both factors may be considered important by specialists in linguistics, political sciences and mass-media and communication. As such, the researcher of the current study intends to focus on the ideological use of language to build “Self” and ‘Other’ polarities in the CNN’s online news investigating Chilton and Schaffner’s notion of strategic functions which are manifested through linguistic choices in its media discourse about Arab spring. To help achieve this aim, the researcher will utilize a CDA framework concentrating on the CNN’s ideological representation of “Self” and “Other” towards Arab spring.

Literature Review

Critical discourse analysis (CDA)

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is an approach or method to explore, investigate and analyze the written or spoken discourse revealing its discursive source of ideology, bias and power. However, CDA’s main goal is to unearth the socio-political inequalities in any societies, whether
they are religious, political, economic, and cultural and so on so forth. Fairclough, one of CDA pioneers, defined CDA as the study of “often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, event and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power; and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor of security power and hegemony” (1995, p.132). By such a definition, Fairclough elucidated that CDA’s main concern is to show how an event, social and cultural, is expressed by discursive structures in such a dialectical relation being reflected in a written or spoken text. Furthermore, CDA investigates the role of discourse in sustaining and reflecting social relations of power and ideology. For Wodak (1989), CDA is an interdisciplinary method to study language critically aiming to manifest language behavior in relation with social actors. This means that CDA concentrates on analyzing texts and their contexts to unveil their hidden ideologies and power embedded within language. Van Dijk (1993) asserted that CDA is the study of ideology, power and resistance by means of analyzing linguistic structures as main priority.

In nutshell, the main aim of CDA is to reveal and expose power relations being embedded in and over discourses as discourse constitutes and is constituted by society and culture. Therefore, discourse reflects the social and cultural practices within their linguistic character, showing how the powerful group dominates the powerless ones legitimizing and imposing current socio-cultural status quo power relations (van Dijk, 1998a). As discourses are embedded with ideologies, analyzing texts is crucial process to uncover the imbedded ideologies, determining how texts reflect the hegemony of the powerful elite which (re)produces and transmits them.

Employing CDA on media news texts brings awareness and understanding of the linguistic strategies and components of the ideological power behind. CDA is, in fact, a tool that can be utilized to discover the implicit ideology through language. As such, this paper intended to shed light on the ideological use of language in the construction of ‘Self’ and ‘Other’’s components in the genre of media news texts. In other words, this paper intends to clarify how language can be utilized strategically to reveal the world providing readers another way to interpret and understand news texts. Thus, this researcher realizes the need for further understanding of how language can be used in the context of news media texts that cover Arab spring phenomenon, particularly, showing how components of “Self and Other” are represented from a political perspective. First, the concept of “Self and Other” and its ideological role in inter-waving media texts will be explained in the next section.

“Self and Other”

Riggins (1997) asserted that the two terms of “Self” and “Other” have been used since Plato’s times, representing the relation between an observer (self) and an observed (other). In recent and modern times these two terms are used with ideological implications and interests. The term “Other” is commonly used to refer to all people the ‘self’ perceives as mildly or radically different” (p.3). Moreover, the discourse involving the two identities, revolve about the notion that “Self” is completely different from “Other” as the first is portrayed positively and the second negatively (P.4). Put differently, “Self” and “Other” always involve a “dualistic good versus evil struggle” (p.10).

Furthermore, the two terms are, also, used to refer to “Us” and “Them” with positive connotation for the first and negative one for the second. In fact, Van Dijk (1998b, p.68-69) posited the polarization of “Us” vs. “Them” as ideological representation of “who we are, what we stand for, what our values are and what our relationships are with other groups, in particular our enemies or opponents”. Mazid (2007, p.368) used “Utopic Kernel” to refer to “Us” and “Dystopic kernel” to refer to all that is not “Us”.

Van Dijk (1998b) asserted that the ideological discourse is organized by a general strategy of positive “Self” presentation (boasting) and negative “Other” presentation (derogation). This strategy operates at all levels to emphasize our good things and their bad things. At the same time, our bad things and their good things should be deemphasized (van Dijk, 1998b). This makes the discourse ideological. In CDA, this is, more or less, a standard theory. Hence, critical discourse analysis aims, empirically, to examine systematically the strategies and structures of the various types of ideological discourses and their role in acquiring and reproducing ideologies of groups as a whole.

Throughout discussing his group conflict and interest notion, van Dijk (1998b) added that a typical racist ideology is where “we are representing Us as superior , and Them as inferior” (p.68). He stressed that each group tries to approve that its ideological beliefs are true, leading to hard opposition between “Us” and “Them” as ideologically different groups. “We” is always represented positively whereas “They” is represented negatively. Thus, “positive self-presentation and negative other presentation seems to be a fundamental property of ideologies” (p.69).

Van Dijk (1998b) argued that ideology is utilized within discourse structures to show one’s beliefs implicitly and explicitly. It is also used as a persuasive tool by the writer to manipulate the recipients’ minds. The general strategy to control discourse is based on the underlying in and out group polarization of ideologies:

-Our good things and their bad things will be emphasized as it is the case for the mitigation of our bad things and their good things. Thus, the image of “Self” is created by contrasting it with the image of “Other”. To sum up, ideology has pejorative and negative connotation, generating polarized attitudes of “Us” and “Them”, “We” and “They”, “Self” and “Other”.

Presupposition

“Presupposition is something the speaker assumes to be the case prior to making an utterance. Speakers, not sentences, have presuppositions. One major empirical test of
presupposition is constancy under negation, that is, if an affirmative sentence conveys a presupposition, it will convey the same presupposition when it is negated” (Yule, 1996:29). For example, both, “My mobile is expensive” and “My mobile is not expensive” presupposes: “I have a mobile”.

Many authors identify “presupposition triggers”. Levinson (1983: ch.4) and Yule (1996), for example lists the following:
- Existential Presuppositions
- Factive Presuppositions
- Structural Presuppositions
- Counter-Factual Presuppositions
- Non-Factive Presuppositions
- Lexical Presuppositions

Table 1 presents examples of Presuppositions ‘types within their triggers which would help to be a guide throughout the descriptive analysis stage.

### Objectives of the Study

The main objective of the present paper resides in showing the possibility of establishing the Chilton and Schaffner (1997)’s political discourse strategic functions in media discourse, exemplified by CNN’s selected news text. Thus, it concerns with identification and discussion of the strategic functions utilized by CNN in its online news text to be analyzed within a CDA study, reflecting its “Self” and “Other”. To achieve this goal Fairclough’s 3-dimensional approach of CDA (1995) and Wodak’s approach of historical discourse (2009) will be applied in analyzing the suggested CNN news text. As such, with the main objective mentioned above, this study is designed:
- to identify whether Chilton and Schaffner (1997)’s political discourse strategic functions can be established and used in media discourse.
- to identify the prevailing strategic functions enacted through linguistic choices to reflect “Self and Other” ‘s constructions in the CNN’s Arab spring news discourse.

### Table 1. Presuppositions’ Triggers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Triggers</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existential Presuppositions</td>
<td>a) Definite Description</td>
<td>-Lilly didn’t find her friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Lilly found her friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;&gt; Lilly has a friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Possessive Construction</td>
<td>-Lilly’s dress is so beautiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Lilly’s is not so beautiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;&gt; Lilly has a dress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factive Presuppositions</td>
<td>Factive verbs (realize, glad, be aware….)</td>
<td>-Lilly regrets to see him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Lilly does not regret to see him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;&gt; Lilly sees him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Presuppositions</td>
<td>What -question</td>
<td>-Who goes abroad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;&gt; Someone goes abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleft Sentence</td>
<td>-Where Lilly goes is nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Where Lilly goes is not nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;&gt; Lilly goes somewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-Factual Presuppositions</td>
<td>Conditional “if”</td>
<td>-If Lilly was clever, her family’s situation would have been good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;&gt; Lilly was not clever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Factive Presuppositions</td>
<td>Non-Factive verbs (imagine, dream…)</td>
<td>-Lilly pretends to be brilliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Lilly does not pretend to be brilliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;&gt; Lilly is not brilliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical Presuppositions</td>
<td>a) Change of State Verbs (stop, enter, come, arrive, go, leave, carry on)</td>
<td>-Lilly finishes her homework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Lilly doesn’t finish her homework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;&gt; Lilly used to do her homework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Implicative Verbs (imagine, avoid, ought to…)</td>
<td>-Lilly forgot to cook food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Lilly didn’t forget to cook food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;&gt; Lilly used to cook food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Iterative (returned, another time, to comb back…)</td>
<td>-Lilly apologized again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Lilly didn’t apologize again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;&gt; Lilly apologized before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Comparisons &amp; Contrasts</td>
<td>-Lilly is better teacher than him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Lilly is not better teacher than him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;&gt; Lilly can teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Temporal Clauses (after, while, during, since, as….)</td>
<td>-Before the match’s end, Lilly became aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Before the match’s end, Lilly didn’t become Aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;&gt; Lilly used to watch matches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- to identify the ideologies that are hidden within the linguistic choices to reflect “Self and Other” ’s constructions in the CNN’s Arab spring news discourse.
- to identify the main presupposition triggers underling the assumptions that construct the “Self and Other” in the CNN’s Arab spring news discourse.

Research Questions of the Study

The present study will be concerned to answer the following questions:
1- Can strategic functions be established and used within the media discourse to convey ideological media message to the recipients?
2- What are the prevailing strategic functions enacted through linguistic choices to reflect “Self and Other” ’s constructions in CNN’s Arab spring news discourse?
3- What are the ideologies that are hidden within the linguistic choices to reflect “Self and Other” ’s constructions in CNN’s Arab spring news discourse?
4- What are the main presupposition’s triggers underling the assumptions that construct the “Self and Other” in CNN’s Arab spring news discourse?

Research Methodology

In adapting Fairclough’s approach to CDA, the researcher adopts the notion of strategic functions suggested by Chilton and Schaffner (1997) to elucidate the ideological use of language in the construction of “Self and Other” in CNN’s Arab spring news discourse. Following a qualitative approach, the researcher will link between the linguistic choices and strategic functions enacted within CNN’s media news text.

Chilton and Schaffner (1997) stated that the news political discourse should relate the pragmatic, semantic and syntactic choices to the fur “strategic functions” (p.214). Due to research constraints, the researcher will do the pragmatic level analysis. At the pragmatic level, the researcher will look at the presupposition to reveal the hidden ideologies relating the concept of “Self and Other” expressed within the CNN’s selected news text to be analyzed.

This study involves an analysis at the pragmatic level concentrating on presupposition as an analytical tool to understand the underlying assumptions utilized to build the sense of “Self” and “Other” in the chosen media news text.

The presupposition will be located and identified in accordance to its types through applying constancy under negation test. “>>” symbol is used to denote what is presupposed as used by Levinson (1983) and Yule (1996).

By linking the linguistic analysis, which is the micro analysis of a text, to the strategic functions contributing to the macro analysis of the analyzed text, the researcher will be able to express the hidden ideologies which stand behind the political -powerful forces enacted within news texts. Subsequent to the selection and labeling process, every sentence in the news text is numbered. (see appendix)

Theories and Approaches Applied

Chilton and Schaffner’s strategic function (1997)

The linguistic analysis of CNN’s discourse will be linked to the strategic functions suggested by Chilton and Schaffner (1997) to interpret CNN’s ideological intentions and views concerning the “Self” and “Other” notion. They identified four strategic functions which are associated with political discourse: Coercion, resistance –opposition- protest, dissimulation and legitimization and delegitimization can be regarded as an intermediate level to “link political situations and processes to discourse types and levels of discourse organization” (p.212). Their perspective is useful in the context of a theory of political discursive acts as affecters of social cognition because the strategic functions are directly related to the manipulation of people’s mental models construction. In a nutshell, they are directly related to the manipulation of people’s minds. These functions will be utilized in the process of analyzing CNN’s news report concerning Saddam’s execution to reflect and expose its ideological orientations. The main aim is to know whether these strategic functions can be applied and detected within media discourse, the main core of this paper.

Legitimization and delegitimization aims to create a favorable image of the “Self”. There are different levels of Self’s images. Delegitimization is the “essential counterpar: others […] have to be presented negatively, and the techniques include the use of ideas of differences and boundaries, and speech acts of blaming, accusing, insulting, etc” (p.213). Delegitimization usually is done more implicitly than legititimization. It is closely connected to dissimulation in the careful choice of representations for “other”, and the linking of negative connotations to those representations. Often, this is achieved by conjointing references to “other” to lexical fields that are typically evaluated negatively by the recipients. It can be often, observed that models of “Self” and “Other” are constructed that weigh, compare and evaluate “self” against “other” and try to achieve legititization of “Self” by the delegitimization of “Other”.

Coercion is the use of power to affect other people’s behavior and acts. Examples of coercion are seen in laws, verdicts, edicts, commands and censhorships. Furthermore, “political actors also often act coercively through discourse in setting agenda, selecting topics in conversation, position the self and other in specific relationships, making assumptions about realities that hearers are obliged to, at least, temporarily, accept in order to process the text or talk” (p.212).

Dissimulation is the control of the flow of information “which is by definition a matter of discourse control” (p.212). This category tends to divert attention from troublesome and controversial issues by controlling and mastering information. This access of information can be controlled by many ways: --Keeping the information internal.
- Preventing the spread of information by publication. This is called “qualitative” control (p.212) whereas the “quantitative” control “includes various kinds of verbal evasion and denial […]”, or the commission of reference to
actors. Euphemism has the cognitive effect of conceptually ‘blurring’ or ‘defocusing’ unwanted referents, be they objects or actions” (p.213).

Resistance, oppositional and protest is considered as a group of strategic functions that are used by “those who regard themselves as opposing power” (p.212). This category is an interesting one for the sake of manipulation of social cognition. The main focus will be on the role of this category played by the opposing groups.

The following Figure 1 shows the four strategic functions of Chilton and Schaffner (1997):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Legitimization vs. Delegitimization} \\
\text{Coercion} \\
\text{Dissimulation} \\
\text{Resistance, Opposition \& Protest}
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{Figure 1. Strategic functions}\]

Fairclough’s 3dimensional approach (1995)

In this part of the paper, the researcher describes the approach followed in the analysis. Fairclough’s 3-dimention approach of CDA (1995) will be used and utilized to facilitate the process of analysis aiming to achieve full understanding of the texts, under study. In fact, systematic analysis of strategic functions utilized by CNN can be achieved by three dimensions of Fairclough’s approach: description, interpretation and explanation. While the description of the textual components corresponds to the micro analysis, interpretation and explanation of micro level results correspond to the macro analysis. This approach is used in connecting the linguistic units with their intended implied ideologies, which is the key aim of the current study, showing how the strategic functions reflect are exploited linguistically to reflect them. This approach operates the analysis process to study “the linguistic constructions that prompt us to note some further claim or point behind those explicitly made in a text” (Goatly, 2000, p.214). Hence, the process starts with:

\text{Description stage}; to describe the news text’s linguistic units and formal properties. Then, the analytical process continues with

\text{Interpretation stage}; to interpret them and

\text{Explanation stage}; to explain why they are utilized in this way.

This process will be adopted in analyzing CNN’s news text to show its “Self” and “Other” and how they are reflected by the strategic functions Chilton and Schaffner (1997). The whole process will serve, at the end, to provide an answer to the research’s questions. The following Figure 2 will clarify Fairclough’s three–dimensional model for CDA which is modified to suit the present study’s goal:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Interpretation Stage} \\
\text{To interpret the linguistic choices at the pragmatic level (Presupposition)} \\
\text{Explanation Stage} \\
\text{To relate the pragmatic linguistic analysis to the strategic functions of media discourse}
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{Figure 2. Fairclough’s CDA model}\]

and negative “Other” (out-group) as far as the Arab spring consequences events in Arab homeland is concerned.

Wodak’s historical-discoursal approach

Wodak’s approach (2009) provides background information with which the discursive event is embedded. Hence, it is useful to direct the light towards the implicit meaning of news text to be explicit by relating it to the relevant historical –socio-political situations in which it happened. Such information will be of a great help to guide the reader to comprehend the news text. This method can be used with the analysis of the strategic functions, the main aim of the present study. To comprehend the Arab spring upheaval, it is useful to apply this approach to achieve an objective analysis of the events. CNN’s ideological view can be understood by integrating the historical, socio and political context with the whole process of analysis. Furthermore, CNN usage of strategic functions of Chilton and Schaffner (1997) will be justified with utilizing Wodak’s approach of historical discourse (2009). This approach will be integrated in the process of the analysis of the CNN’s news story.

Theoretical Framework

The current study draws upon the pragmatic features in CNN’s media news text that concerns with Arab spring phenomenon. The descriptive analysis will apply theories and approaches that are exemplified in the following Figure 3.
ANALYSIS OF CNN'S ARTICLE – YEMEN: “YEMEN: SECTARIN FIGHTING KILLS DOZENS”

Preamble
The present study involves a news story published by CNN website on 2-3 Nov. 2013. It concerns with the Yemeni internal conflict after the Arab spring revolution 2011. It shows the sectarian fighting that erupted between Sunni and Shia communities reflecting an important era Yemen has passed through after President Ali Abdullah Saleh’s fall down. In fact, Yemen has struggled for many years to topple Saleh’s regime which continued in power for more than (33) years controlling the whole country with iron fist (Bakri and Goodman, 2011; Fadhli, 2013). After the Tunisian revolution, the Yemeni people were encouraged to show opposition to president Saleh who was, then, forced to step down from his post as the president of the republic of Yemen on...2011 (Fadhli, 2013). But Yemen passed through critical time after his resignation facing the sectarian Sunni-Shia conflict. This is the main content of CNN’s news story the researcher deals with in this case study. Moreover, it is the main reason to choose it to be part of the study data aiming to show the sectarian conflict Yemen witnessed after its Arab spring revolution (Bakri, 2013). CNN documented this era represented by this news story as it sought to express its ideological views concerning sectarian internal conflict. Many other thematic propositions or topics can be detected in the text which can be summarized as in the following macro-proposition:

Dozens were killed in a sectarian fighting during which the Shia houthis determined to force the Sunni Salafi militants to leave Dammaj, a jihadist stronghold for thousands of fundamental foreign Sunni fighters who responded to Salafi calls for jihad against Shia while the Yemeni armed troops spread there as a peacekeeping force after the government’s efforts failed to prevent terrorists entering Saada amid houthi efforts to change the political map by which discrimination will be ended in Yemen which struggles with the South separatists and al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula.

CNN’s “Self” and “Other” with the Strategic Functions and Beyond
CNN’s news text titled “Yemen: Sectarian fighting kills dozens” is written in one part having one media message supporting the Shia houthis in their struggle against the Sunni Salafists in Yemen. Within this part of the study, the one – part CNN’s news text will be analyzed and discussed in relation with the strategic functions of Chilton and Schaffner (1997). It aims to manifest how CNN utilizes them to serve its ideological message hidden with its news story that reflect its view of ‘Self’ and ‘Other’ concerning the political players of the Yemeni internal – sectarian conflict.

Starting with the headline (s.1), it is clear that it involves the sectarian fighting that led to the killing of dozens. Here, although the responsible party for this fighting is not declared, many victims paid their souls for a coercive action (s.1-Coercion). The same reference is repeated in s.2 stating...
that the sectarian clashes led to kill dozens of people without mentioning the responsible party for such coercive action (s.2 - Coercion). The sense of coercion is intensified in s.3 as it sheds light on the doers of such coercive action, the houthi rebels and Salafi militants, led to hundreds of wounded people (s.3 – Coercion).

The Yemeni government agrees with the Salafists in accusing and criticizing the houthi rebels for their attack at the Dammaj’s religious center for the sake of forcing the Salafists to go out of the city, forcibly. Here, the government stands with the Salafists accusing the houthi of committing a cruel-criminalized action aiming to delegitimize their action (s.5- Coercion and Legitimization vs. delegitimization).

But the houthis, from the beginning, seek to vindicate themselves from any charge of cruelty and coercion by accusing the Salafists, themselves, of bringing thousands of salafi foreign fighters to the city. This, in fact, can be considered as an illegitimate action. With this reference, CNN tries, itself, to delegitimize the Salafists’ attempt giving the full right to the Shia houthi in launching their attack to protect themselves in front of thousands of Sunni foreign fighters (s.6- Legitimization vs. delegitimization).

CNN continues its attempt to prove the legitimacy of houthi action by including other information about Salafists’ attempts to convert the religious center into a jihadist-terrorist stronghold, legitimizing the houthi fears and action in Dammaj (s.7- Legitimization vs. delegitimization). To make a terrorist center out of a religious school is something that cannot be accepted by the houthi because it is illegal and against the law. CNN agrees with them in its reference to their statement (s.8- Legitimization vs. delegitimization).

The houthi’s attempt to legitimize their action continues giving the evidence for their credibility and honesty in what they say when they refer to the salafi figureheads’ calls for jihad against them. Here, CNN depends on a Yemeni official’s statement confirming the houthi claims. By stating this, CNN delegitimizes the Salafists’ call and action as they have no right in their call for killing (s.9- Legitimization vs. delegitimization).

To hide their bad intentions, the salafi spokesman refers to the houthi’s attack at Dammaj that led to kill dozens of people. This is, in fact, a salafi attempt to draw people’s attention away from the truth and the real reason behind the whole standoff in Yemen. By referring to the Salafi mobilization of fighters from outside of Yemen, CNN intends to assert that they are behind causing the latest crisis leading to bloodshed. In other words, CNN accuses them of killing themselves in brining salafi fighters from abroad to fight the houthi who have no choice but to take the action by which the Salafi evil plans would be failed. Thus, by its reference to this point concerning the Salafists’ bloodshed, CNN confirms the Salafists’ intention to dissimulate the truth (s.10- Dissimilation).

In s.19, the houthi spokesman tries to defend his group in front of any accusation of igniting the crisis blaming the Yemeni government for its failure not to take the right action to prevent the foreign jihadists’ presence in Dammaj. As a result, the houthi have no choice but to attack them in their stronghold. And this is what CNN tries to mention with some sort of details, legitimizing the houthi ‘military action (s.19- Legitimization vs. delegitimization).

In s.20, CNN refers to more details said by the houthi spokesman by which he re-accuses the Salafists of what Saada witness out of terrorism. He defends his group’s armed fighters’ military action in a way to legitimize it. By establishing such details, CNN expresses its support to the houthi position legitimizing their attack at the Salafi center in Dammaj and blaming the Yemeni government that it has failed to stop the salafi foreign invasion to Yemen. In other words, it gives the houthis the right to defend themselves, legitimizing their military action (s.20 & s. 21, Legitimization vs. delegitimization).

In s.23, the Yemeni official, in his interview with CNN, justifies, indirectly, the houthi behavior against the Salafists in Dammaj. He asserts that the houthi had complained for decades about the Salafi foreign interference to support their counterparts in Dammaj. Thus, by acknowledging this, he gives them the right to defend themselves. Here, CNN emphasizes this official’s acknowledgment justifying the houthi action (s.23- Legitimization vs. delegitimization). Moreover, CNN quotes the official spokesman, directly, saying that Yemeni government is cautious from the whole situation between the Salafists and the houthis. But its response is slow. Here, dissimulation can be noticed with his announcement as the government is not cautious. It shows no support to houthi being afraid of the Salafists and their big influence especially after they received external endorsement. The Yemeni official tries to dissimulate the fact about the Yemeni government’s weak role towards the internal crisis, being afraid of the houthi power which controls the Yemeni political scene after the Arab spring revolution (s. 25- Dissimilation).

CNN returns back to the strategy of legitimization to support the houthi’s legitimacy when it indicates, directly, that the houthi action is regarded as a self-defense to protect their community from discrimination followed by the Yemeni government for longtime. According to CNN, the houthi has the right to defend themselves against the government’s political and social discrimination (s.28- Legitimization vs. delegitimization). This is the main content of CNN’s media message to support the houthi’s confirming the legitimacy of their action.

Throughout the analysis process, the researcher notices that CNN continues its endorsement for the houthi as the positive ‘Self’ and its hostility against the Salafists as the negative ‘Other’. To achieve its goal, it intends to utilize certain strategic functions reflecting its ideological view concerning the Yemeni conflict and its symbols. The following Table 2 shows CNN’s ‘Self’ and ‘Other’ ideological representation according to Chilton and Schaffner’s strategic functions (1997):

**DISCUSSION**

It is clear that CNN depends, mainly, on the strategic function of legitimization vs. delegitimization as it is used for ten times cementing CNN’s ideological position. It is utilized to legitimize houthi rebels’ action to protect their community against the Salafists. In fact, CNN’s ideological view will be
clarified and deepened by this strategic function, intensively, supporting the ‘Self’ (the houthis) positively and antagonizing the ‘Other’ (the Salafists) negatively. As such, CNN’s media message will be manifested towards the Yemeni conflict pertaining with van Dijk’s Ideological Square’s of positive ‘Self’ and negative ‘Other’ presentation (see section below). The following table (3) shows the strategic functions of Chilton and Schaffner (1997) in numbers:

**Table 2. CNN’s applications of the strategic functions notion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Presupposition sentence</th>
<th>Presupposition type</th>
<th>Presupposed meaning</th>
<th>Strategic function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yemen: Sectarian fighting kills dozens</td>
<td>Factive</td>
<td>&gt;&gt; there is bloody fighting</td>
<td>Coercion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>…have been killed by sectarian clashes……</td>
<td>Factive</td>
<td>&gt;&gt; there is bloody fighting</td>
<td>Coercion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Violence has escalated…</td>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>&gt;&gt; violence spread in Yemen</td>
<td>Coercion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…injured as a result.</td>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>&gt;&gt; there are many injuries</td>
<td>Coercion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>…in a bid to force Salafists to leave the area</td>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>&gt;&gt; there are many attempts of extra-force</td>
<td>Coercion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>…a statement accusing the Salafists of causing this conflict…..</td>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>&gt;&gt; the Salafist have been accused of stability’s deterioration</td>
<td>Legitimization vs. delegitimization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>…accused the Salafists of transforming ……</td>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>&gt;&gt; the Salafist have been accused of terrorism</td>
<td>Legitimization vs. delegitimization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The Houthis said they would not tolerate…</td>
<td>Existential + Factive</td>
<td>&gt;&gt; The Houthis has the right in their action</td>
<td>Legitimization vs. delegitimization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>….which raised tension in the past several weeks.</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>&gt;&gt; The houthis justify their accusation</td>
<td>Legitimization vs. delegitization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>…that most of those killed by Houthis have been civilians.</td>
<td>Factive</td>
<td>&gt;&gt; there are civilians who have been killed in the conflict</td>
<td>Dissimulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>…denied the Houthis are fueling clashes…. to ensure foreign jihadi fighters didn’t enter the region,</td>
<td>Factive</td>
<td>&gt;&gt; Houthis defend themselves</td>
<td>Legitimization vs. delegitization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>“Foreigners are fighting on the side of the Salafi</td>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>&gt;&gt; Houthis has the right in their action</td>
<td>Legitimization vs. delegitization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>…resulting in many suspected terrorists entering Saada province.</td>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>&gt;&gt; Houthis justify their action</td>
<td>Legitimization vs. delegitization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>…Houthis supporters have complained of foreign interference coming from Dammaj, where there is a Salafi center</td>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>&gt;&gt; there is a real danger</td>
<td>Legitimization vs. delegitization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The government ‘s response has been slow…..</td>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>&gt;&gt; there is a governmental response</td>
<td>Dissimulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>…which is thought to have thousands of fighters…. …its actions are taken to protect its community….</td>
<td>Factive</td>
<td>&gt;&gt; there are allegations</td>
<td>Legitimization vs. delegitization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) CNN’s Positive ‘Self’; which is represented by:

a) The Shia Houthi rebels
b) Their supporters.

This group represents the Shia Houthi community which was keen to terminate the salafi presence in Yemen especially after the Yemeni government’s failure to prevent the terrorists –jihadists from entering Saada. Hence, by launching their pre-emptive attack, Houthi affiliates faced the imminent danger. Thus, they rejected any accusation of creating the internal crisis (s.19). The Government’s acknowledgement of Salafi presence can be regarded as good motive to strengthen their position in this struggle. The Yemeni top officials have acknowledged that the houthis had complained of the foreign interference in Dammaj through the salafi religious institute (s.6 & 7). However, the government’s
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**Table 3. CNN’s strategic functions in numbers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Functions</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legitimization vs. delegitimization</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissimulation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance, opposition &amp; protest</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

acknowledgment did not change what was on the ground. Hence, they launched their attack at the terrorist institute hoping to put an end to foreign terrorists there (s.22). This proves their strength and influence in Yemen. They are, now, a power that cannot be eliminated, having six years of experience in fighting with the Yemeni army 2004-2009 (s.27). Their armed wing has thousands of loyal fighters (s.28). They are the power that rejects the discrimination supported by the Yemeni government, hoping to make the dignified life for their Shia followers in Yemen a real fact (s.28). As such, the Yemeni government does not want to be involved in a seventh war (s.25). They are the striking force that will change the political map in Yemen (s.24) for their sake. This proves this group’s strength and determination to ensure its followers’ rights. Thus, the Yemeni government cannot do anything but negotiating with them aiming to reach a long-term peace deal between the conflict’s two sides. In fact, the last ceasefire sponsored by the government has failed proving the latter’s unsuccessful efforts to solve the crisis (s.17 & 18) forcing the houthis to protect their community in front of any salafi-terrorist attempts to terminate them. Moreover, they wanted to establish their effective role in the new Yemen after the Arab spring. As it failed to do anything, the Yemeni government decided not to be involved in a seventh war with them (s. 25 & s.26). This can be regarded as an evidence of their strength and influence confirmed by the Yemeni official (s.25). By such reference, CNN confirms that the houthis are a difficult entity that cannot be ignored. Furthermore, they are the most powerful entity in the Yemeni political street that forces the government to negotiate with them. Otherwise, the consequences will be disastrous. This is what the government is afraid of (s.25-26). By such indication, CNN adopts the houthis’ opinion in respecting their rights and status in Yemen. This can be taken as a good evidence of its support to them standing behind them in their political and military campaigns against the Sunni Salafists.

By such indications, CNN asserts two points about this group:

a) It is the oppressed group that suffers from Salafists’ attacks for long time.

b) It is the strong group as it declares its campaign against the oppressing Salafists.

Thus, according to CNN, this group should be supported in its struggle against the Salafists in Yemen. To sum up, CNN describes the houthis as a big power, shedding light on their strong role in the post–Arab spring Yemen. Thus, CNN draws this group positively believing in them and their legitimate right in Yemen, thus, presenting them as a positive ‘Self’ that should be hailed and supported as a big power.

2) **CNN’s negative ‘Other’**; which is represented by:

a) The Sunni Salafists

b) Their supporters

This group represents those who reject the Shia tide in Yemen. They declared their position and opinion, adopting a hostile-bloody policy to terminate the Shia presence. Thus, they waged a sectarian war against the Shia houthis in Dammaj, Saada, the houthi stronghold, through their Salafi institute which is their base to launch their war. Thus, they brought thousands of foreign Salafi fighters (s.6) transferring the religious institute into a terrorist – jihadist center against the Shia (s.7). It was confirmed not only by the houthis but by the Yemeni officials in Saada who asserted that the Salafi figureheads in Dammaj called for the jihad against the houthi (s.9) escalating tension in the whole region. This forces the houthis to launch their counter-attack (s.5) against the Salafists who faced the results of what they called for, leading to dozens of dead (s.1, 2, 3, 5 & 10). In fact, it was a houthi attempt to force the Salafi foreigners to sop fighting and be out of the city (s.5). Here, CNN describes the Salafists as a weak power which has received a painful blow its followers paid their souls for. Their calls to criticize houthi action were resulted in nothing but in confirming that they are the main reason behind the crisis. It was admitted by the Yemeni officials asserting that the houthis, for decades, have complained of foreign interference in Saada coming from Dammaj (s. 23). The official stated that the houthi attack was a houthi attempt to change the political map in Yemen (s.24) where the role of the Salafists would be dwindled, failing to achieve their goals. Moreover, the Salafists, in their war against Shia, failed to serve their interest. On the opposite, such war hurt them as their followers were killed due to their wicked plans (s.1,2,5&10).

By such indication, CNN expresses its rejection for the Salafists seeking to expose their plans against the houthis in Yemen. Thus, it stands against them declaring its antagonism. Accordingly, it presents them as the negative ‘Other’ rejecting their evil plans against Shia houthis. In fact, CNN asserts two points about this group:

a) It is the oppressing group that insists to attack the Shia houthis for long time

b) It is the weak group that loses control in Yemen.

To sum up, CNN describes the Salafists as a negative power, showing their passive role they played in the past Arab spring Yemen. Thus, CNN draws this group negatively rejecting them and their efforts and calls to kill other people. As such, it presents them as the negative ‘Other’ that should be criticized as an evil power in Yemen.

Briefly, the researcher summarizes the CNN’s ideological view concerning the Yemeni internal sectarian conflict as in the following:

1) **CNN supports the Shia houthi rebels defending their rights in having their own role and status in the political scene in Yemen.** Thus, it endorses them, drawing them positively. Hence, it legitimizes their struggle to end Salafists’ dominance in Yemen. For CNN, houthi rebels are a powerful entity which fights for its rights, playing its role that cannot be ignored in the new Yemen after the Arab spring.
2) CNN antagonizes the Sunni Salafists and their followers for their evil war against the Shia houthis aiming to terminate them in Yemen. It rejects them drawing them negatively. Hence, it delegitimizes the Salafists’ intentions, plans and policies against Shia houthis.

In a nutshell, CNN presents the houthi rebels as the positive ‘Self’ standing behind them to support and the Salafists as the negative ‘Other’ standing against them to reject.

By expressing its support for the houthi rebels and antagonism for the Salafists, CNN draws a clear -line division between its positive ‘Self’ and negative ‘Other’ presentation. In other words, CNN’s news text is connected with van Dijk’s Ideological Square of positive ‘Self’ (in-group) and negative ‘Other’ (out-group) presentation, reflecting the Yemeni sectarian conflict. To clarify CNN’s supportive attitude towards this group, section 2.3 will provide more information.

CNN’s News Text and Wodak’s Historical Discourse Approach

In its news story, CNN expresses its ideological view towards the Yemeni sectarian conflict Yemen witnesses after the Arab spring revolution. In section (2.2), the researcher asserts that CNN supports Shia houthi rebels representing the positive ‘Self’ and antagonizes the Sunni Salafists representing the negative ‘Other’. CNN’s ideological presentation of ‘Self’ and ‘Other’ needs the following information and historical facts to be understood:

1) Generally, after the Arab spring, Yemen witnessed internal sectarian conflict between the Sunni group represented by the Salafists and al-Qaeda, on one side, and the Shia group represented by houthis, on the other side, for the sake of control and influence since 2004 (Orient ‘s Gate,2012). The first group, the Sunnis, regards the second one, the Shias, its sectarian old enemy that should be eliminated. Due to the weak Yemeni consequent governments, different parts of Yemen, after the Arab spring, witnessed a sectarian war between the two sides that led to the death of dozens of people from both sides.

In turn, such struggle led to political disorder, economic failure and security lack.

In fact, the Salafi-Houthi conflict is not a religious conflict but a political one for the sake of power and domination with which the houthis seek to have their own role and rights (Al- Quds,2014). The houthi rebellion can be considered as a big cry to end discrimination against the houthis, rejecting any attempt to make their struggle sectarian or religious, only. Thus, they became a wide popular movement in Saada, attracting large number of Yemenis. The houthis reject the stifling of freedoms, the marginalization of Shia and the threat of religious belief. To achieve their goals, their movement demanded acknowledgement as political party to ensure their rights (Orient ‘s Gate,2012), playing an important role in the Yemeni political process. They suffered, according to Yemeni interior ministry officials, from the Salafists and fundamentalists’ conspiracies, leading to the death of large number of their affiliates (Al-Khudiri, 2014). Thus, they became anti Salafists political power showing rejection to any attempt to end them. With the time, the tension between the two sides has escalated to high extent in Dammaj, the Salafi stronghold, from which the Salafists launched their military operations against the houthis who became a big power with great popularity especially among the Yemeni youths.

2) The American United State gave a financial help to Yemen estimated (900) million dollar since 2011 to pass the transitional era after the President Saleh’s fall down. It watched the developments of events in Yemen where the houthi entity became one of the main political participants in the Yemeni political scene due to their role in fighting al-Qaeda. In fact, USA believes that Houthis can play a basic role to terminate al-Qaeda terrorism, being active ally in the global war against religious terror of Salafists and al-Qaeda. Thus, USA looks at the houthis as a big power and by supporting them it can achieve what it plans for in the Yemeni and Arab arena ((Al- Quds, 2014).

Findings

As it is an American news outlet, CNN tries to show the American point of view towards the internal conflict in Yemen declared by the American government. Namely, CNN takes a pro- American government attitude. Thus, throughout its text, it supports the houthis as a Yemeni political power that may help to eliminate the religious terrorism in Yemen represented by the Salafists and al-Qaeda whom it antagonizes. A thoughtful reading of the CNN’s text clarifies this point, vividly. Accordingly,

i) CNN legitimizes the houthis in their campaign against the Salafists hoping to terminate religious terrorism.

ii) CNN delegitimizes the Salafists and other religious Sunni groups for their bloody war against the houthis hoping to establish peace in Yemen.

Discussion of Findings

In its news story text, CNN deals with the internal sectarian conflict between Shias and Sunnis that dominated Yemen in its recent history after the Arab spring revolution, 2011. It is an important issue which throws its weight in the political arena of Yemen, affecting its course of events. In fact, through the exacerbating sectarian strife between the Houthis and Salafists, CNN seeks to reflect Yemen after the Arab spring wave after the President Ali Abdullah Saleh’s fall down.

Throughout the whole text, CNN presents the long term conflict between Shia houthis and Sunni Salafists who overpowered the Yemeni political scene, fighting for control and domination after the Arab spring. A deep reading for the text clarifies CNN’s ideological orientation towards these two powers, reflecting its view of ‘Self’ and ‘Other’. Within the Yemeni circle, CNN intends to clarify the houthis’ position, in detail, justifying their attack at the Dammaj’s salafi religious center which became a salafi stronghold. To sum up, CNN expresses:

1) Its support to the houthis, presented as the positive ‘Self’
2) Its antagonism against the Salafists, presented as the negative ‘Other’.
Thus, the whole CNN text is pertained with the van Dijk’s Ideological Square of positive ‘Self’ (in-group) and negative ‘Other’ (out-group) presentation.

CONCLUSIONS

The linguistic analysis of CNN’s news text that concern with Arab spring events in Yemen approves the following points:

1) The strategic functions concept initiated by Chilton and Schaffner (1997) can be detected within the analyzed data. Thus, this concept can be established and detected within the media news discourse, in general. This provides the study with an answer to the first question.

2) To express its ideological view of ‘Self’ and ‘Other’ within its text that concerns with Arab spring event in Yemen, CNN depends, mainly, on two strategic functions:
   a) Legitimization vs. delegitimization (10 times); to cement its ideological attitude towards the Yemeni conflict’s two powers; houthis and Salafists. More specifically, CNN legitimates the houthi rebels’ action to defend themselves against the Salafists and delegitimizes the Salafists’ action to fight the houthis in Saada.
   b) Coercion (4 times); to reflect the suffering of Yemeni people because of sectarian fighting which the Salafists’ plans and policies stand behind.

Thus, these strategic functions are utilized to reflect the houthi rebels’ positive role presenting CNN’s positive ‘Self’ and the Salafists’ negative role presenting CNN’s negative ‘Other’. This provides the study with an answer to the second and third questions.

3) Different presupposition types are detected throughout the present study’s data. Lexical presuppositions and factive presuppositions are the prevailed ones in both CNN’s news texts analyzed. In CNN’s news text that concerns with the sectarian conflict in Yemen, lexical presuppositions are frequented 8 times and factive presuppositions are frequented 6 times. This provides the study with an answer to the fourth question.
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CNN’s News text:


(CNN) -- Dozens of people have been killed by sectarian clashes in Yemen’s northern province of Saada in the past several days, according to local officials.

In recent days, violence has escalated between Houthi rebels and Salafi militants in the city of Dammaj, with hundreds injured as a result. The Houthis are Shiites and the Salafis are Sunni Muslims.

Saada government officials and a spokesman for Salafis in Dammaj accuse Houthi rebels of firing mortars and rockets last week at Dammaj’s Al-Mazraa mosque -- part of a Salafi religious institute -- in a bid to force Salafis to leave the area.

Earlier, the Houthis issued a statement accusing the Salafis of causing this conflict by transporting thousands of foreign Sunni fighters there.

The political arm of the Houthi rebel group accused the Salafis of transforming a religious center in Dammaj into a jihadist stronghold. The Houthis said they would not tolerate such a threat so close to their stronghold.

According to officials, regional Salafi figureheads have been calling for jihad against the Houthi rebels, which has raised tensions in the past several weeks.

Serour al-Wadei, a spokesman for the Salafis in Dammaj, told CNN that most of those killed by Houthis have been civilians.

The International Committee of the Red Cross expressed growing concern about the situation. In a statement released Saturday, the ICRC, which has been trying to access the area, said it was prevented again from entering Dammaj.

“There are a large number of wounded civilians in Dammaj, and the risk to them will only grow if the ICRC is denied access,” the aid agency said.

ICRC teams that are about 8 kilometers (5 miles) away have been ready to respond since last week.

“We appeal for a halt to the violence and for immediate and unconditional access so that we can evacuate the wounded and deliver much-needed medical assistance,” said Cedric Schweizer, head of the ICRC delegation in Sanaa, Yemen’s capital.

APPENDICES

Concerned about the escalation in violence, Yemeni Defense Minister Mohammed Nasser Ahmed ordered the dispatch of troops to Saada, on Yemen’s border with Saudi Arabia, to act as peacekeepers and to deter warring factions. But so far, government efforts to end the fighting have not been fruitful.

“The ceasefire did not last, but a presidential delegation is negotiating a long-term peace agreement with both sides,” a senior Defense Ministry official told CNN.

Hasan al-Hamran, a Houthi spokesman, denied the Houthis are fueling the clashes and said the government wasn’t doing enough to ensure foreign jihadi fighters didn’t enter the region.

“Foreigners are fighting on the side of the Salafi Sunnis in Dammaj and not Yemenis,” al-Hamran said. “The government does not have authority over the Salafi religious institute, resulting in many suspected terrorists entering Saada province.”

A Yemeni government official told CNN on background that the situation has been brewing for some time. The official said that for decades, Houthi supporters have complained of foreign interference coming from Dammaj, where there is a Salafi Center.

“But shelling them today is nothing more than a sign of hubris and exposes how the political map is evolving,” the official added.

“The government’s response has been slow because it’s taking a cautious approach. The army doesn’t want to be embroiled in a seventh war with the Houthis.”

Insurgent Houthi rebels fought six wars with Yemen’s government between 2004 and 2009. The group, which is thought to have thousands of fighters, is anti-United States and anti-Israel, and maintains its actions are taken to protect its community from government discrimination.

Yemen is the most impoverished country in the Middle East. It is facing a growing separatist movement in the country’s south and is the hub for al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, which many analysts believe is the most dangerous wing of the terrorist network.

Currently, the country is engaged in the National Dialogue Conference, U.N.-backed reconciliation talks aimed at drafting a new constitution and laying the groundwork for elections to be held next year.