

Anush Martirosyan

*Lecturer of the Department of Languages, Communication
and Pedagogy at Eurasia International University,*

Ph.D. in Philology

Email: anush.martirosyan@eiu.am

DOI: 10.53614/18294952-2025.2-204

PSYCHOLINGUISTICS IN THE CONCEPT OF TERRORISM

The article discusses the communicative aspect of terrorism from a psycholinguistic perspective, with a specific focus on the strategic use of language for manipulating cognition, emotions, and behavioral responses. The research is based on the text-based analysis of the speeches, declarations, and messages of the terrorists. The study reveals that terrorism is not only a political act of violence but also a communicative act intended to influence various audiences. The study reveals that the terrorists' messages contain persuasive, emotive, and coercive language strategies, with a specific emphasis on the repeated use of religious, moral, and ideological concepts such as God, jihad, martyrdom, freedom, and homeland. These concepts are shown to function as psychological stimuli that legitimize violence, create moral duty, and transform terrorists into victims or into defenders of justice. The article uses the comparison of various examples from different ideological and geographical contexts to show how terrorist discourse adapts to political contexts, yet always employs fear, absolutism, and moral polarization. The findings highlight the role of language in processes of radicalization and in the construction of terrorism as a psychological strategy rather than a violent one.

Key words: psycholinguistics, communicative act, language, legitimize, terrorist discourse, violence, linguistic cognition.

Introduction

Terrorism primarily pursues political goals; (Maniszewska, 2024) hence their speech should reflect their demands and goals and the language used there must have a substantial impact on people's thoughts. But it cannot be persuasive and powerful unless it touches one's psychology: emotions, beliefs, point of view, etc. This persuasion is not about offering luxurious things or the promise of a good life, but words offering immaterial things that directly affect people's way of thinking. If we analyze their speech two things will be clear: one is the notion of religion and the other one is liberty. It is widely known that a language is not only a means of communication but also a strong tool for building one's strategy. Terrorists send their messages to vulnerable groups, urging them to take the path of jihad or anything else by justifying their actions, and explaining why people should join them. The secret of persuading or attracting people is the power of language use as a strategy.

Text-based linguistic analysis of terrorism speech shows that the communication of terrorists is mainly through videos and social media, which is a very productive instrument in the hands of terrorist groups taking into consideration the fast pace of innovation technologies. Their messages travel the world at light speed and convince thousands of people to join them.

To gain attention on social media, they use non-verbal communication enabled by actions such as train or subway bombings, kidnappings, hijacking planes, etc. There are hundreds of cases when terrorists contacted the governments through terror actions such as the Munich Massacre that happened in 1972, September 5 in the Olympic Village in Munich, West Germany, or the kidnap and the assassination of Italian Prime Minister Aldo Moro, or assassination of Egyptian President Anwar Sadat on October 6, 1981, etc. ¹

Research Methodology

The research design of the current study is based on a qualitative approach, specifically grounded in the paradigms of psycholinguistic analysis and critical discourse analysis (CDA), in addressing the phenomenon of terrorism as a form of strategic communication. The qualitative approach is most appropriate in addressing the research objectives because it is interested in interpreting and understanding the meanings, psychological processes, and ideologies embedded in terrorist discourse rather than quantitatively measuring frequency or probability.

Data Collection

The data for the current study are based on primary sources of information, which are readily available in the public domain. These include speeches, video communications, declarations, interviews, and written statements of terrorist leaders and representatives. The data include discourse from prominent terrorist figures such as Osama bin Laden, Ayman al-Zawahiri, Shamil Basayev, and others

¹ For more information see the book of Stephen Sloan, *Terrorism: The Present Threat in Context*, Berg, 2006

from ideologically motivated extremist groups. These were selected because of their visibility, impact, and role in the process of radicalization and intimidation of society at large.

The data were gathered from credible and authentic sources, including the media, academic journals, and official records.

Analytical Framework

The analytical approach is informed by a psycholinguistic approach, with emphasis on the role of language in the construction of cognition, emotion, belief systems, and behavior. This approach is integrated with critical discourse analysis, which enables the analysis of power relationships, ideological constructions, and moral legitimizations in terrorist discourse.

Particular attention is paid to religious, moral, and ideological concepts (God, jihad, martyrdom, freedom, homeland, etc.) and linguistic forms such as modality, emotionality, absolutism, and positioning.

Analytical Procedure

The chosen texts have been studied through close textual analysis. Words, metaphors, modal verbs, emotional arguments, and narrative techniques have been found and interpreted. Three major forms of discourse have been found: persuasive, emotional, and coercive communication.

A comparative method has been used to find similarities and differences in the discourse of different ideologies and geographical areas, including Islamist, nationalist, and separatist movements. This helped to find out the flexibility of terrorist discourse in different political settings with a constant psychological and symbolic core.

Ethical Considerations

The materials used in the study are strictly for academic purposes. There is no intention to support or validate extremist ideologies in any way. Quotations from terrorist discourse are used for the purpose of illustration only.

Results

The analysis confirms that terrorism functions not only as political violence but also as a strategic form of communication aimed at shaping public perception, emotions, and behavior. Terrorist speech consistently reflects political demands and goals, but its effectiveness lies in its ability to engage psychological factors such as belief, identity, fear, and moral obligation rather than offering material incentives.

The findings show that terrorist discourse relies on three dominant linguistic strategies: persuasive, emotional, and coercive language. Persuasive language frames violent acts as morally justified, lawful, or divinely mandated. Emotional language appeals to feelings of injustice, humiliation, revenge, and collective suffering, encouraging identification with the group. Coercive language is used to threaten governments and societies, creating fear as a means of pressure.

A key result is the central role of religious and moral concepts—particularly

God, jihad, martyrdom, freedom, and homeland—which function as powerful psychological triggers. These concepts legitimize violence, construct moral duty, and transform perpetrators into defenders or victims rather than aggressors. Modal expressions of obligation (e.g., *must, duty*) reinforce conformity and discourage dissent by presenting participation in violence as unavoidable.

The study also finds that terrorist communication is multimodal. Violent acts themselves operate as non-verbal messages designed to attract attention and generate fear, while subsequent speeches and statements provide ideological justification. Media coverage amplifies this process, extending the reach and impact of terrorist messages beyond the immediate context of the attack.

Comparative analysis reveals that while terrorist discourse varies across ideological and geographical contexts, its underlying logic remains consistent. Islamist groups emphasize divine authority and religious absolutism, whereas nationalist or separatist movements focus more on independence, sovereignty, and political legitimacy. Despite these differences, all rely on fear, moral polarization, and symbolic language to achieve their goals.

Discussion

Verbal communication occurs mainly after terror tactics and actions have been used as a strategy to pursue larger goals. They are usually emotional and uncompromising, expecting the utmost to achieve their goals. The images that people see and the speech they hear from terrorists create an atmosphere of fear in the public that turns into a strategy to pressure governments, organizations, or individuals to satisfy terrorists' demands by directly manipulating people's psychology.

While analyzing some terrorist group leaders' speeches, as we will see later, we will have the following forms of language.

1. **Persuasive language** (persuade people that what they are doing is based on justice, and equality, has legal bases and most importantly expresses God's will by excluding the rule of law).
2. **Emotional language** (to impact people to join them and make them believe that they serve God, their religion, and their lands and rights).
3. **Coercive language** (force their enemies to fulfill their demands (mainly governments), to spread terror and fear).

The morality of their actions is linked with values such as beliefs, homeland, protection, freedom, and so on. Spicing their speech with words like God, jihad, mujahedin, martyrdom, Islam, monoethnic, religion, etc. terrorists, they try to persuade people and spread emotional influence on their psychology, and even more, they send societies signs of obligation to join them using sentences with the message of obligation, moral responsibility, and commitment.

Osama bin Laden, who is one of the most famous figures in the history of terrorism, claimed in Farag's manifesto the following:

(6) *“We **must** start our **Islamic** country from him by establishing the rule of*

God in our nation... the first struggle for Jihad is to root out these infidel leaders and replace them with an Islamic system from which we can build."

Ayman al-Zawahiri, who was one of the leaders of al-Qaeda, after the assassination of Egyptian President Anwar al-Sadat in 1981, declared:

(7) *"We have sacrificed, and we are still ready for more sacrifices until the victory of Islam."* (Zawahiri, 2022)

In 2005 Al-Jazeera aired a video where Ayman al-Zawahiri said.

- *"You will not dream of security until we live it as a reality in Palestine and before all infidel armies leave the land of Mohammed,"* (Zawahiri, Ayman al, 2008)

In all the speeches we see the continuing faithfulness to their commitments, and moral values which are the cornerstones of terrorism speech mainly expressed through modality. The specific usage of words tends to manipulate psychologically of the group members and brainwash them in the name of God. (M.Jerrold, 2002)

Sometimes, their speech shows the fact that they are fighting for equality and justice, or the order of nature by creating the opposite image converting them from terrorists into victims of world politics and foreign governments to create the illusion of being targeted by other powers. They express revenge through their speech but build an atmosphere of having the right to retaliate and apply terrorist acts for the given idea.

After the attack of 9/11, Osama bin Laden gave a speech through a video where he mainly said:

- (9) *Here is America struck by God Almighty in one of its vital organs, so that its greatest buildings are destroyed. Grace and gratitude to God. America has been filled with horror from north to south and east to west, and thanks be to God. What America is tasting now is only a copy of what we have tasted.* (Lincoln, 2006)
- *"How is it right for you to occupy our countries and kill our women and children and expect to live in peace and security? ... the equation is clear: you are killed as you kill and abducted as you abduct ...* (Laden O. b., The Guardian, 2011)

The speech of Osama bin Laden is aimed to show the ability to retaliate if necessary, stressing that they have experienced worse things than the USA as if they are showing mercy.

The messages terrorists send to their addresses are ego-centric showing their pride, persistence, and sense of revenge. It is emotional and sometimes pathetic. For example, Osama bin Laden in his videotape speech after 9/11 said.

- (10) *Our Islamic nation has been tasting the same for more than 80 years of humiliation and disgrace, its sons killed, and their blood spilled, its sanctities desecrated.* (Osama bin Laden, 2001)

In the above-mentioned speech, we see emotional speech which is not based on proven facts, and which differs from diplomatic speech, their messages are

direct and sometimes aggressive. Another aspect of terrorist speech is that they try to represent themselves as a collective body against the threats coming to Islamic lands from other 'infidel' countries by codifying people's brains to accept their actions as protective and defensive.

In 1996, in the document called "Declaration of War against the Americans Occupying the Land of the Two Holy Places" Osama bin Laden gave a speech where he said:

- *[T]he people of Islam have suffered from aggression, iniquity, and injustice imposed on them by the Zionist Crusader alliance ... Their blood was spilled in Palestine and Iraq. The horrifying pictures of the massacre of Qana, in Lebanon, are still fresh in our memory. Massacres in Tajikistan, Burma, Kashmir, Assam, the Philippines, Somalia, Eritrea, Chechnya, and in Bosnia-Herzegovina took place, massacres that send shivers through the body and shake the conscience.* (Berner, 2006)

The message of the speech was to send signals to the mentioned countries that his group is fighting for one united Muslim world by creating a heroic profile and targeting those countries that were not satisfied with Western policy to give a legal basis for their actions.

The chosen words send a message to the audience following the ideology like '**freedom fighter**', **Islam**, **Jihad**, **martyrdom**, and **mujahedin**, etc., and explain the philosophy of life which means that in the fight for the freedom of all nations, innocent people die inevitably. Through these words and emotional impact, terrorist groups easily attract people of poor education with a bad social background or vice versa to collaborate with them, in such a way to affect their psychology and convince them to fight and kill in the name of God and the Islamic world.

The sentences like '**true believers of Islam must join**' also show manipulation of one's psychology yet the hidden message of the sentence is that those ones who do not join are not true believers and express modality of obligation through the modal verb 'must'. Such a notion as **martyrdom**, after which, according to the Qur'an, a person will appear in heaven, would be the greatest motive for 'true believers' to commit those acts of terrorism and be justified for them.

Commander Hassan Salameh, who was one of the suicide bombers who carried out the 1996 bombings to defeat Prime Minister Shimon Peres, justified his actions as follows:

- (11) - *The bombers are **holy fighters who** carry out one of the most important articles of faith.* (Post, 2004)

Another commander emphasizes:

- (12) - *It is suicide attacks that earn the most respect and elevate the bombers to the highest possible level of **martyrdom**.* ²

This means that true believers' highest proof of their God is to refuse their own lives and show their dedication to God, God's will, and values. This is why

² See in the same book.

for the justification of suicide bombings; terrorists chose such phrases that can completely wrap those minds who truly believe in God and are convinced that such kind of action is heroism and appreciated by God. Terrorist perceptions about suicide are not the same as people generally think. For them, it is even more. In one of the interviews, a terrorist was asked about suicide to which he answered that *'suicide is selfish and reflects mental weakness and what they do is not a suicide but martyrdom (istishad) or self-sacrifice to serve God'*.

As some researchers mention terrorist acts holding messages to the receivers are a process of communication between terrorists, terrorist groups, and their targets (state, organization, individuals, etc.). This is to say that whenever they are bombing something, they want to send signs about their goals and desires to the public generally, hence the main reason for terrorist attacks is not the destruction or killing itself, but public information as a communication strategy to influence governments or impact audiences. When we analyze Ben Laden's speech, we have a clear understanding of it. Regarding the killing and destruction once he said:

- (13) – *"I am not a murderer. A murderer is someone with a psychological problem; armed actions have a goal. Even if civilians are killed, it is not because we like it or are bloodthirsty. It is a fact of life in a people's struggle. The group doesn't do it because it wants to kill civilians, but because the **jihad** must go on."*
- (14) *The **jihad** is continuing with strength, for Allah be all the credit, despite all the barbarity, the repressive steps taken by the American army and its agents, to the extent that there is no longer any mentionable difference between this criminality and the criminality of Saddam.* (Laden O. b., The Guardian, 2011)

Terrorists are interested in publicity but to have their attention they apply terrorism. Actions like murder, bombing, embassy attacks, or suicides are attractive topics for the media. This is the case that they communicate with the public in a nonverbal way and verbal communication is provided to justify their actions. The striking point here is that the media while reporting about terrorism automatically provides them with public information, a thing that terrorists need to make the audience force the governments to complete terrorists' demands so they will be satisfied because terrorists think that only threatening the organizations or states can have influence and their voice would be heard, and through terrorist actions they send their messages.

Dr. Beatrice de Graaf in her research work mentions that terrorism is communication and that it is aimed at creating fear and anxiety within a society.

- As mentioned, the main key linguistic privilege is that terrorists use the language of persuasion, which is based on the ideology of Islam, the Muslim world, freedom, Jihad, the Quran, etc. We should also notice that terrorist speech is wrapped by words that strongly shape their political views by weaponizing the words, which means that by applying specific vocabulary

and emphasis they make their discourse more persuasive. To make their discourse more understandable terrorists usually make clear what is good with Islam and what is bad without Islam. We can understand it based on the examples below quoted.

- (15) *Atheism causes the destruction of minds. They say that the universe is working automatically. They say that the universe is the creation of an accident. They say that the process of creation is automatically underway. This atheism is destroying the minds of our children in schools, colleges, and universities.* (Aaron, 2008)
- (16) *Christians can think of their amended and modified Bible in these terms, but Quran is still alive in the same shape as it was revealed from the skies.*³
- (17) *Jihad is the path of God in spirit is the greatest and best means of drawing close to God in Spirit is the greatest and best means of drawing close to God. Everyone is aware of its excellence.*⁴

They can use the language of absolutism, showing zero tolerance, which can be seen especially in bin Laden's speech.

- (18) *Know the truth and its roots. The book of God is our Guide. Either Islam or Atheism.* (Laden O. b., Bin Laden, 2002). The example shows that there is no other choice.

Touching upon such an idea as God and other concepts, are directly connected with psychology and perceptions of people which make them vulnerable, hence it is not surprising to find the words 'God' 'Muslim' and 'Islam' repeated everywhere and in their every speech, for examples,

- (19) *We—with **God's help**—call on every Muslim who believes in **God** and wishes to be rewarded to comply with **God's** order to kill the Americans and plunder their money wherever and whenever they find it. We also call on Muslim ulema, leaders, youths, and soldiers to launch the raid on Satan's U.S. troops and the devil's supporters allying with them and to displace those who are behind them so that they may learn a lesson.* (Laden O. b., PBS, 1998)
- (20) *The ruling to kill the Americans and their allies — civilians and military — is an individual duty for every **Muslim** who can do it in any country in which it is possible to do it, in order to liberate the al-Aqsa Mosque and the holy mosque [Mecca] from their grip, and in order for their armies to move out of all the lands of Islam, defeated and unable to threaten any **Muslim***⁵.
- *"I ask the Muslim women to join **jihad** by providing food to **mujahideen** [holy warriors]. Elders should pray for us. I am proud of those martyrs who sacrificed their lives for the sake of **Islam** ...* (Laden O. b., The Guardian, 2011)

³ See on the same page.

⁴ See in the same book, page 82.

⁵ See in the same book.

The way to safeguard your security is to cease your oppression and its impact on our nation, most importantly your withdrawal from the *ill-fated Bush war in Afghanistan*.⁷⁶

The idea of using the concept of God to obtain their goals is the most effective way to persuade people, this is why we see the notion of God being manipulated so much by terrorists and their groups. Terrorism does not come only from the liberation and freedom of the countries, but it can be because of other factors such as nationalism, racism, migration flow, etc.

It must be said that acts resulting from nationalism, racism, religion, and even hatred can also cause terrorism. It might not be called terrorism, but it can be called extremism or radicalization, which is related to terrorism as it is conducted in the same way as terrorist activities. If we study terrorism-related arrests in the EU (2010–2021) (European, 2021) we will see Right-wing terrorism, anarchism, and ethno nationalism, among others and the reasons can be quite different. For example, a reason for terrorism can be monotonicity or independence, which moral is hidden in the depth of a human being and sometimes not understandable to others.

Bombings organized by non-Muslim groups deviate somewhat from the terrorist ideology of the Muslim people. If in the first case, in addition to the value of freedom, the value of God is very important, which pushes the protection of human rights, freedom of speech, etc. into the background, then, in this case, we are dealing with the concept of independence, sovereignty, and monotonicity, democracy, etc.

Of course, this does not mean that the concept of God has never been used to carry out terrorist activities. A case related to terrorism arranged by religion was the terror act of ‘Christian massacres organized in 2008, 24–27 December by Ugandan rebellious and a heterodox group called Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA) led by mainly Joseph Kony. If in other cases religion and God concepts were used to reach some political goals, then in this case the aspect was quite different. First, the followers of Kony believed he was possessed by Spirits. We can find prejudice in his followers’ psychology which made them influenced by that person. The concept of his speech was built on the notion of God. He insisted in his interviews that they are fighting for the Ten Commandments of God, and in one of his interviews to defend their actions he rhetorically asked:

- *Yes, we are fighting for the Ten Commandments. Is it bad? It is not against human rights. And that commandment was not given by Joseph. It was not given by LRA. No, those commandments were given by God.* (Chris Seiple, 2012)
- *In another interview with IRIN, the LRA commander Vincent Otti was asked about the LRA’s vision of an ideal government, to which he responded:*
- *Lord’s Resistance Army is just the name of the movement because we are fighting in the name of God. God is the one helping us in the bush. That’s*

6 See in the same book.

why we created this name, Lord's Resistance Army. And people always ask us, are we fighting for the Ten Commandments of God? That is true— because the Ten Commandments of God is the constitution that God has given to the people of the world. All people. If you go to the constitution, nobody will accept people who steal, nobody could accept to go and take somebody's wife, nobody could accept killing the innocent, or whatever. The Ten Commandments carry all this. (Cline, 2013)

Another vivid example is the Birmingham pub bombings organized on 21 November 1974 in which the Provisional IRA was suspected. The provisioned IRA did not officially admit responsibility but years later, in 2014 a former senior officer of the organization confessed that they were involved in it. To deliver the idea of a terrorist act does not necessarily need verbal communication. Sometimes the facts and symbols speak instead of words. The reason for doing it was to increase pressure on the British government according to the main opinion to withdraw British Army from Northern Ireland.

Another thing that we noticed is that terrorists' attitudes can be different towards the governments based on their locations, whether they are fighting within the country against the government or outside of the country if they value the leader of the government, and what style of regime the government has.

On September 1st when a school in the town of Beslan, Russia, was attacked as an answer to the assassination of the pro-Moscow president of Chechnya, Akhmad Kadyrov, terrorists took over 1120 children and adults. On the second day used the following coercive language:

“From Allah's slave Shamil Basayev to President Putin

- *Vladimir Putin, it wasn't you who started this war. But you can finish it if you have enough courage and determination of de Gaulle. We offer you a sensible peace based on mutual benefit by the principle of independence in exchange for security. In case of troops withdrawal and acknowledgment of the independence of the Chechen Republic of Ichkeria, we are obliged not to make any political, military, or economic treaties with anyone against Russia, not to accommodate foreign military bases on our territory even temporarily, not to support and not to finance groups or organizations carrying out a military struggle against RF, to be present in the united ruble zone, to enter CIS. Besides, we can sign a treaty even though a neutral state status is more acceptable to us. We can also guarantee a renunciation of armed struggle against RF by all Muslims of Russia for at least 10 to 15 years under the condition of freedom of faith. We are not related to the apartment bombings in Moscow and Volgodonk, but we can take responsibility for this in an acceptable way.*
- *The Chechen people are leading a nation-liberating struggle for its freedom and independence, for its self-protection rather than for the destruction or humiliation of Russia. We offer you peace, but the choice is yours. Allahu Akbar. (Basayev, 2004)*

In the speech we see that organizers of terrorism try to negotiate with the president of Russia by putting their conditions, meanwhile offering options to come to a common agreement. They are respectful to the president and the country, with no offensive words, and no language of absolutism. This kind of speech is seen randomly since terrorist speech is the speech of absolutism. They demand and do not compromise. They set conditions to be adopted by others, but they do not accept others' conditions.

This fact of how terrorists communicate with different governmental regimes shows that it is more possible for authoritarian regimes to agree with the terrorists than with the democrat regime. Another difference here is that the concept of God is not highlighted that much, which we see very much in the speech of al Qaeda's leaders regardless of how they address their messages. The speech of Shamil Basayev directly expresses the idea of independence, meanwhile, terrorists from the Middle East express their idea of independence or freedom through the notion of God. This difference could be arranged by the fact that al Qaeda as a terrorist group was fighting against external powers, meanwhile, Shamil Basayev himself was from Russia and had Chechen origins. This is to show that communication of terrorists can vary depending on the geographical locations, governmental regimes, societies, etc. However, whatever they are doing, the main language used by terrorists as a communication form to reach their goals against the government is the language of force.

Conclusion

This study has shown that terrorism is not only an act of political violence but also a carefully planned form of communication in which language plays a decisive role. Terrorist discourse is shaped to influence how people think and feel, using emotions, beliefs, and shared identities to justify violence, attract supporters, and put pressure on governments. Rather than offering material rewards, such speech appeals to abstract ideas such as moral duty, religious obligation, honor, and belonging, which makes it particularly powerful for individuals who feel marginalized or vulnerable.

The analysis makes clear that terrorist language mainly relies on persuasion, emotional appeal, and coercion. By repeatedly referring to concepts such as God, jihad, martyrdom, freedom, homeland, and justice, terrorist groups present their actions as morally right and divinely approved, while portraying opposing views as illegitimate or immoral. Absolute language and expressions of obligation leave little room for choice, turning violence into something that appears necessary and unavoidable. In this way, language becomes a key tool for psychological influence and ideological control. Terrorism also works as a form of communication beyond words. Violent acts themselves function as messages designed to gain attention and provoke fear, while speeches and statements that follow explain, justify, and reinforce those actions. Media coverage further spreads these messages, often amplifying their impact and turning local attacks into global events. As a result,

the goal of terrorism is often less about physical destruction and more about spreading fear and meaning on a wide scale.

The study also shows that terrorist discourse is not the same everywhere. It changes depending on ideology, location, and political context. While Islamist groups often emphasize religious authority and divine justification, other movements focus on nationalism, independence, or sovereignty. Despite these differences, the core strategy remains similar: using language to legitimize violence and influence audiences through fear.

In conclusion, understanding terrorism as a linguistic and psychological process is essential for addressing it effectively. By critically examining terrorist narratives, exposing their manipulation of moral and religious ideas, and limiting their communicative reach, it becomes possible to weaken the ideological appeal of terrorism and reduce its influence on individuals and societies.

Bibliography

- Aaron, D. (2008). *In Their Own Words. Voices of Jihad*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- Basayev, S. (02 09 2004 г.). *LiveJornal*. Получено 19 04 2023 г., из Beslan/ Live Journa:: <https://beslan.livejournal.com/1356.html>
- Berner, B. K. (2006). *Jihad. Bin Laden in his own words: Declarations, Interviews, and Speeches*. New Delhi: Peacock Books.
- Chris Seiple, D. H. (2012). *The Routledge Handbook of Religion and Security*. (D. H. Chris Seiple, Ред.) New York: Routledge.
- Cline, L. E. (2013). *The Lord's Resistance Army*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- European, U. (01 01 2021 г.). *Council of the European Union*. Accessed 05 12 2023, Council of the European Union: <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/infographics/terrorism-eu-facts-figures/>
- Laden, O. b. (22 02 1998 г.). *PBS*. Accessed 17 05 2023, <https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/binladen/who/edicts.html>
- Laden, O. b. (05 02 2002 г.). Bin Laden. (Al-Jazeera, Интервьюер) Al Jazeera. Accessed 10 05 2023, <http://edition.cnn.com/2002/WORLD/asiapcf/south/02/05/binladen.transcript/>
- Laden, O. b. (02 05 2011 г.). *The Guardian*. Accessed 20 04 2023, Bin Laden: the war in his words: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/may/02/bin-laden-war-words-quotes>
- Laden, O. b. (02 05 2011 г.). *The Guardian*. Accessed 26 04 2023, [teh guardian.com: https://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/may/02/bin-laden-war-words-quotes](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/may/02/bin-laden-war-words-quotes)
- Laden, O. b. (02 05 2011 г.). *The Guardian*. Accessed 26 04 2023, The Guardian: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/may/02/bin-laden-war-words-quotes>
- Lincoln, B. (2006). *Holy Terrors* (изд. 2). London: The Univeristy of Chicago Press.
- M.Jerrold. (01 11 2002 г.). Killing in the name of god. Alabama, Alabama, USA: Maxwell Air Force Base. Accessed 15 11 2022, <https://irp.fas.org/world/para/post.pdf>
- Osama bin Laden. (07 11 2001 г.). Videotaped Address. Unk. Accessed 26 04 2023, [ress. uchicago.edu: https://press.uchicago.edu/Misc/Chicago/481921texts.html](https://press.uchicago.edu/Misc/Chicago/481921texts.html)

- Post, J. M. (2004). *Leaders and Their Followers in a Dangerous World: The Psychology of Political Behavior*. United States of America: Cornell University Press.
- Zawahiri, A. a. (01 08 2022 թ.). *From Cairo Physician to Terrorist*. Accessed 13 10 2022, Voice of America: <https://www.voanews.com/a/ayman-al-zawahiri-from-cairo-physician-to-terrorist-leader-/6683227.html>
- Zawahiri, Ayman al. (01 09 2008 թ.). *IntelCenter Terrorism Incident Reference (TIR) Afghanistan 2000–2007*. Alexandria, VA, USA: Tempest Publishing.

Անուշ Մարտիրոսյան

*Եվրասիա միջազգային համալսարանի լեզուների, հաղորդակցության
և մանկավարժության ամբիոնի դասախոս,
բանասիրական գիտությունների թեկնածու
Էլ. հասցե՝ anush.martirosyan@eiu.am*

ՀՈԳԵԼԵԶՎԱԲԱՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ ԱՀԱԲԵԿՎՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՀԱՅՅՑԱԿԱՐԳՈՒՄ

Հոդվածն ուսումնասիրում է ահաբեկչությունը որպես հաղորդակցական երևույթ՝ հոգեբանաուղեղաբանական (հոգեբանալեզվաբանական) դիտանկյունից՝ կենտրոնանալով այն բանի վրա, թե ինչպես է լեզուն ռազմավարականորեն օգտագործվում ճանաչողության, հույզերի և վարքագծի մանիպուլյացիայի համար: Ելնելով ահաբեկչական առաջնորդների և կազմակերպությունների կողմից արտադրված խոսքերի, հոչակագրերի և մեդիա հաղորդագրությունների տեքստային վերլուծությունից՝ ուսումնասիրությունը ցույց է տալիս, որ ահաբեկչությունը ոչ միայն քաղաքական բռնության ձև է, այլև նպատակային հաղորդակցական գործողություն՝ ուղղված միաժամանակ մի քանի լսարանների վրա ազդեցություն գործադրելուն: Վերլուծության արդյունքում բացահայտվում է, որ համոզիչ, հուզական և հարկադրական լեզուն հանդիսանում են հիմնական լեզվական ռազմավարությունները, որոնցում առանձնահատուկ տեղ է զբաղեցնում կրոնական, բարոյական և գաղափարական հասկացությունների կրկնվող կիրառումը, ինչպիսիք են Աստվածը, ջիհադը, նահատակությունը, ազատությունը և հայրենիքը: Ցույց է տրվում, որ այս հասկացությունները գործում են որպես հոգեբանական խթաններ՝ օրինականացնելով բռնությունը, ձևավորելով բարոյական պարտավորության զգացում և վերախմաստավորելով գործող սուբյեկտներին որպես զոհեր կամ արդարության պաշտպաններ: Տարբեր գաղափարական և աշխարհագրական համատեքստերում օրինակների համադրական վերլուծության միջոցով հոդվածը ընդգծում է, թե ինչպես է ահաբեկչական խոսքը հարմարվում քաղաքական միջավայրերին՝ միաժամանակ հետևողականորեն հիմնվելով վախի, բացարձակականության և բարոյական բևեռացման վրա: Ստացված արդյունքները վկայում են, որ լեզուն առանցքային դեր ունի ռադիկալացման գործընթացներում և ահաբեկչության կառուցման մեջ՝ ոչ միայն որպես ֆիզիկական բռնության դրսևորում, այլ որպես խորհրդանշական և հոգեբա-

նախնական դասավարդություն:

Հիմնաբառեր. հոգեկենդանականություն, հաղորդակցական ակտ, լեզու, օրինականացնել, ահաբեկչական խոսույթ, բռնություն, լեզվամտածողություն:

Ануш Мартиросян

Преподаватель кафедры языков, коммуникации и педагогики

Международного университета Евразия,

кандидат филологических наук

Эл. адрес: anush.martirosyan@eiu.am

ПСИХОЛИНГВИСТИКА В КОНЦЕПЦИИ ТЕРРОРИЗМА

Статья рассматривает терроризм как коммуникативное явление с психолингвистической точки зрения, сосредотачиваясь на том, как язык стратегически используется для манипулирования когнитивными процессами, эмоциями и поведением. Опираясь на текстовый анализ речей, деклараций и медиасообщений, создаваемых лидерами и организациями террористических групп, исследование показывает, что терроризм представляет собой не только форму политического насилия, но и целенаправленный акт коммуникации, направленный на воздействие сразу на несколько аудиторий.

Анализ выявляет убеждающий, эмоциональный и принудительный типы языка как доминирующие лингвистические стратегии, с особым акцентом на повторяющееся использование религиозных, моральных и идеологических понятий, таких как Бог, джихад, мученичество, свобода и родина. Показано, что данные концепты функционируют как психологические триггеры, легитимирующие насилие, формирующие ощущение морального долга и переосмысливающие исполнителей насилия как жертв или защитников справедливости. Сравнительный анализ примеров из различных идеологических и географических контекстов позволяет продемонстрировать, каким образом террористический дискурс адаптируется к политическим условиям, при этом последовательно опираясь на страх, абсолютизм и моральную поляризацию. Полученные результаты подчеркивают ключевую роль языка в процессах радикализации и в конструировании терроризма как символической и психологической стратегии, а не исключительно как акта насилия.

Ключевые слова: психолингвистика, коммуникативный акт, язык, легитимизация, террористический дискурс, насилие, лингвистическое познание.

Հոդվածը խմբագրություն է ներկայացվել՝ 2025թ. նոյեմբերի 3-ին:

Հոդվածը հանձնվել է գրախոսման՝ 2025թ. նոյեմբերի 5-ին:

Հոդվածն ընդունվել է տպագրության՝ 2025թ. դեկտեմբերի 19-ին: