INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF
SCIENCE ARTS AND COMMERCE

THE METAPHORICAL CONSTRUCTION OF THE POLITICAL ENEMY IN THE ISLAMIST DISCOURSE

Brahim Hiba

University of Ibn Tofail, Morocco

Abstract

All human language is metaphorical. People very often talk and think about something in terms of another thing, that is in a metaphorical way. Metaphors are not just poetic expressions we use to decorate our literary works, but they actually play a primary role in shaping our understanding of the world around us. For this reason, this article aims at exploring the relationships between the metaphorical use of language and ideology and how such relationships are represented in the discourse of Mohamed Emara, an Egyptian Islamist thinker. More specifically, this article will investigate how the use of metaphor reflects the way this Islamist thinker view liberals and secularists, his political opponents. The article also contends that although metaphors are mere abstract linguistic devices, they actually may have concrete and devastating ramifications on the real world, the world of men and women.

Key words: Critical Discourse Analysis, metaphor, ideology, Critical Metaphor Analysis, power, discourse.

Introduction

For many centuries, the majority of linguists, grammarians, and philosophers thought that language is a mere means of communication used by human beings belonging to the same community. However, some 20th century linguists (Whorf (1956), Sapir (1949), De Saussure (1967)) started making some comparative approaches to different languages and came up with some surprising results. Some of these results are that languages are not sheer linguistic media, but in fact they play crucial roles in the formation of the thought and worldview of every speech community. In this connection, Whorf (1956), for instance, claims that language is not simply a way of voicing ideas, but it is the very thing which shapes our ideas. One cannot think outside the confines of one's language. We are mental prisoners and unable to think freely because of the restrictions of the vocabulary of the language we speak. When you watch a TV talk show or attend a lecture, a conference, a discussion, a sermon, or a debate in a parliament, what you hear is not mere strings of words isolated from the socio-political

affiliations of the speaker uttering those words. In fact, what you hear is not only a person speaking but also a person conducting a social practice. According to Fairclough (1989), language is a form of social practice and is shaped by the social structures of society (1989:17); and by this he means that language is not separate from the social context in which it is practiced; that is to say, language is organically related to society and it reflects its cultural practices and political structures.

History clearly shows how language can be used for ideological or propagandist aims. Prominent figures like Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini, Saddam Husain, Gaddafi and all types of totalitarian regimes used language to win supporters, control people, and oppress opponents. Yet, the ideological and hegemonic use of language is not limited to the discourses of these historical figures and political systems mentioned above, but, as Foucault (1993: 334) says, power is everywhere in society "power is not an institution, and not a structure; neither is it a certain strength we are endowed with; it is the name that one attributes to a complex strategical situation in a particular society". What Foucault means by this is that power can be seen not only in matters that are exclusively political or military; instead, it can be detected in all aspects of social life; when power takes a concrete form, one can see it, for instance, in clothes, body gestures, and ways of behaving. However, when power takes a linguistic form, one can see it in the type of language one chooses to speak about the world and other people.

I. Theoretical framework

Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) will be the theoretical framework which underpins the thesis of this article. For Critical Discourse Analysis practitioners, a particular perspective presupposes ideological consideration. As it is stated in Fairclough (1995), ideology involves the representation of the world from the perspective of a particular interest, which indicates the important role that metaphor could play in Critical Discourse Analysis. Fairclough (1989, 1995, 2003), a major Critical Discourse Analyst, considers language "a social practice" that reflects the ideology and the socio-political ambitions of the person or the social group using that language.

The relevance of Critical Discourse Analysis to this article lies in the fact that it is a type of discourse-analytical research which studies the relationship between discourse (i.e. language use) and social power. Critical Discourse Analysis describes and explains how power abuse is enacted, reproduced, and legitimized by the text and the talk of dominant groups or social institutions (van Dijk, 1996:84). More specifically, the use of Critical Discourse Analysis in this article will show how meaning and ideology are produced through the medium of language. Critical Discourse Analysis' scholars (van Dijk,1995) (Fairclough,1989) (Wodak & Meyer, 2001) assert that Critical Discourse Analysis focuses on discourse or language use, and how the latter is constructed by the social milieus or institutions that people belong to. From a Marxist point of view, powerful people in society not only own the materialistic capital of society, namely raw materials and means of production, but they also have a hand in the symbolic capital of their society; this symbolic capital includes the discourses produced by influential social institutions such as the parliament, the mosque, the school, the university, and the media. These discourses are not produced in vacuum but they are rather

the product of the interaction of many social variables such as economic interests, religious beliefs, customs, social class, gender, and the political orientations of people. In short, discourses are the product of ideology and social struggle.

Powerful people usually tend to impose their ideology on those who are less powerful; some of these powerful people tend to naturalize their ideology and makes it sound as if it were a shared norm or common sense. And one of the means through which the powerful impose their ideology and naturalize their worldview is language. Wodak points out that "dominant structures [or dominant social classes] stabilize conventions and naturalize them, that is, the effects of power and ideology in the production of meaning are obscured and acquire stable and natural forms: they are taken as "given"'" (Wodak & Meyer, 2001: 3). In this respect, Critical Discourse Analysis has a role in piercing the opacity of these naturalized conventions which, in van Dijk's view, are more powerfully established via the subtle, everyday, textual work of persuasion, dissimulation and manipulation that set out to change the minds of others in one's own interests (van Dijk, 1993: 254).

Since the publication of Lakoff and Johnson's Metaphors We Live By (1980) in which the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) was put forward, it has been widely recognized that metaphor is not only a mere rhetorical strategy used by writers and poets, but also an essential tool through which we come to conceptualize the world. Our ordinary conceptual system in terms of which we both think and act is fundamentally metaphorical in nature (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). As a fundamental cognitive tool to conceptualize the world, metaphor may create realities for us, especially social realities. However, by providing a particular perspective of viewing reality, metaphors form an important part of ideology. They reflect the beliefs and mores of the speech community using these metaphors. Therefore, we should not only focus on the cognitive function of the metaphor, but also on its cultural and ideological function.

Fairclough (1989) considers metaphor as "a means of representing one aspect of experience in terms of another" (1989: 119), and warns that we commit a mistake when we keep associating metaphors with literature and neglect their ideological functions in other discourses; in the political discourse, for instance, metaphors can cause the listener to make unconscious presuppositions. If the metaphor is used frequently, the listener may begin to assume and act as if the two phenomena under comparison are, in fact, strongly related. For example, during the cold war between the United States and the Soviet Union, conservatives in Reagan's administration compared the Soviet Union to pre-World War II Germany, claiming that Europe and the United States must 'avoid another Munich' by confronting the enemy, rejecting any chance for reconciliation and appeasement. However, even when one refuses this form of analogical reasoning, the comparison would still appear natural and commonsensical. Moreover, one might then "use it as a benchmark, making Reagan's policies prudent so long as nothing as a global war came to pass" (Gastil, 1992: 488). Lakoff (2001) analyzed the use of metaphor in Bush's political discourses about the September 11 attacks. In examining the use of metaphors in Bush's speeches and his administration's reactions to the attacks, Lakoff remarked the administration's shift from discussing September 11 in terms of crime metaphor to discussing it in terms of war metaphor. The

ideological use of the war metaphor has allowed the administration to exercise power in ways that would not have been possible under the crime metaphor. In their study of the Christian fundamentalist discourse, Kettemann and Marko (2012) view metaphor as a means of radicalization; that is, metaphors are used to suggest that differences and conflicts are irreconcilable and that drastic measures must be taken as soon as possible. One of the bad effects of overusing or overextending metaphors is their distortion of reality. Howe (1988), cited in Gastil (1992: 488), clarifies this problem in the case of sport and war metaphors, both of which are commonly used in American politics:

Although such metaphors do correspond in some ways to reality, they ignore or disguise one inescapable fact about contemporary America: the political process and, more especially, passing legislation proceeds through compromise and consensus… The destructive irony is that metaphors from sports and war can delude their users into believing that negation and compromise are forbidden by the rules of conflict. (Howe 1988, cited in Gastil, 1992: 488) The use of metaphors shares the same features of other types of implied meaning such as implicature and presupposition: the listener may come up with different meanings than those intended by the speaker. The danger of misinterpretation is almost always present with metaphor. To give a concrete example of the ideological power of metaphors and their cognitive impact on people, Fairclough (1989) cites the following excerpt from a Scottish newspaper about a riot in 1981: As the riots of rampaging youths spread from the south, even the most optimistic have fears for the future, afraid worse is yet to come. How far can the trouble spread? If it comes to Scotland, where will it strike?

The riot, argues Fairclough, is metaphorically represented as a disease, which is a vague, subhuman and unthinking force (nobody knows where it will strike) .It is like cancer, and with cancer negotiation and arguments do not work; the ideological meaning of this metaphor is that just as cancer has to be eliminated, the 'riot' has to be cut out (Fairclough, 1989:120). Another approach that will be used in this article is Critical Metaphor Analysis (henceforth CMA). The latter is one of the several approaches to discourse analysis that derive from CDA. It was developed by Jonathan Charteris-Black (2004) in his book Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis, as an approach for analyzing metaphors in discourse. The purpose of using these two approaches, which are CDA and CMA, is to identify the hidden intentions (possibly unconscious) and ideologies underlying language use, in general, and metaphors' use, in particular.

CMA, like CDA, is carried through three stages: identification, interpretation and explanation of metaphors. Metaphor identification stage copes with locating which metaphors are present in a text, and whether they show semantic tension between the literal source from which they are taken and the metaphorical target they are applied to. Metaphor interpretation stage aims at determining the type of social relations that are constructed through the metaphors identified. Metaphor explanation stage deals with the way metaphors interact within the context in which they occur. More specifically, the explanation stage of CMA is based on the explanation of the ideological motivations behind metaphors' use.

II. Data and methodology

This article will be concerned with analyzing the discourse of an Egyptian Islamist thinker who was invited to al-Bayyena TV talk-show to talk about secularism and liberalism in the Arab world. In the analysis, I will focus on revealing the discursive sources of power, dominance, inequality, bias and how these sources are initiated, maintained, reproduced in the discourse of the Islamist thinker in the show. To put it differently, the main objective of this article is to analyze how liberals and secularists are metaphorically represented in al-Bayyena TV talk show, especially in the discourse of Mohamed Emara who is the guest-speaker in the show. Therefore, the objectives of the study can be summed up as follows:

1. To demonstrate how liberals and secularists are represented in the TV talk- show through metaphorization;

2. To investigate the significance of the source domains from which Emara derives his metaphors,

3. To show the political and social ramifications of such metaphorical representations;

The data used in this article are 7 extracts from Emara's discourse about liberals and secularists. These 7 extracts have been drawn from a TV talk-show called al-Bayyena. The latter is a religious TV talk-show broadcast every Thursday at 19: 30 (GMT) on Iqraa TV channel, the episode from which I obtained the data is retrieved from YouTube (YouTube: al-Bayyena). In fact there are two versions of the episode on YouTube; one is 44 minutes long and has been watched until the writing of this research by 14 290 viewers; the other one is 10 minutes long and it has 20152 viewers. The episode is in Arabic and it is entitled "ʔalʕelmaneyyun wa ʔalleberaleyyun fe mizan ʔalmanteq" (Secularists and Liberals in The Balance of Logic). In the episode I am working on, Emara is invited as an Islamist expert in Islamic thought and Western philosophy; he is asked to clarify for Muslims around the Arab World the fundamental principles of secularism and the political position of liberals and secularists in the Arab World. In this article, I will investigate the 7 extracts and utterances produced by the host and Emara throughout the whole TV talk-show. These extracts, which are translated from Arabic into English, will be analyzed in the light of CDA and CMA. More specifically, in the investigation, I will focus mainly on the metaphorical devices, within the extracts, which indicate discrimination, inequality, ideology, bias, and power; this is done for the purpose of achieving a thorough analysis and deep understanding of the ideological paradigm and power relations promoted by this talk show.

III. Analysis

According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980) metaphors are not just poetic devices, but they actually play a fundamental role in shaping our understanding of the world around us. Furthermore, metaphoric thought has deep roots in our conceptual level of consciousness and, in turn, influences our speech at the textual level. Charteris-Black asserts that metaphors have a great impact on people's beliefs, attitudes and values because metaphors use language to trigger unconscious emotional associations and they influence the value that people place on ideas and beliefs on a scale of goodness and badness (Charteris-Black, 2005: 13). In the

following data and in other excerpts from the talk show, I will analyze how Emara uses metaphors to talk about secularists and how these metaphors reflect ideology and power.

1. The Family Metaphor

Family values and blood are very important in the culture of Arabs. The ethnic background of a person, that is to say the origin of their family, determines the way people will treat and look at that person. In the following extract, Emara, responding to the show's host question as to where do secularists and liberals come from, uses this family value to present secularists to the Arab audience as outsiders and "illegitimate sons." Extract 1

Emara: So, from the first moment we can say that liberals and seculars are the grandsons of Bonaparte …their thought is from the Occident, their Qibla is the Occident. So, there is an agreement that these people are a people of dependence and imitation of the Occidental archetype of civilization…They have a relationship neither with the originality of the Nation [our Islamic Nation] or with the history of the Nation, nor with the religion of the Nation. In this passage, Emara not only claims that secularists and liberals are strangers to Arab and Islamic countries but also suggests that secularists are Westerners even if they hold Arab names. To support this claim, Emara uses the family metaphor in his statement that "secularists are the grandsons of Bonaparte." Knowing the importance of family and blood bonds for the Arab audience, Emara establishes a blood link between Arab secularists and Bonaparte, which means that, as Emara asserts, people should not be deceived by the appearance and names of Arab secularists and liberals; they are both the descendants of Bonaparte, a French invader. Moreover, Emara asserts that secularists can be faithful to no one but to the Occident; and to make this claim a stronger one, he uses a religious metaphor "their Qibla is the Occident." The word "Qibla" means that when Muslims want to pray they direct their faces and prayers towards Mecca; this religious metaphor implies that secularists believe in another religion other than Islam. So, secularist and liberals, according to Emara's logic are apostates. And to suggest that there is no doubt about what he says about secularists, Emara uses the expression "there is an agreement that…" [hunaka ?etefaq] he provides no further information or evidence to support this claim of total "agreement." However, what sounds in this context as a personal opinion that Emara could have rephrased as "I think that a lot of people agree that…" he has changed this expression, which is a mental process, into a noun; he has nominalized the verb "agree" and uses it in its nominal form: "agreement." By this grammatical transformation Emara has been able to hide the "agency" behind his opinion, which is Emara himself, and thus make his claim appear as an entity, an unquestionable and agreed upon fact.

2. The Cancer Metaphor

In Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners the word "cancer" is defined as "a serious illness caused by a group of cells in the body increasing in an uncontrolled way." A second meaning of the word "cancer" is given, in the same dictionary, as "something harmful that affects a lot of people and is difficult to stop." Other lexical items that usually collocate with the word "cancer" are "beat," "prevent," "suffer from," "die of," "fight," "incurable,"

"inoperable," and "terminal". Generally speaking, cancer is represented, in the collective consciousness of people, as a dangerous and sometimes a terminal illness. In the following extract, I will show how Emara uses "cancer" in a metaphorical way to assert his power and dominance over secularists and liberals.

Extract 2

Host: [You consider secularists as outsiders] even though they belong to the Nation [of Islam]?

Emara: Of course … [secularists] dress up like us and speak our language but they are the cancerous dimensions of this Occidental archetype of civilization.

This passage from the interview is related to the passage above in Extract 2; the host wonders how secularists can ever be strangers to the nation of Islam and be faithful to the Occident though they belong to Arab and Islamic countries; Emara replies that secularists have a deceiving appearance; he points out that even if "they dress up like us and speak our language" secularists are not from "us". To make this idea clear, the idea that secularist are strangers to the Arabo-Islamic body, Emara uses a metaphor borrowed from epidemiology; he describes secularists as having "cancerous dimensions" [ʔemtedadat sarataneya] of the Occident. This metaphor has a great cognitive impact on the listener. First, cancer is a dangerous and inhuman force; it destroys any organism it afflicts. Second, one cannot negotiate with cancer or come to a compromise with it; the only way to cope with cancer is to cut it out. Consequently, one of the political implications of the cancer metaphor that Emara has used is that secularists are a dangerous species and must be eliminated before they destroy the body of the Islamic Nation.

So, Emara has emphasized the idea that secularists are strangers and outsiders. However, this strangeness has two dimensions: cultural strangeness and physical strangeness. On one hand, cultural strangeness is epitomized by the fact that even if secularists speak Arabic and dress up like Arabs and Muslims, they must not, Emara believes, be considered as true Muslims; their grandfather is Bonaparte, a colonizer, and their "Qibla" or holy land is the West. On the other hand, physical strangeness is suggested by the use of the cancer metaphor: secularists are a virus which is invading the body of the Arabo-Islamic nation, and they must be eliminated before it is late.

3. The Demon Metaphor

Accusing secularists of immorality is a predominant theme in Emara's discourse. In fact, this strategy is just another different manifestation of the "poisoning the well" strategy. In this respect, Emara ascribes all sorts of unfavorable information to secularists in order to discredit them. In extracts 3 and 4 Emara demonizes secularists by using two metaphors: the demon metaphor and the slave metaphor. In the former Emara portrays secularists as dishonest members in the Arab society, in the latter he describes them as mere servants who work for the benefit of their European and American "masters".

Extract 3

Emara: "the trick that Western Enlightenment played on Judaism and Christianity… they [secularists] are imitating it. For this reason I say that…people must know that among these [secularists] there isn't even one of them who possesses an atom of creativity, these [secularits] are imitators of the Western Enlightenment thought […]"

Emara accuses secularists of being not serious and irresponsible; he asserts that all that they say and do is a "trick" [le9ba] they "play". What the words "trick" and "play" imply is that secularists are deceivers and Muslims should be careful of the hidden snare that secularists prepare for them. Emara also assigns himself the authority to warn people against secularists he says "people must know that…"

4. The Slave Metaphor Extract 4

Host: "Do these [secularists] have any leaders abroad?"

Emara: "these [secularists] are the students of America…the slaves of Condoleezza Rice…they are promoting the American project of Creative Chaos which tears apart, divides, and makes this affliction we live in…"

Accusing secularists of dependency is a predominant theme in the talk-show. For this reason, Emara describes secularists as "students" [talameda] which implies that the social and political views that Arab secularists hold are not truly theirs, but they are adopting in fact the ideas of their American "teachers". This image of intellectual dependency is strengthened when he says that secularists are mere "slaves" [9abeed] under the control of "Condoleezza Rice". Furthermore, secularists do nothing but "promote" the American project in the Middle East; the word "promote" [yurawejuna] has a commercial connotation in Arabic and suggests that secularists' ideas have nothing to do with Arabs' great causes: secularists' ideas are only business and financial profit. Along with that, Emara suggests that secularists' project should not be seen as a constructive one, but rather as the one which "tears apart, divides, and makes this affliction [that Arabs] live in…"

5. The War Metaphor

In a fundamentalist discourse such as Emara's discourse the relationship with other competing ideologies is seen in terms of battles and clashes. Therefore, Secularism and Liberalism are seen as the bitter enemies of Islam. To urge Muslims to fight these "enemies" Emara often talk about Secularism and Liberalism using war metaphors. In the following extracts, I will show how the war metaphor works within Emara's fundamentalist discourse and how it reflects power and dominance.

Extract 5

Emara: "I'm wondering: what do these [secularists] have to do with the resistance to the Zionist crusade all over the Islamic World? Every one o f them defends the American Project, American liberalism, the normalization of relationships with Israel, and is hostile to

Islam… Sir, for long decades our voice has become husky by [constantly] telling them that there is a war on Islam but they make fun of us."

Emara makes overgeneralizations about secularists; he says "everyone of them…" he puts again all secularists in one bag and accuses them of cooperating with Arabs' enemies: they do not resist the "Zionist Crusade", they "defend the American Project in the Middle East," and they establish "normal" [tattbee9] relationships with Israel. Emara asserts that he and Islamists have been warning secularists for many years that there is a war on Islam; he says that his voice has become husky because of constantly warning secularists. However, secularists have never reacted; they are, as Emara insinuates, either deaf or careless. In either case, they should not be allowed to participate in political life in Arabo-Islamic countries.

Extract 6

Emara: "I want to say that the positions of these [secularists] are with the enemy…now when those offences occurred to the Prophet (peace be upon him) and offences in the Occident are not something new, what was their attitude? All of them criticized the movement of the Arab street and the Nation's rising in support of their Prophet (peace be upon him) and its holy things."

Emara uses the war metaphor by saying that secularists put themselves at the side of the enemies of Muslims: "the positions of these are with the enemy." Intertextually, the war metaphor is indeed a culturally and ideologically loaded metaphor. It triggers a dominant theme/trauma in Arab- Muslim popular consciousness, one that is strongly related to early Christian Crusades, European colonialism and its present re-incarnation in the Israeli occupation of Palestine and the American invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan.

Once again, whenever Emara wants to ascribe a "bad" attitude or action to secularists he uses overgeneralization: "all of them criticized …" "every one of them…" he puts secularists in one bag and treats them as one species.

6. The Hybrid Metaphor

In his book Mein Kampf Hitler decribed the Jews as 'slime, maggots, bacteria' (Rash, 2006: 174) and, thus, gave them the status of being 'viruses' or 'parasites'. Similarly Emara emphasizes in his discourse the idea that secularists are no more than viruses that may destroy the body of the Islamic Nation. In the following extract, Emara depicts secularists as impure human beings, hence the danger of defiling and polluting the Islamic society on their part.

Extract 7

Emara: "by the way, once someone asked me "what is your definition of the secularist intellectual?" I told him he is an effeminate intellectual…

Host: [interrupting] intellectual, what? Emara: effeminate.

Host: effeminate!

Emara: yeah, why? God has created people as men and women [the secularist intellectual] is effeminate; he is neither perfectly masculine nor perfectly feminine […] What is a secularist? He is neither an absolute Muslim nor an absolute unbeliever. So, he is an intellectual who believes in one part of the Scripture and disbelieve in the other part…we want to show them this blemish they live in order to make them perfect Muslims. So, Islam is a global method […] For this reason, I want to say that the correct method to fight this secular extremism and this extremist inertia and imitation is Islamic Moderation which will set us back again to implementing the Prophetic Model."

Emara, again, confirms that secularists want to manipulate God's Creation; he states that secularists have a heterogeneous identity-- both physically and mentally. At the physical level, a secularist is effeminate [muxanat]; he neither a perfect man nor a perfect woman. At the mental or spiritual level, a secularist, says Emara, is "is neither an absolute Muslim nor an absolute unbeliever." This idea of heterogeneity or hybridity contributes to the foregrounding of another theme that has been emphasized by Emara throughout the talk show; this theme is that secularists are a strange lot. Along with that, Emara points out that "the correct method to fight this secular extremism and this extremist inertia and imitation is Islamic moderation;" by such a statement Emara suggests that secularists are pervert members of society and Muslims should fight them to put them back on the right track again.

Metaphorization as radicalization

Along with polarization and negativisation, Emara uses another strategy to construct his discourse; this strategy is radicalization. By radicalization I mean that the differences and conflicts within Emara's discourse are presented as being extreme so that possible problems seem more acute and the resulting necessity to act seems greater and thus very urgent. Radicalization in Emara's discourse can primarily be found in vocabulary, particularly in the many extremely negative connotations of words, with which his political opponents are described. This shows how strongly radicalization is related to polarization.

Metaphors are a common means of radicalization. Many metaphorical expressions from the field of war, criminology, epidemiology, commerce, genealogy, vandalism and botany are used in Emara's religious discourse. This indicates that his discourse creates a wide-spread semantic correspondence between difference/opposition and war or evil. We may therefore speak of a conceptual metaphor: difference is war, cancer, immorality, and destruction.

The fact that the semantic field of war, epidemiology, and criminology so often serve as the source of the metaphors in Emara's discourse, however, is remarkable and supports the assumption that the reality construed in Emara's discourse is marked by extreme polarization and radicalization. The latter, in turn, implies a certain amount of hatred and symbolic violence emanating from the discourse. Whether this symbolic violence amounts to a real concrete threat from individuals belonging to Islamic fundamentalist movements, such as Muslims Brotherhood, of which Emara is a member, in the Arab world is another question. But I may at least speculate that the existing violence in the fundamentalist discourse may be

a fertile ground for specific acts repeatedly carried out by Islamic fundamentalists such as the assassination of liberal thinkers and artists in Egypt and in other Arab countries.

Conclusion

In fact, Emara's discourse is a polarized discourse; it is a structure of dichotomies and binary oppositions. At the level of epistemological opposition, secularists are described as being wrong in every claim they make and every action they do, whereas Islamists are portrayed as those who own the Truth and represent true Islam. At the political level, Islamists are depicted as victims and always in a position of defense against the threats of secularists. The latter, at the moral level, are portrayed as corrupt and evil. These negative images are emphasized and covered by too many expressions and lexical items which serve to emphasize the same meanings. Polarization in Emara's discourse is also characterized by negativisation, i.e. an excessive concern with the negative aspects of the other side of the issue, which is secularism.

Harb (2010: 31- 4), a Lebanese thinker, argues that the Islamic fundamentalist discourse has basically six features among which the most salient are: (i) doctrinal narcissism (ii) dogmatism and

(iii) exclusive reason. Islamic fundamentalists, argues Harb, are narcissists and believe that they are superior to people from other religions and ideologies; this superiority is expressed in Emara's discourse by his use of the cancer metaphor and the genealogy metaphor. In the first metaphor, secularists are depicted as a virus that has to be cut out and in the second metaphor secularists are declared to be "the grandsons of Bonaparte"; which means that they are illegitimate sons: the product of fornication. Social and political exclusion is also a predominant theme in the fundamentalist discourse. Throughout the TV talk show, Emara has described secularists as outsiders to the Islamic Nation and has even called the audience to step into action and take their arms and fight them. Dogmatism, too, is a basic feature of Emara's discourse. On the one hand, Islamists are presented as the people who own the truth and know well what is good and what is bad for Muslims. On the other hand, secularists are described as a bunch of "secret agents" and "traitors".

All these rhetorical strategies indeed prove Fairclough's (1989) claim that language is not merely a means of communication; it is rather a "social practice" that reflects the ideology and power ambitions of the person or the group of people using it. The CDA and CMA approaches I applied to the discourse in the TV talk-show have shown that discourses are not mere constructions of neutral words and opinions uttered by innocent people but they are also ideologically laden and politically oriented. The lexical style and discursive strategies used by Emara and his host indicate and represent derogation, domination, marginalization, and hatred; all these feelings, attitudes and rhetorical strategies are used to influence the Muslim audience, to strengthen Islamists' legitimacy, to underestimate and stigmatize secularists, to maintain the power and spread the Islamist ideology and make it accepted and recognized by the lay Muslim. Finally, the present research findings support Fairclough's model of Critical

Discourse Analysis which claims that language use is not neutral and that it, in fact, serves political and ideological objectives.

References

Charteris-Black, J. (2004) Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis. NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Charteris-Black, J. (2005) Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor. Hampshire : Palgrave Macmillan.

De Saussure, F. (1967) Cours de Linguistique Générale. Paris: Grande Bibliothèque Payot.

Fairclough, N (1995) Critical Discourse Analysis: the critical study of Language. Essex: Longman Group Limited.

Fairclough, N. (1989) Language and Power. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2003) Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for social Research. London and New York: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1993), "Excerpts from 'The History of Sexuality: Volume 1: An Introduction", in Natoli, J. and Hutcheon, L. (Eds.), A postmodern reader, State University of New York Press, New York, pp. 333-341.

Gastil, J. (1992) "Undemocratic discourse: a review of theory and research on political discourse" in Discourse & Society (1992) Vol. 3 (4) London: Sage. pp. 469-500.

Harb, A. (2010) Almassaleh wa Almass'er. Algiers: Editions El-Ikhtilef. (in Arabic)

Kettemann, B. & Marko, G. (2012) ""But what does the Bible really say?" A Critical Analysis of Fundamentalist Discourse." Retrieved on 5 March 2012 from http://www.uni

graz.at/bernhard.kettemann/forschungsprojekte/fundamentalismus/fund.html

Lakoff, G. (2001, October 29). Metaphors of terror. Retrieved from http://www.inthesetimes.com/issue/25/24/lakoff2524.htm

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980) Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: Chicago University Press. Rash, F. (2006) The Language of Violence: Adolf Hitler's Mein Kampf. New York: Peter Lang.

Sapir, E. (1949) Mandelbaum, D. (ed). Selected Writings in Language, Culture and Personality. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1993) Discourse & society. London: Sage,Vol. 4(2).

Van Dijk, T.A. (1995) Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In Sch¨affner, C., and Wenden, A. (eds.), Language and Peace: 17--33. Aldershot: Dartmouth.

Van Dijk. T. A. (1996) Discourse, power and access. Texts and practices: readings in critical discourse analysis, ed. by Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard and Malcolm Coulthard, 84-104. New York: Routledge.

Whorf, B. (1956) Language, Thought and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf. Cambridge, Ma: MIT Press.

Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (2001) Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis. (Eds.). London: Sage Publications.

Youtube, al-Bayyena: Retrieved on October 10, 2012 from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2hYOPnoLOn8

Author's biography

Brahim Hiba is a Moroccan philosopher and discourse analyst. He is currently working on a PhD thesis about teaching Critical Discourse Consciousness. Brahim Hiba also teaches Critical Discourse Consciousness in two Moroccan universities, Cadi Ayyad University and Ibn Tofail University. Hiba is interested in research areas such as Critical Discourse Analysis, religious discourse, Critical Pedagogy, and Poststructuralism.