



The Metaphorical and Ideological Representation of the Political Opponent in the Hardline Islamist Discourse in Tunisia

Mouna Hamrita,

Phd Student In English Linguistics, Faculty Of Letters, Arts & Humanities Of Manouba, Tunisia

Received 20 June, 2016; Accepted 30 June, 2016 © The author(s) 2014. Published with open access at www.questjournals.org

ABSTRACT: Metaphor is considered as one of the significant properties of human language. People often talk metaphorically. In other words, they express one idea while referring to another idea. As stated by pragmatic theorists (e.g., Searle, Martinich) in speaking metaphorically we use the commonly known meaning of the words uttered in order to perform a speech act in a distinct given context. Accordingly, metaphors are not meant to be figures of speech we employ to ornament our pieces of writing. Yet, these linguistic devices contribute to the construction of our world views. Metaphors are of great importance in many contexts like religious and political contexts for it is through them that religious and political actors communicate their ideas to people in a simpler way. It is also through metaphors that the latter are likely to influence the audience positively or negatively. To study the ideological connotations of the metaphorical expressions communicated in the language of a Tunisian Hardline Islamist politician *Ridha Belhadj, the present piece of research adopts a methodological scheme consisting of two main theories, namely Critical Discourse Analysis and Conceptual Metaphor Theory. Particularly, the main research aim of this paper is to analyse the way in which the metaphorical expressions utilized in the 'politico-religious' discourse of this Hardline Islamist politician reveal his perception of his liberal and secularist political enemies. Furthermore, the current article assumes that such metaphorical use of language as manifested in the language of this politician is likely to have harmful effects on the Tunisian post-revolution context.

Key terms: 'Politico-religious' discourse, Hardline Islamism, Critical Discourse Analysis, metaphor, power, Metaphorical Analysis, ideology, discourse

I. PRELIMINARY INTRODUCTION: SETTING THE SCENE

1. Tunisian Post-Revolution Islamist Trend

The Tunisian revolution of 14th January 2011 which swept the country holding slogans calling for freedom and dignity was a peaceful popular uprising. This is because it was a spontaneous popular reaction to the long years of tyranny and dictatorship and it was not led by political actors. Yet, after the Islamist party Ennahdha took over, it attempted to alter the revolutionary slogans of freedom and dignity held in the aftermath of the revolution into slogans of identity and sanctity. As such the Islamist party turned the revolution's main point from a dignity revolution to a revolutionist search for identity. On September 6, 2013 Op-ed contributors in Tunisia wrote "The freedom of the media in Tunisia was the first freedom to be targeted by the Ennahdha party. The Islamists want to make the public media a government-controlled media. When Tunisian journalists refused to abandon their professionalism and neutralism, Islamists thus called them part of a ~media of shame." In this very context comes the discourse of 'Ridha Belhadj' the focus of the current article. 'Ridha Belhadj' who belongs to the Islamist trend in the first place, is more radical than Ennahdha political party members. The radical dimension of his Islamist political discourse is described in the next section.

2. Introducing The Discourse Of The Hardline Islamist Party "Hizb Tahrir": The Case Of 'Ridha Belhadj' Its Spokesperson

In the Twentieth century the Hardline Islamist Party 'Hizb Tahrir' emerged holding a 'politico religious' discourse whose main tenets are based on several principles such as, Islam is not merely a religion but it is also a comprehensive political ideology whereby supreme power belongs to 'Allah', not humans. In this context, Ahmed and Stuart (2009) wrote "Its vision of a Caliphate is shaped by modern conceptions of statehood incorporating, for example, a standing army, constitution and governing body. HT's draft constitution implements *Shari'ah* law at state level." (p.17). In the Tunisian context, *Hizb Tahrir* or (the Liberation party), is a

pan-Islamist party whose foundation dates back to the emergence of the *Muslim Brotherhood* movement in the early 1950s. This party calls for the establishment of the *Caliphate* and the application of Islamic law or *Shari'a*. In Tunisia, it has been active since the 1980s mainly under the form of small groups located especially in poor areas. In the aftermath of the Tunisian revolution, this party came to the fore and obtained its legal status on 17 July 2012. Since then, it has introduced itself as an Islamist moderate movement that is far from violence and radicalism. This tendency is conveyed in the discourse of 'Ridha Belhadj', its spokesman whose discourse seems to be a polarized discourse in which he shows a clear antagonism towards his secular and liberal political opponents. This antagonism stems from the fact that secular and liberal principles, according to him, do not fit his party's core nationalist and Islamist values and they are often perceived as an aspect of 'blasphamy' or 'kufri' brought from the west. The most notable ideological values of *Hizb Tahrir* according to Ahmed and Stuart (2009) revolves around the idea that there is "a clash between Western and Islamic Civilisations (...) the United Kingdom and the United States of America are leading a campaign against Islam and Muslims worldwide (...) the influence of Western thought and physical presence in Muslim majority countries [is] a threat to Islam, which it wishes to uproot"(p.3). For *Hizb Tahrir*, "liberal values , secularism, human rights and pluralism are rejected as un-Islamic because they differ from the part's Islamist doctrine. Promoting democracy , for example, is seen as part of Western conspiracy to weaken Islam."(p.3).

Given all those points, in his public speeches and broadcast interviews, 'Ridha Belhadj' often shows an intense feeling of hatred and derogation to secularists. This attitude is clearly seen through the metaphors he employs when he refers to them. The present paper is therefore an attempt to deconstruct this type of extremist political discourse so as to analyse and discuss the different connotations and implications of these metaphors.

3. The Significant Role Of Language In Different Types Of Discourse: The Case Of Public Political Discourse

Throughout history, Linguists, and philosophers had been assuming that language is no more than a tool of interaction utilized by the members of a given speech community. Yet, in the 20th century a number of linguists, notably De Saussure (1967) initiated new definitions of language and ended up with new interesting results. All of these new approaches to language revolve around the idea that language is not only a mere tool of communication between humans who belong to the same speech community, but it is a vehicle that forms human beliefs and perceptions of the world around him. For instance, Whorf (1956) argues that language is not merely a tool of expressing ideas but it is what forms them. In other words, people can only think within the vocabulary offered by language, thus we are unable to think outside the confines of language.

Following this reasoning, in every communicative context such as conferences, television talk shows, religious sermons, etc. we usually see people enacting social actions while speaking. This is because according to the 20th century linguists, language is not disconnected from social reality, but it is a mirror that reflects its cultural, religious and political structures. In this respect, Fairclough (1989) argues that "language is a form of social practice and is shaped by social structures of society".(p.17).

Actually, history obviously shows the way in which political and religious discourses have been intertwined to achieve ideological or manipulative aims. Historical leaders like Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini, Bush, Obama, Ben Ali and all types of political totalitarian and the "so called democratic" systems used to use language as a means to influence people, and manipulate them. This was done first by drawing a positive and even 'sacred' image of their policies while portraying their ideological opponent as an enemy to the whole nation thus incriminating them and inciting the people to reject and fight them. Yet, the manipulative use of language is not restricted to the discourses of the stated political leaders and political systems, but, the power implied in discourse can be felt in many other types of social discourses. This idea is confirmed by Foucault (1993: 334) who maintains that "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 strategic situation in a particular society". In here, Foucault believes when we talk about power we are not necessarily referring to political or military issues. As a matter of fact, power exists in all types of discourse including religious discourse, sports' discourse, medical discourse, judicial discourse, etc. When power is expressed physically, it is obviously easy to detect. Yet, when it is expressed verbally, this depends on the linguistic tools that are used to convey it. Metaphor is one of these tools.

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

1. Theoretical Framework

1.1. The Input of Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is the theoretical framework that is adopted to study the main thesis of the present article. For Critical Discourse analysts, a specific point of view definitely implies ideological consideration. Fairclough (1995) claims that ideology embeds a pragmatic representation of the world. This shows the strong link between the study of metaphor and Critical Discourse Analysis since it is

through deconstructing metaphors that we come to understand the ideological implications of any discourse. Fairclough (1989), views language as “a social practice” that mirrors the ideological and the socio-political ends of language users bearing in mind that political discourse is not confined to the world of politics according to Van Dijk (1993).

In simpler terms, ideology is no longer seen as a negative concept standing for an extremist versus an objective point of view. It is rather a concept that reflects people's socio-political representation of the world. This representational framework is based mostly on metaphor. Accordingly, whenever we talk about ideology we are in front of one ideological aspect since what is metaphorical is by no means ideological. This is because we often think in terms of a set of metaphors that signal the perspective from which we talk. It is in fact this interconnectedness between ideology and metaphor that makes metaphor a strong linguistic device.

Referring back to the Tunisian Islamist discourse, the focus of the present paper, their apparent religious discourse is indeed a political discourse since Islamists are already members of a political party that has the same political ambitions as the other political parties regardless of their ideological backgrounds. This political discourse has been defined as an argumentative discourse whose main aim is to persuade the other with theoretical points of view seeking his agreement (Mutz et al., 1999). In this way, the political discourse seeks to attack the enemies and gather as much supporters as possible through various argumentative devices most importantly through metaphor. Having recognised the manipulative aspect of this type of discourse, this very 'politico-religious' discourse does in fact exercise a sort of emotional containment on the public through this ideological and manipulative persuasive tool namely metaphor.

Given these points, employing Critical Discourse Analysis in this paper is an analytical tool used to study the way in which social power is expressed in the language of 'Ridha Belhadj', and also to explore how meaning and ideology are expressed in such a 'politico-religious' discourse.

1.2. Incorporating Conceptual Metaphor Theory and CDA

Critical Discourse Analysts believe that 'interdisciplinary' study of language is crucial for an effective understanding of 'how language functions' in constructing 'knowledge, in organising social institutions' or in 'exercising power (Li,2016). Here comes the utility of Conceptual Metaphor Theory. CMT which was first initiated by George Lakoff & Mark Johnson in their work *Metaphors We Live By (1980)* stresses the idea that metaphors are ways of thinking while metaphorical expressions embed conceptual metaphors (Li, 2016 p.2).

In the same line of thought, Black (2004, p.28) states that "metaphor is (...) central to critical discourse analysis since it is concerned with forming a coherent view of reality". This idea is further emphasized by (Bart, 2012) who represents Critical Metaphor Analysis (CMA) as a part of CDA. Following this reasoning, the strong link between CMT and CDA is obviously clear.

This very connectedness between the two theories is in fact understood while studying political communication. In other words, in such type of discourse, metaphors play a significant role in informing, manipulating, and persuading the public. This is why Edelman (1964) argues that the main aim of political discourse is to use metaphors that are frequently repeated so as to 'mobilize public opinion'. According to Edelman, metaphors have a strong manipulative role and 'the repetition' of these metaphors 'results in' "dulling the critical faculties rather than waking them".(p.124). As such, when a given metaphor or a cliché is permanently repeated the audience get easily brainwashed and stop questioning and criticizing the politicians' ideas.

Important to realize is the fact that metaphors are like other manipulative discursive structures such as presupposition, implicature, etc. whose main aim in political discourse is to influence the audience so as to gain their support. In all these discursive strategies including metaphors, the hearer assumes a meaning that is different from the speaker's meant message. Here, comes the ambiguity and misinterpretation of metaphors.

So to speak, the rationale behind using these two theories in the present article is to identify the implied meanings and ideologies conveyed in the discourse of the Tunisian Hardline Islamist 'Ridha Belhadj' while referring to his Tunisian ideological opponents stressing the role of metaphors in this analysis process.

Following Charteris-Black (2004) three stages of metaphor analysis, namely *identification, interpretation and explanation* of conceptual metaphor, the present piece of research is to identify the metaphors used in the televised political discourse of 'Ridha Belhadj' while talking about his political enemies. Then, it is to interpret the metaphors cognitively and pragmatically. Finally, it is to explain the rationale behind Belhadj's exclusive choice of such metaphors stressing their intended impact on the public.

1.3. Most Relevant Studies

Revisiting the history of using metaphors in political communication, many scholars and critical discourse analysts have conducted various studies on the use of metaphors in political communication. Bronowski (1972) who studied metaphors in politics did consider them as persuasive devices that politicians use so as to convince the public of the political claims they make. In this respect, he maintains "(...) to make

metaphor is also to make a political claim"(pp.108-109). That is to say, metaphors in political speeches are full of implications that are embedded in the metaphors used.

Similarly, Stone (1998) who was interested in metaphors and politics argues that metaphor is used in political communication in order to justify and legitimize political actions. According to Mio(1997) reviewed studies conducted on metaphors as persuasive devices in political communication can be classified into three classes: "First, metaphors can simplify and make understandable political events (...). Second, metaphors can resonate to underlying symbolic representations in its recipient (...). Third, metaphors can stir emotions or bridge the gap between logical and emotional (...) forms of persuasion".(p.9). Mio (1997) also identified what he called 'root metaphors' that are often used in political communication. He defined them as "those metaphors that provide a central theme to the text and speakers conscious of this theme constantly resonate it".

Obviously, most of the studies done on the use of metaphors in the realm of political arena have found out that there are recurrent 'root metaphors' that are frequently used in political speeches. The dominant 'political metaphors' according to Howe (1998) who investigated various 'political speeches' from 1980 to 1995 were 'sports', and 'warfare' metaphors. Another metaphor used in political speeches like that of Reagan's 1998 speech of presidential campaign was the 'heroic metaphor'. Ivie and Ritter (1989) who studied Donald Reagan's root metaphor of America as 'heroic' found out that he tended to describe the Soviet Union as the 'Evil Empire'.

In the same line of reasoning, an interesting article written by Brahim (2015) dealt with the metaphorical construction of the political enemy in the Islamist discourse of Mohamed Emara, an Egyptian Islamist thinker employing CDA and CMA approaches. In her article she found out that several metaphors in this discourse were identified. There are the 'Family metaphor', the 'Cancer metaphor', the 'Demon metaphor', the 'Slave metaphor', and the 'War metaphor'. All of these 'root' metaphors were said to be used by this Islamist so as to portray his liberal enemies in a negative way thus 'demonizing' them and incite the public to distrust them as potential political candidates.

Again, Bart (2012) studied 'the strategic use of metaphors by political and media elite in the 2007-11 Belgian constitutional crisis'. In this piece of research, the author identified four metaphors of 'Sports', 'Games', 'War', and 'Transport'. These metaphors were used by North-Belgian politicians and journalists in order to fulfil political and ideological ends such as 'expressing immobility', blaming, inciting people to unite, etc.

In brief, one interesting conclusion to draw from the above reviewed studies is the fact that ideological political discourse is metaphorical in nature. This is because, in such type of discourse metaphors serve to persuade, influence and manipulate the public. In the case of the 'politico-religious' discourse under study, a remaining question needs to be answered namely, to what extent is this drawn conclusion applicable to the discourse of the Hardline Islamist 'Ridha Belhadj'?

III. METHODOLOGY

1. Selection of Data

The main concern of this paper is to analyze the discourse of a Tunisian Hardline Islamist politician 'Ridha Belhadj' who intervened in a number of political TV talk-shows to talk about many issues. In his broadcast interventions, this Islamist politician could not talk about his political programs and future plans without referring back to his liberal and secular political opponents in Tunisia and in the Arab world. Indeed, his discourse about Tunisian and Arab liberals was an aggressive discourse whose main aspect was exercising a discursive and ideological power and dominance on his political enemies. Therefore in the analysis the focus is to be put on exploring the discursive resources of power employed by the politician to produce, reproduce and legitimize his radical discourse, and also on studying the role of metaphors chosen by him to negatively represent his liberal and secularist opponents. In sum, the present research paper aims at finding answers to the following questions:

- 1. In what way did metaphor contribute to negatively represent liberals and secularists in the TV talk show ?**
- 2. How influential are the thematic fields from which Ridha Belhadj derives his metaphors ?**
- 3. To what extent are such metaphorical representations influential politically and socially?**
- 4. How interesting was the role of CDA in sensitizing the audience of the importance of understanding the ideological messages communicated by the politicians through the metaphors used?**

The corpus of the present article is 5 extracts from Ridha Belhadj's political interventions in different political Televised shows in which he voiced his views about his liberal political opponents. These 5 excerpts were extracted from a selection of political TV talk-shows broadcast in different Tunisian channels as shown in the table below:

Talk show title	TV Channel	Websites
Attasia masa'a	Attounsiya TV	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gv1vFiJj-38
Thawrat Cha'ab	Hannibal TV	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PkIZtWWXl0M
Milaf Assa'a	Hannibal TV	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RtJAUrQ3tuo
Hiwar hawla Albadil	Aljanoubia TV	www.aljanoubiatv.com

The talk show extracts from which the data was selected are retrieved from YouTube (see table 1). Extracts broadcast on YouTube had different versions ranging from 5 minutes to 15 minutes although I had to watch the whole debates from which the episodes were extracted so as to understand the overall context in which the shows were broadcasted. The shows' extracts were in Arabic and they were given different titles as demonstrated in the table above. In the extracts under study the focus is on Ridha Belhadj who was invited as the spokesman of "Hizb Tahrir". This pan-Islamist party calls mainly for the establishment of 'the Islamic Kilafah' or the Islamic state which has to enforce the Islamic Chari'aa law. In the excerpts under study he was asked several questions among which to clarify for the audience his perspective of the mainstream secular spirit of the Tunisian political parties and his position of Tunisian Liberals and secularists.

The main focus of this paper is to identify the metaphors used by 'Ridha Belhadj' in the 5 extracts, analyse the linguistic devices from which these metaphors were expressed. These extracts were translated from Arabic into English, then analyzed in the light of CDA and CMA. Specifically, research interest was in analysing the discursive implications of power, dominance, bias, and ideology drawn from the metaphorical devices employed in the extracts. In so doing, the ideological structures and power relations were uncovered in the discourse of this Islamist politicians.

IV. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

As already mentioned, metaphors are not just poetic devices, but in reality they play an essential role in shaping our understanding of the world (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). Generally speaking, metaphors are strongly associated with the world of politics. This is confirmed by Thompson (1996) who claims that "Politics without metaphors is like a 'fish without water'". Furthermore, metaphors have been highly valorised by cognitive psychologists, linguists, and political scientists such as (Ditmer 1977; Miller 1979; Lakoff and Johnson, 1980) who believe that metaphors are symbolic discourse structures used to produce meaning, to manipulate the public or to simplify politics. In the following extracts, findings on metaphor analysis in political communication are to be tested in an attempt to come out with new findings specific to the Tunisian context.

The Metaphor of Alienation

In his broadcast interventions in different talk shows, Ridha Belhadj resorts to metaphorical expressions which revolve around the implications of psychological complex and a state of alienation while describing his liberal and secularist opponents. Broadly speaking, alienation which is described as a psychological disease is perceived in the collective awareness of people as a serious psychological illness whose infected subject is pathetic. Thus, he should be taken for an idiot in such a state. In the following extract, I will demonstrate how Ridha Belhadj use "alienation" in a metaphorically in order to maintain discursive power and hegemony over his liberal political opponents pushing the audience to undermine them.

Extract 1

" There is an obvious call for dictatorship that is terrible in a desperate discourse, an alienated discourse because it is suffering from psychological complexes alienation in this country, a bumptious discourse as if it were doing us a favour. 'Islamic awakening' does not wait for any favour from anybody (...) because it is already entrenched in this nation. The only natural existence is that of the Islamic awakening following both historical and political criteria (...). This is a truth. Therefore showing us as waiting for favours is something that we have accepted just because we thought of them as still younger." (Attasi'a masa'an, or 9 P.M talk show on Attounsiya TV, March, 15th 2012)

In this way, Ridha Belhadj portrays secularists as strangers to the nation implying that they do not naturally belong to it . This is confirmed by the expression "the natural existence is that of the Islamic awakening". This very expression presupposes that the Tunisian Muslim people have been deprived of true Islamic teaching under the liberal regimes. Therefore it is time for them to wake up and go back to their roots and it is his party that will awaken the nation. In his talk about his liberals and secularists, there is another metaphorical expression that supports his denigrating strategy is epitomized in the adjective " younger". As such, he portrays his components as not mature enough to be fought.

The Metaphor of Evil

One of the recurrent implications in Ridha Belhadj's discourse about his secularist opponents is that of misery or bile. Indeed, his speech is full of metaphorical terms which serve to persuade the audience that his opponents once elected as leaders of the country they will only bring unhappiness, misery and ignorance to the country. He has chosen to talk in a symbolic way so as to simplify his discourse to the public. This extract will be an evidence of the evil metaphor that he uses.

Extract 2

"If we are to determine what is natural and what is not, there is a natural plant and another one called 'a plant of distemper' [nabt nakad] this word is found in the standard Arabic. This plant is an enemy to Islamic faith. From a religious point of view, those people have a problem even with 'In the name of Allah the merciful' [Basmalah] (...) We have seen some of these people in the Constitutional Assembly who refused to say this phrase even in a formal way. There is a very keen ideological insistence on blasphemy in the real sense of blasphemy. They themselves admitted this fact. I'm not saying something different from what they have said. they are well known for that. There are people who have chosen to be ideologically different which is a scandal I mean." (Talk show Thawrat Cha'ab on Hannibal TV)

As shown in this extract, In the discourse of the Islamist Ridha Belhadj Secularists and Liberals are represented as the bitter enemies of Islam. The metaphorical expression of "the plant of Distemper" which is taken from the Qu'ran emphasizes the alienation metaphor and the idea that secularists are strangers and outsiders studied in the first extract . It also reinforces the theme of the bitterness of the secularists since the described plant is generally known as a plant that has no smell and its name in Arabic implies sadness misery and bitterness. Besides, he attributes another evil description to them which is blasphemy. The word blasphemy is used twice in his speech to refer to his secularist opponents. Indeed, Ridha Belhadj seems to be using hyperbole when he overtly accuses his opponents of blasphemy. This is especially true when he argues that his opponents refuse to do the " Basmalah" even in a formal way without offering real evidences or names. This manipulative discursive strategy serves to amplify the negative image of the secularist and make them seem as sinful people who are against Islam.

The Metaphor of Demon

By using phrases like "ideological scandal" "I feel shy to inform you in what way do secularists and communists view the woman, for them she is someone open and available to everybody", Ridha Belhadj adopts a demon metaphor to explicitly accuse communists of immorality. The theme of 'scandal' is a recurrent aspect of Ridha Belhadj's discourse. In fact, this predominant thematic structure is another illustration of the demonizing strategy he adopts to attack his political opponents. As such, he attributes all kinds of unfavourable descriptions to secularists so as to uncover what he assumes to be their secular ideological background. In here, even the theme of the social position of women is purposefully chosen as topic to deal with by 'Ridha Belhadj' because through it he can influence the citizens especially that the question of the of woman chastity in the Arab Muslim culture is of high sensitivity. Accordingly, portraying the liberals as violating this ethical principle and describing what they do as 'scandals' does in fact have manipulative ends whose aim is to exercise a discursive power over on his liberal opponents , thus dominating them.

Extract 3

" The Communist regime has negated itself, it had gone through a 70-year experience and then it came out with a scandal. This system used to criticize capitalism. Yet, it moved to speak on behalf of capitalism. This is an ideological and moral scandal .That is why, I did not respect it and I did not bother to talk about it. Shall I talk to you about the way in which this communist system views the women? I feel shy indeed to do so. She is someone shared and available to everybody."(Talk show "Thawrat Cha'ab or a People's Revolution on Hannibal TV, March, 29 2012).

In here, he describes communists as corrupt people whose ideology is about exploiting women sexually. He also describes them as failures, dishonest and liars since he argues that they used to criticise capitalism and then they speak on the behalf of it.

The Metaphor of War

The war metaphor is another feature of 'Ridha Belhadj's political discourse when he talks about his secularist political opponents. His ideological relationship with them seems to be based on clash and conflicts since he radically opposes their principles. This is why he tends to describe them as 'terrorists' implicitly urging the Tunisian people to fight them as they represent a symbolic threat to the Tunisian identity most importantly to

Islamic creed. For him, secularists' principles contracts with Islam. This idea is clearly expressed in the following extracts:

Extract 4

" To come and negate the most original principle of the nation [Khilafah] then you are exercising terrorism. Thus, the Secularist project in the Arab countries is a terrorist project because it has terrorised them culturally" (www.aljanoubiatv.com).

Extract 5

"Let me give one source of the sources of violence that is theorized for by the left. It is the theory of contradictions because for the leftists history works by these contradictions (...) they therefore encourage the rebellious violence so as history operates." (Talk show Milaf Assa" a or 'the Timely Folder' on Hannibal TV, December ,1st 2011)

Accordingly, by portraying secularists as terrorists, the speaker implicitly urges the people to fight them. Also, By representing 'Khilafah' and Secularism as opposite, Ridha Belhadj represents secularist as bringing a destructive project to the nation. A project that belongs to the west. This is not to forget that in the popular consciousness of the Muslim Arab community the west of symbolizes the Christian Crusades and so on. In addition, using abstract concepts such as "Theory of contradictions" is another manipulative strategy employed by Ridha Belhadj to manipulate and influence the audience so as to distort the image of secularists. Associating this concept with violence when describing his ideological opponents, the Islamist politician aims at frightening the people warning them of secularist whose main aim is to fight Muslim peaceful existence. Here, what is noteworthy is the fact that Ridha Belhadj's discourse about his political opponents lacks agents. Indeed, the actions attributed to the secularist have not known actors. His theoretical concepts are not well explained. This vagueness in negatively representing the political enemy is another discursive strategy used by Ridha Belhadj to persuade the audience with his ideas, manipulate them and especially to discredit and incriminate his ideological opponents.

V. THE CRUCIAL ROLE OF CONTEXT IN UNDERSTANDING METAPHOR

Metaphors in the discourse of Ridha Belhadj appear to reflect in the different extracts analysed different ways of describing relevant world views as they are parts of the readymade clichés that the Tunisian community and the Arabs in general use to categorize people. This fact clearly shows the crucial role of context in understanding the implications of metaphors as symbolic representations. In simpler terms, belonging to the same cultural context, audience come to grasp the intended meaning of the metaphor used by the participant who takes part in the TV talk show. In this respect, Edelman (1964: 124) claims metaphors which are used in political discourse serve to mobilize the public. That is why, their producers often purposefully use metaphors that echo the latent popular opinions. These metaphors become a kind of a symbolic coded speech. Repetition of these metaphors results in "dulling the critical faculties [of the audience] rather than awakening them"

Context is equally valorised by CDA practitioners. For them, metaphors are not mere 'parachuted' concepts added to the text for ornamental reasons but they cannot be understood outside their socio-cultural context. In this respect Van Dijk (1993 :9) argues that "metaphors in politics will function in a political context, for instance in the attack on political opponents, the presentation of policies or the legitimization of political power". Having listed the different 'conceptual metaphors' used by Ridha Belhadj in his discourse about his secularist opponents, we must identify the general as well as the specific cultural contexts n which his discourse take place. These contexts are as follows:

The Communicative Context: the space in which the discourse of Ridha Belhadj takes place is Television. Since 1960, television has become important in forming people's opinions and world views. This very fact makes Ridha Belhadj's discourse influential and in this context even dangerous when it comes to a manipulative and polarized discourse.

The Political Context: the political context of the present discourse is a post-revolution context whose main characteristic the state of chaos that applies to lay people and elites.

The Personal Context: the personal context stands for the personality of Ridha Belhadj , an Islamist politician known for his strict rejection of secularists and liberals and considers them as enemies of Islam and partisans of the west.

VI. METAPHOR AS A FORM OF FUNDAMENTALISM

In addition to polarization, Ridha Belhadj 's discourse is loaded with strategies of radicalization that are purposefully used to publicly amplify the threat that his liberal opponents represent. That way, he exercises an ethical power on the Tunisian people inciting them to fight those secularists implicitly representing this 'fight' it as their religious duty. This very tendency reveals the strong tie between fundamentalist discourse, polarization and violence..

In such a fundamentalist discourse, metaphors have played a huge role in expressing this Islamist's view of secularists and liberals, his political opponents. Metaphors have been also a mirror through which audience get informed about politics in a simpler and more manipulative way. In the analysed extracts many metaphorical expressions drawn from the theme of alienation, war ,terrorism, violence and blasphemy are used in the discourse of Ridha Belhadj have a deep influence on the Tunisian people. This is because the thematic source domains from which this Islamist draws his metaphors are deeply rooted in the Tunisian Arabic and Islamic culture.

VII. CONCLUSION

To sum up, Ridha Belhadj's discourse is a manipulative discourse that is based on polarization. As such, his liberal political opponents are discursively represented as being wicked politicians who are working for Western agendas, while Islamists are described as the only patriots, holders of truth and true Muslims. Also, this Hardline Islamist intends to portray Islamists as innocent people who are resisting the violence and terrorism caused by the evil and corrupt secularists. This polarized representation is epitomized in the metaphorical expressions that he resorts to wherever he refers to secularists. These findings do confirm Harb's (2010) perception of Islamic fundamental discourse. According to him, this type of discourse is characterized mainly by 'dogmatism' and 'superiority'. These two discursive features are obviously felt in the metaphorical language of Ridha Belhadj while talking about his secularist and liberal political opponents. These research results do also support CDA's social view of language. That is to say, language for critical discourse analysts is not merely a tool of communication, but it is a 'social practice' through which people exercise power and dominance within their ideological discourse.

REFERENCES

- [1]. H Ahmed, H Stuart. The Canter of Social Cohesion [Clouth House, London 2009]. Hizb UT-Tahrir: Ideology and Strategy
- [2]. De Saussure, F. (1967) Cours de Linguistique Générale. Paris: Grande Bibliothèque Payot.
- [3]. Whorf, B. (1956) Language, Thought and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf. Cambridge, Ma: MIT Press.
- [4]. Fairclough, N. (1989) Language and Power. London: Longman.
- [5]. Fairclough, N (1995) Critical Discourse Analysis: the critical study of Language. Essex: Longman
- [6]. 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.
- [8]. 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. NewYork: Routledge.
- [9]. Li,W. (2016) Rethinking Critical Metaphor Analysis: International Journal of Education and Research.College of International Studies, Southwest University, Chongqing, China.
- [10]. Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980) Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- [11]. Bart,C.(2007).The Strategic Use of Metaphors by Political and Media Elite : the 2007-11 Belgian Constitutional Crisis. LSE Research Online. International Journal of Media and Politics.
- [12]. Mio,S.J (1997).Metaphors and Politics,California State Polytechnic University,Panoma.
- [13]. Brahim,H. (2015) The Metaphorical Construction of the Political Enemy in the Islamist
- [14]. Discourse: International Journal of Education and Research Vol. 3 No. 11 November
- [15]. Charteris-Black, J. (2005) Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor. Hampshire : Palgrave Macmillan.
- [17]. Harb, A. (2010) Almassaleh wa Almass'er. Algiers: Editions El-Ikhtilef. (in Arabic).
- [18]. Youtube, selection of debates: Retrieved on May, 2013 from
- [19]. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XWlaHrM0408>