The Framing of the Arab-Israeli Conflict in the Writing of Thomas Friedman: A Conceptual Metaphor Analysis

[1]Reem Elguindy, [2]Abeer M. Refky M. Seddeek and [3]Jeff Wallace

[1,2]Arab Academy for Science, Technology and Maritime Transport, Egypt

[3] Cardiffmet University Cardiff, wales, UK

E-Mail: reemelguindy@aast.edu; dr.abeer.refky@aast.edu; jwallace@cardiffmet.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

This study presents a conceptual metaphor analysis of the Arab Israeli conflict in the discourse of the journalist Thomas Freidman during the time period of 2001 till 2010. Drawing on Conceptual Metaphor Analysis and Frame analysis, this study focuses on the rendering of the metaphors used to depict the conflict in Thomas Friedman's discourse. Following an eclectic approach, the analytical framework incorporates Lakoff and Johnson's cognitive Conceptual Metaphor theory (1980) and the Critical metaphor Analysis theory developed by Charteris-Black (2004). Frame Analysis theory (Entman 1993) is also applied to provide a more comprehensive picture of the data. This study argues that the use of conceptual metaphors would help in shedding light on the ideological and political leanings of the writer. The main aim was to find the conceptual metaphors that the writer used in his discourse and to form a comprehensive picture about the ideological and political orientations of this discourse through these findings in the period from 2001-2010. The analysis concludes that the representation of the conflict and the entities involved in it in Freidman's discourse utilized the Clash of Civilizations paradigm as developed by Samuel Huntington (1997) as a main frame to present the conflict as part of the War on Terror that was taking place at the time. Findings also showed the writer's perspective to be leaning towards the positive rendering of the Western side of the conflict including Israel to the disadvantage of the Arab side.

Keywords: *Clash of Civilizations, East, metaphors, walls, war on terror, West*

1. INTRODUCTION

The Arab Israeli conflict is one of the most controversial and intractable conflicts in the Middle East. It started roughly in the middle of the 20th century and is still ongoing till the present time. As the region is a hotbed of conflicts, wars and political struggles reflect on international events, it is, thus, not surprising that international media has taken to cover the events and the development of the conflict as a constant part of its coverage of the Middle East and its political issues. However, the scrutiny to which the international media coverage of the conflict was subjected, has led to much controversy. Both factions of the conflict, that is Arabs and Israelis, claim to be the receiver of biased coverage and prejudiced treatment by the media. It is the aim of this work to study the representation of the conflict by one of the major American political media writers namely, Thomas Friedman, through analysing the conceptual metaphors and the framing used in his discourse.

Thomas Friedman was accused of being pro-Israeli by many critics including the Fairness and Accuracy in Reporting Organization (FAIR) which claimed that he approved of Israel's attacks on both Gaza and Lebanon in 2004 and 2006. In 2004 Noam Chomsky openly accused him of endorsing Israel's violence towards Palestinians and of being a racist (Chomsky 1986). On the other hand, other notable political analysts accused him of being a self-hating Jew and of hating Israel and Israelis (Rubin 2011).

A. Theoretical Background

1. Conceptual Metaphors

Metaphor in cognitive Linguistics is no longer considered as the decorative rhetorical tool that it was regarded as in the past, instead it is now considered as part of the processes of human thinking and understanding.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) proposed their Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) which explained and outlined the approach to metaphor as an important constituent of thought processing in human minds. The main tenet of Lakoff and Johnson's Conceptual Metaphor Theory is that metaphors are not mere tropes that are used for decorative purposes in written texts. On the contrary, metaphors form a basic part of our conceptual system, as humans, and are thus not only present in the words we choose but also in our understanding and structuring of the concepts they are used to represent. Lakoff and Johnson described metaphors in terms of mapping between two different conceptual domains. The basis for the mapping process originates from embodied experiences that are organized in the minds of individuals who employ or receive the metaphors. According to the theory, we are said to understand one concept (the more abstract) in terms of another more concrete one. The theory is in fact a cognitive theory of metaphor, one that endeavoured to integrate metaphors into the cognitive and conceptual realms (Lakoff and Johnson 1980).

Lakoff (2010) highlighted the fact that Metaphors are not only relevant as tools to analyse the conceptual basics that are at work in language and thought but also in exploring the ideological systems of beliefs underlying their usage and understanding in a particular language (Lakoff 2010). Since using metaphors is not a requirement in any given situation, therefore, the fact that a speaker or writer chooses to express themselves via a certain metaphor should reflect the ideological beliefs behind their choice (Charteris-Black 2004). Charteris-Black argued for the inclusion of conceptual metaphors in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) on the basis that CDA is concerned with text evaluation and that metaphor forms a main part of the ideology behind any given text (Charteris-Black 2001). Charteris-Black also underlines the significance of metaphor in interpreting the intentions of writers and thus it helps in the process of identifying the underlying ideologies (Charteris-Black 2001).

Metaphor's pragmatic dimension came into play when Charteris-black (2004) introduced his Critical Metaphor Analysis (CMA) approach in which he included the pragmatic aspect of metaphor as an indicator of the ideological and rhetorical foundations on which metaphors are based in a discourse. Charteris –Black outlined a method which rendered the Conceptual Metaphor Theory more accessible and easier to apply on selected texts. The method devised by him is a three-step plan which comprises first the Identification stage, in which the analyst extracts metaphorical expressions from a given text depending on linguistic, pragmatic and cognitive criteria. Next, is the interpretation stage in which the analyst identifies the conceptual metaphors that may exist behind each group of related metaphorical expressions. The third stage is the explanation stage, in which the analyst tries to decipher the ideological and rhetorical underpinnings that prompted the use of such conceptual metaphors (Charteris-black 2004). A conceptual metaphor, as Charteris- Black (2001) explains is an idea that is concealed in a figure of speech which can be discerned from metaphorical expressions. A conceptual key, a term which Charteris-Black (2001) created, could be arrived at when several conceptual metaphors are thought to be somehow related to the description of the same or similar items. Simply put, according to Charteris-Black, a conceptual key is to conceptual metaphors what a conceptual metaphor is to simple metaphorical linguistic expressions.

2. **Frame Analysis**

Frames, according to Gamson (1989), are the organizing means by which individuals try to understand and analyse events around them. Lakoff (2003) sees frames as an actual material presence in our neural circuitry which guide the way we think of issues, and which allow us to decide on what to include and exclude in our understanding of the world. Entman (1993) envisages frames as methods to encourage the understanding of certain problems or situations in a pre-determined light. They provide receivers with a certain causal and moral understanding of the situation or problem addressed and they often present a favoured answer or solution to it. Entman (1993) explains that a frame usually gives prominence to certain features and downplays others, in order to promote the desired understanding of a topic or problem. Accordingly, a frame provides a definition for the problem and presents its causes, it also passes ethical evaluations of it and ultimately it may also supply methods of repairing or redressing it. A frame may perform all of these operations or some of them depending on the aims of the text producer (Entman 1993).

An actual case in point to exemplify framing theory is the conspiracy frame that was adopted by Egyptian official media after the Arab spring and the Egyptian revolution in 2011. The frame dominated the media as well as the official modus operandi, that is to say, all major international events, be it national or international, were officially interpreted in the light of the international conspiracy against Egypt. The source of any problem was usually identified as the West in general and the United States and Israel, in particular. Moral judgments were passed about the West (the corrupting Other) and some remedies, or

no remedies were proposed according to the situation that the frame was addressing. The conspiracy frame was presented as a cause for various issues ranging from corruption, bombing incidents inside and outside the country, the presence of oppositional views inside Egypt and eventually it was presented as 'the conspiracy' behind the Egyptian revolution itself.

In the present study, we are interested in conceptual metaphors as they bear direct relations to the theoretical underpinnings of the study. Lines of reasoning and causal connections may emerge as an overall guiding element for the organization of metaphors and frames. Such devices combined help in providing analysts and readers with an overall understanding of the text and a recognition of the proposed line of thinking and hence of the framing suggested by the writer.

2. Rationale and Research Questions

The main focus of this investigation is to explore the representations of the Arab Israeli conflict in the discourse of Thomas Friedman through investigating the conceptual metaphors that he used. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:156) claim that the use of metaphors "[c]onstituted a license for policy change and political and economic action" that took place in the energy crises of the 70's through the use of the conceptual metaphor THE SEARCH FOR ENERGY IS WAR. This was the starting point for this analysis, in other words how these conceptual metaphors when consciously used continuously can indeed shape, change and affect policies and actions whether positively or negatively. Thus, Conceptual metaphor theory presented a tool for exploring and interpreting the metaphors used in Thomas Friedman's discourse. As such, the research is a step on the way for explaining the power of the media and the language it uses in building a narrative that can persuade the public to accept, support or oppose certain status quos. The research aims intend to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the conceptual metaphors used in depicting the Arab Israeli conflict in the period from 2001-2010?
2. How do these conceptual metaphors frame the Arab Israeli conflict in the writer's discourse?

3. Literature Review

Several research studies attempted to analyse the conceptual metaphors surrounding the intractable Arab Israeli conflict. Most of these studies aimed at detecting and measuring the amount of bias that may be present in the media on both sides of the conflict. Of special importance to this conflict was the American media because of the direct American involvement in the conflict. Indeed, the Arab Israeli conflict is believed to be the most attentively followed foreign political conflict by American audience (Pew Research Centre 2002).

Metaphors play an important role in revealing the ideological bearings of journalistic writing. Khairallah (2017) analysed the use of metaphors in the creation of mental frames for hijab and hijab wearing women in British press discourse. The study focuses on the relevance that should be attributed to conceptual metaphors in social multidisciplinary analysis and the interpretation of cultural phenomena as represented in press discourse using such metaphors. Metaphors depicting the negative framing of Hijab and Hijabies were found in the analysis tending to view hijab as a symbol of submission, ignorance, oppression, indiscipline and othering.

Kort (2019) tackled the metaphorical representation of Arabs and Americans in the American newspaper 'The New York Times' versus the Arab newspapers Al-Jazeera English' and 'Arab news'. The study used Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff and Johnson 1980) and Critical Metaphor Analysis (Charteris-Black 2004) as its main theoretical frames of analysis. The researcher found that metaphors in the American newspaper aim at representing Americans as an exceptional and ideal nation while metaphors associated with Arabs associated them with danger, violence and threat. In the Arab newspapers the image of American exceptionalism is reproduced while metaphors depicting Arabs linked them to passivity and powerlessness. The writer concluded that in both cases ideology plays a major role in motivating the use of conceptual metaphors.

Presidential speeches and the conceptual metaphors used therein took an important place in political discourse analysis. Linkeviciute (2018) took an interest in analysing the conceptual metaphors used by President Donald trump in his speeches. The metaphors revealed Trump's belief that he will 'Make America great again' and the representation of his opponents from the Democratic party as enemies of the state. Trump's discourse contained the well-known conceptual metaphors of POLITICS IS WAR, POLITICS IS A JOURNEY AND POLITICS IS A RACE in order to achieve the desired effects.

Wolfsfeld (1997; 2001) analyses the recurrent frames used by media in depicting political conflicts. His research concludes that the framing techniques of the media fell under two major frames, either a 'law and order' frame or an 'injustice and defiance' one. In the 'injustice' frame the issue being discussed is

framed as an unfair practice that is directed against certain victims while the opposing authorities often adopt a 'law and order' frame which springs from their responsibility to maintain collective order and stability in society.

Mussolf (2007) provides a good example of what conceptual metaphors are capable of in political discourse and in real life political events. He explores the conceptual metaphors used by Adolf Hitler in his autobiography 'Mein Kompf'. The study focuses on the conceptual metaphor in which Jews were conceptualized as parasites that have infected the German nation which was, in turn, conceptualized as a human body inflicted by diseases. The study gives readers a glimpse of the way Nazi propaganda employed conceptual metaphors as a basis for the genocide that followed by postulating that Jews were an illness from which the Germans had to be cured. Mussolf (2015) also probes into the metaphors used inside the British debates about foreign immigrants. The study compares the metaphors used in blogs to those used in newspapers and finds that both can be subsumed in four general categories one of which included dehumanizing metaphors which referred to immigrants as 'Parasites, leeches or bloodsuckers' (2015: 41).

Ferrari (2007) attempts the analysis of Bush's speeches in the crucial period from (2001– 4). The investigation focuses on the role that conceptual metaphors played in laying the needed ideological grounds for persuading the public of the necessity of the war on Iraq. The study identifies a Manichean streak in Bush's discourse which tended to idealize the American character against the character of the terrorists. The main objective in this study was the investigation of conceptual metaphors that had a 'persuasive potential' (2007:612) in the discourse of George W. Bush.

The concept of A STATE IS A PERSON is pronounced as a very important as well as a very commonplace metaphor in politics by Lakoff (1991). In this metaphor, countries or states are visualized as persons living together in the world community. The geographical location of the country is its home and the countries lying on its borders constitute the neighbourhood in which it lives. Consequently, a country can be good or bad and it can live in a good or a bad neighbourhood and is capable of good or bad actions in addition to having an 'Inherent disposition: they can be peaceful or aggressive' (1991: 26). According to Lakoff industrial development is a sign of maturity and thus third world countries, being under-developed, are considered as immature children who need guidance and direction.

This also has bearings on the family metaphor as introduced by Lakoff (2013) in which the developed or mature state appear as a father figure which could be nurturing and guiding to the errant children or the immature states or could also be strict and punishing towards these underdeveloped states or immature children.

4.Methodology and Discussion

The corpus for this study is made up of columns that Thomas Friedman wrote twice a week, or sometimes more, in the New York Times newspaper in the period from September 2001 till December 2010 (198266 words). The criteria for article selection were based on selecting articles discussing topics closely related to the research themes. In addition, the abundance of metaphors that seemed promising for the line of research was another point that was taken into consideration. Both Qualitative and quantitative methods are used for identifying conceptual metaphors, employing both CMA and CMT with more focus on the qualitative side.

The analysis of conceptual metaphors uses CMT (Lakoff and Johnson 1980) following CMA; the method outlined by Charteris-Black (2001) in applying it. The analyst looks for conceptual metaphors that depict the Arab Israeli conflict and the entities engaged in. it. This involved the search for the words "America, United States, Americans, the Arab World, Arabs, Palestine, Palestinians, Hamas, Israel and Israelis" in the corpus and checking their usage and context of use to identify the conceptual metaphors being utilized. Metaphors are identified using Charteris-Black (2004) criteria for identifying metaphors which comprises linguistic, pragmatic and cognitive criteria for identifying lexical items that may indicate the presence of linguistic metaphors. The next step was the grouping of similar conceptual metaphors found in the corpus under headings which resulted in finding three main conceptual keys:

- CONCEPTS ARE BUILDINGS and CIVILIZATION IS ORDER
- CONCEPTS ARE BUILDINGS
- CIVILIZATION IS ORDER

In the conceptual key CIVILIZATION IS ORDER, for example, the words 'civilization' and 'order' were located in the articles and the criteria for metaphor analysis (Charteris-Black 2010) were applied to discern whether or not they could be considered as conceptual metaphors. When a conceptual metaphor was found it was not counted as one unless other instances of its usage abounded in the corpus.

All conceptual keys and conceptual metaphors were presented in upper case form in the analysis as per

Lakoff and Johnson's method (1980). According to Charteris-Black conceptual keys are conceptual metaphors under which other conceptual metaphors can be grouped. Many conceptual metaphors were found under these three keys as will be detailed later in the discussion chapter. Upon the discovery of these metaphorical keys other words were added to the set of words to be researched, these words were "civilization, wall, order, East and West".

5.   ANALYSIS

A.   Frame Analysis of Data

The main frame that could be recognized in Friedman's discourse in the period from 2001 till 2010 is the 'Clash of Civilizations' frame. The phrase was originally coined by Bernard Lewis in his article 'The Roots of Muslim rage' (1990) and was later taken up by Samuel Huntington (1997) who maintained that future international military strife will be between the West/Occident and the East/ Orient's cultures and civilizations and not between warring nation states. In this view, Huntington (1997) professedd that the world needed a new paradigm and map to provide order and justification for new developments and events after the end of the Cold War era. His premise rests on the notion that Western values and beliefs stand in contrast to Eastern values and beliefs and thus as these two come in contact, they are bound to conflict with each other. Huntington uses a key phrase in his paradigm, 'The West and the rest' which was originally coined by the Singaporean diplomat Kishore Mahbubani in his article bearing the same title (1992). The phrase effectively sums up the stance that Huntington's discourse takes. The West is pictured as an embodiment of all the commendable and desirable humane values like freedom, democracy and individualism which, for Huntington, run opposite to basic Eastern values and this is where a major part of the conflict is bound to be exhibited.

This paradigm gained more recognition and acclaim directly after the terror attacks of 9/11 with readers accepting it as the only plausible explanation for such a horrendous violence (Seib 2005). As for the media and other specialists on the political scene, it came as a welcome excuse to explain the problems between the East and the West without referring to the current sensitive political problems (Abrahamian 2003). In the present analysis, we propose that the paradigm provided one way of including the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in it, with the added benefit of avoiding the discussion of real-time politics among the key players in the conflict. In other words, it allowed Western media, embodied in the discourse of Thomas Friedman in this analysis, to discuss the Israeli Arab conflict within a general frame of the clash of Civilizations without having to discuss the actual political issues of occupation and resistance. Even though Thomas Friedman professed to disagree with Huntington's thesis on the basis that the clash of civilisations paradigm misjudged the effects of globalization, of which he was a major endorser, and the growing networks of interconnections between nation states (Friedman 1989), however, upon delving deeply in Friedman's discourse, after the 9/11 attacks, evidence to the contrary can be found.

Our main claim in the current analysis is that Thomas Friedman used the clash of civilization in his discourse to justify the ensuing clash between the East and the West. However, the main parties that were involved in this conflict, according to this framing, were not limited to the Americans/the West against the terrorists/the East as proposed in the clash of civilizations paradigm. That is, in Friedman's discourse, these entities expanded to include Israel on the side of America and the West on the one hand and Arab, Muslim countries and particularly Palestine on the side of the terrorists on the other hand. In this frame two enemies were designated

> With on one side arrayed the forces of civilization, rule of law, freedom, democratic values, prosperity, security, way of life, human dignity, tolerance and even open economics; on the other side is the enemy which encompassed; Terror, fear, violence, fascism and the destroyers of civilization (Reese 2010: 43).

Associating individuals, parties, groups or countries with either side of the clash would result in these associated entities being included in the frame with all the related attributes attached to such a polarized inclusion applied to them. The war on terror, within the context of the clash of civilizations thesis, came, in this context, as a natural and almost expected culmination that ensued because of the strife between the two different civilizations which eventually lead to a heady but expected clash in 9/11. To this end, several conceptual metaphors were used by Thomas Friedman to establish this frame in his discourse. Within this frame, the United States stood for the civilized world values, indeed the White House's statement in 2003 stated that the September 11th attacks were "[a]gainst the United states and its allies, and against the very idea of civilized society". The word 'allies' in this context is very significant; it is not only America which was and still is, at the time, targeted but it is all those who stand close to and are affiliated with it. In addition, per the previous statement, America stands for the very idea of civilization and if Israel is included in that category as an ally, or an equal or even a country in the same situation and facing the same enemy, as was

implied in the writer's discourse, then it will become identified with all the concomitant values stated above on the side of America. Accordingly, in Friedman's discourse, Israel became the symbol that stood for the West in the East and thus became associated with Western values like freedom, individuality, free market, progress and enlightenment while Palestinians and Arabs became symbols for Eastern values which in this paradigm ran opposite to all those coveted Western values as will be seen in detail in the analysis. The attribute 'civilized' is a key word here since it is often repeated in Friedman's discourse, and it brings in connotations of a clash between the civilized world and the uncivilized one or to use Friedman's words 'the world of order Vs the world of disorder'. In this frame of events, the retaliation against the terrorists that became expected and accepted from America post 9/11, will also be treated with the same amount of expectation and acceptance when executed by Israel towards the Palestinians if the latter party became affiliated or equated with that of the terrorists and the uncivilized world. In other words, connecting Palestine and the Arab countries to the other side will conjoin them with the terrorists' camp with all its characteristics and with no rights granted to them and with the retaliation against them, which is a fit punishment for terrorists, foreseen and approved of.

Entman (1993) describes a frame's main function as to provide a definition for the issue or event, cause(s), moral or ethical evaluation and a proposed solution. A frame in this definition does not necessarily have to provide all four components, it may provide any of them as befits the discourse it is being employed in. This analysis locates the main constituents of a frame in Friedman's discourse. The problem encountered during the time span of the study was the 9/11 terror attacks on the United States. The frame we are proposing is the 'Clash of Civilizations' frame and our claim is that Friedman used it to frame both the 'war on terror' and consequently the Israeli-Palestinian conflict which was also framed as part of the clash of civilizations and thus as an extension of the war on terror.

B.   Conceptual Metaphor Analysis

A close scrutiny of the data revealed several conceptual metaphors that were used in the discourse, major among which are the two conceptual keys CONCEPTS ARE BUILDINGS and CIVILIZATION IS ORDER. The metaphors are called up in the corpus, by the ongoing use of metaphorical lexical items like 'walls' and 'barriers' in the case of the first conceptual key and 'order' and 'dis-order' in the case of the second. These lexical items are sometimes used as verbs or

nouns which according to Charteris-Black (2004) should be set down as different instances of the same conceptual metaphors. These metaphors appear to be tying the narrative of the whole discourse throughout the period of the study. Our main claim is that the writer is trying to frame his discourse within the 'Clash of Civilization' frame, in other words he is presenting the world through the polarized prism of 'us' and 'them' or 'the West' versus 'the East'. These two conceptual keys fit this general frame for two reasons; First, both were used throughout the ten years assigned for the study and not during a confined duration of that time, as will be shown in fig 1 (Pp 20). Second, they fit in with the general purpose of the framing of the discourse, which is to divide the world into two camps set against each other; the West and the East. Thus, these metaphors seemed fitting for the overall macrostructure of the discourse as a whole.

Under the conceptual key CONCEPTS ARE BUILDINGS we have several other conceptual metaphors that serve to institute the view that civilization is a barrier or a wall separating the civilized world from the uncivilized one. The conceptual metaphors used for this purpose are,

- CIVILIZATION IS A WALL PROTECTING WEST FROM EAST,
- CIVILIZATION IS A MENTAL WALL SEPARATING WEST FROM EAST
- CIVILIZATION IS A WALL SEPARATING WEST FROM EAST.
-

Often enough this separating wall structure, in Friedman's discourse, came to describe the division between the Middle East Muslim communities and the West and in some other instances the division was meant to be between Israelis and Palestinians.

The conceptual metaphor CIVILIZATION IS A WALL PROTECTING WEST FROM EAST visualised the East as a source of danger and threat from which the West should strive to protect itself by building a mental wall. So, in (2002) the writer tells readers that without a wall, which is 'Clearly defining our side and the enemy's, all sorts of lines are being crossed' (Let Them Come to Berlin 2002). The phrasing of the sentence makes the idea of having a wall to protect 'ourselves', appears to be a must, without which all kinds of danger and threats could be expected to come to 'us'. The use of the possessive 'our' and the pronoun 'us' allows for a sense of closeness with the reader and is clearly directed at the writer's American readership. It shows that the interests of the writer are aligned with those of the readers in separating the source of troubles and in achieving protection and safety.

Employing the same metaphor, the writer harkens back to the past and compares the current political situation with that during the cold war in which the

West had to build a 'wall of containment' against the Soviet Union in 'As dangerous as the Soviet Union was, it was always deterrable with a wall of containment and with nukes of our own' (A War of Ideas, Part 1 2004). He comes up with the result that the Soviet Union was 'more deterrable' than the current threat that the West is facing. The choice of 'more deterrable' conveys the message that the threat coming from the East is indeed grave and cannot be easily stopped. The writer asks readers a question to which he also supplies the answer 'How do we insulate ourselves from the madness of the Middle East? ... build a virtual wall' (The Energy Wall 2006). The proposition is built around the supposition that the reader has asked how we are going to insulate or protect ourselves against the Middle East and its people to which the writer provided the answer; 'build a virtual wall'.

Friedman next sums up the situation and how the West is genuinely feeling about the East and how the 'Western masses will deal with it.

> Because Western masses don't buy it. They see violence exploding from Muslim communities and they find it frightening, and they don't think their leaders are talking honestly about it so many now just want **to build a wall against Islam** (Islam and the Pope 2006).

The protecting wall mentioned in this article is built against 'Islam' and 'Muslim communities', that is, the Arab Muslim East, and is built to protect against the violence emanating from these places. Violence is pictured as 'exploding' which reflects an image of a vast and continuous amount of violence and of a frightened and confused 'Western masses'.

The writer further admits that 'Yes, in the wake of 9/11, we need new precautions, new barriers' (9/11 is Over 2007). Bearing in mind the ethnicity of the perpetrators of 9/11 to which he refers, it is an easy task to guess whom these barriers will be built against. Thus, the metaphor has created a wall that has to be built to protect the West from the East.

The next conceptual metaphor to be found in the corpus, under the same conceptual key, is CIVILIZATION IS A MENTAL WALL SEPARATING WEST FROM EAST. In this metaphor, the wall is envisaged more specifically as a mental rather than physical barrier between the East and the West, which hinders the former from catching up with the world of development and progress, that is, to the West. The writer recounts that he first encountered this wall in 2001 when he visited Israel and he noticed that people in Israel are

> So people in Israel are just **building a wall or** carrying one around in their heads -- partitioning

themselves wherever they can. Israelis wall themselves into their homes, and wall the Palestinians off their roads (Foreign Affairs; Walls 2001)

It is not clear whether Arabs living in Israel are still included in the category of 'people in Israel' or not, but the remainder of the article describes the suffering of the Israelis inside their homes because of the Palestinian suicide bombers. So, it would be safe to say that the people needing the protection of the mental walls in this context are the Israelis. The carrying of the wall in one's head signal's the need for complete separation from the surroundings and this could be also a reference to both parties partitioning themselves away from each other. The author further explicates what he means by such a wall and that,

> Well, there is another wall in the world today. It's not on the ground -- it's in people's heads -- and it divides America from the Arab-Muslim world (Wall of Ideas 2002)

The wall is not only separating Israelis and Palestinians, as in the first example, but it is also separating Americans from the entire Arab-Muslim world. Again, it is not clear whether the walls are built by both sides or by only one side, what is clear though is that there is a mental wall being drawn between the Arab Muslim world (including the Palestinians) and the Western world symbolized by America and Israel.

Next, the author informs readers that there are different walls that exist in the Arab World,

> There are still other walls holding back the explosion of freedom in the East -- much harder walls -- that will also have to fall. The first is the wall in the Arab mind (The Sand Wall 2003).

The wall discussed in this article is holding 'the Arab East' from the values that are inherent to the West, like freedom, and this time the author specifies that this wall exists inside the Arab mind. It is stopping the Arab East from moving on and gaining its freedom and catching on with the civilization and development it has been holding back from. The writer stipulates that for Arabs to gain freedom and other such coveted progressive qualities the walls will have to fall, even though he acknowledges the difficulty of such a prospect. The use of the expression the 'Arab mind' implies that this mind has quite a different construction from other human minds and specifically from the Western mind, which stresses the notion of polarization and difference between the two cultures.

The third conceptual metaphor is CIVILIZATION IS A WALL SEPARATING WEST FROM EAST. This metaphor

secures the comprehension of the concepts behind the two previous ones, the wall is in effect a symbol of the separation and segregation between the East and the West. The writer informs readers that for such a wall or walls to fall, it requires a lot of effort on both sides of such walls. In his columns, he describes the current political and social status of the Arab world as unstable and that it possesses a different and much weaker notion of state than the West does,

> There is still, throughout the Arab world, a very weak notion of statehood and citizenship. And there are still very few civil society institutions outside the mosque, and little historical experience with a free press, free markets or real parliamentary democracy to build upon when the walls fall (When Camels Fly 2005).

Thus, he is envisaging a time when the walls that are separating the Arab world from the list of Western values he mentioned, will fall down but he wonders what foundations will be there to build upon anew. The phrase contains the supposition that indeed the Arab world does lack all these values and it will be difficult to develop them once the walls are demolished. The descriptive evaluation he provides of the Arab world is indicative of the feebleness of the Arab world as pictured in the quotation above.

The writer frames up the metaphor in terms of the Israeli Palestinian context by warning the conflicting parties involved (Israelis and Arabs) in addition to the Western parties engaged in the peace process, that if no progress is achieved in the peace process between them,

> Either we now go all the way toward peace and demand that every party step up to it -- Palestinians, Israelis and Arabs -- or they will keep going all the way the other way, blowing out one civilizational barrier after another until their war touches us (George W. Sadat 2002).

"Us" in this context is a reference to America and is directed at the American readership of the NYT and it implies that the conflict will have world-wide consequences if not resolved. It is also a reference to the fact that the conflict and the peace process are directly involved in the civilization clash since their failure to resolve will cause civilizational barriers to be broken. The message is as much for the Arabs and Israelis as to the American administration in that they have to 'Demand that every party step up to it' otherwise danger can be heading closer than they wish it to. The usage of' 'demand' carries with it the implication that the American administration is in a higher position to that of either of the warring factions which enables it to demand and requires them to 'step up' their actions.

There is an implied difference, in the view of the writer, between, on the one hand, blowing out the walls which entails violence, war and chaos and, on the other, the premeditated act of putting down a wall by willing parties on both sides. The former will be achieved through a full-blown war that will destroy civilization itself, while the latter requires the agreement and effort of both parties and this is what the writer means by 'When the walls fall' (When Camels Fly 2005) or 'Much harder walls have to fall' (The Sand Wall 2003) in the previous quotations, that is, before the Arab world becomes as developed and tolerant as the West wants it to be. Accordingly, he pictures the fundamentalists and terrorists as being not in favour of the peaceful felling of such walls, since they are usually out for the purification of their creed and the return to the old times, and they regard Western civilization as an alien impure one. Thus, in

> Al Qaeda said all the walls have been blown away in the world, thereby threatening our Islamic culture and religious norms (Origin of Species 2004).

The terrorist group is personified as saying that, according to them, all the barriers and walls separating civilizations have been 'blown away', to demonstrate that this was not done by agreement but was done by force, and they see it as a form of threat to their Islamic culture and beliefs. The blowing of the walls is a reference to globalization and the growing networking all around the world that they perceive as a threat.

To sum up the situation the writer says that if Muslims did not reform their ancient ways and adopt new and more progressive concepts,

> Without a real war of ideas within Islam to sort that out — a war that progressives win I fear we are drifting at best toward a wall between civilizations and at worst toward a real clash (Islam and the Pope 2006).

The two options he offers are either a complete separation, a wall, between the civilizations or a clash and most probably a war between them. The wall option is presented as the better option when compared to a full clash and confrontation. The mention of Islam and Muslims is in general, and not of a specific country or group, but is an overgeneralization of all Muslim countries. The tone is also condescending because the whole sentence reads like an ultimatum delivered to the Arab Muslim nations.

The second major conceptual key used to establish the 'clash of civilizations' frame is CIVILIZATION IS ORDER under which there are two conceptual metaphors;
-THE WEST IS THE WORLD OF ORDER.
-THE EAST IS THE WORLD OF DISORDER.

The conceptual key CIVILIZATION IS ORDER reveals a pattern that draws a picture of the world as divided into two regions one representing order and the other representing disorder. The world of Order stands for a world that values freedom, democracy and the Western society's values, in short, it stands for Western civilization while the world of dis-order stands for all other systems that run contrary to this. This division, as the writer has it, started after 9/11 pending the disastrous confrontation between the West and the Arab world in the form of the terror attacks. The world in this vision was divided into 'the world of order' and 'the forces of order' against the 'world of disorder' and 'the forces of disorder'. The claim we are making here is that we have two conceptual metaphors under this conceptual key, the first of which is THE WEST IS THE WORLD OF ORDER. Through this metaphor the writer constructed the West as the epitome of civilization, 'order', freedom and all such associated values. In addition, he also designated it as the keeper of such values all over the world and specifically over 'the world of disorder'. To this end, he positioned America as the leader of that Western world, pointing out that the world 'Is increasingly divided between the ''World of Order'' -- anchored by America... and the ''World of Disorder.''(Vote France off the Island 2003). As such America is pitted as the symbol and 'anchor' for the world of order and civilization in a confrontation against the other world that lacks all these values. It is important to note that the choice of the designation 'world' points out to the chasm that exists between the East and the West to the extent that they are designated as two different worlds.

During the war between Israel and Lebanon, Friedman announced that now is the time that

> **the World of Order** got its act together. This is not Israel's fight alone — and if you really want to see a "disproportional'' Israeli response, just keep leaving Israel to fight this war alone. Then you will see some real craziness (Order Vs Disorder 2006).

The sentence starts with a call for action to the forces of 'the World of Order' to pitch in together to help Israel which should not be left to fight alone. The latent meaning here is that the battle is not only between Israel and the Arabs, but between Israel and the World of Order on one side against Arabs and the World of Disorder on the other. This clearly positions Israel on the side of civilization and order in the 'fight' between both civilizations, which leaves the Palestinians and Arabs on the other side. This call is made because 'This is not Israel's fight alone' which implicitly puts the Arabs in enmity with, not only Israel, but with the whole World of Order, or, in other words, the West. The personification in 'Israel's fight' gives the

impression that Israel is fighting a personal fight and the fact that the writer says that it is not Israel's fight alone deepens the impression that this is a fight for existence and survival.

> In Israel does not like international forces on its borders and worries they will not be effective. But it will be better than a war of attrition, and nothing would set back the forces of disorder in Lebanon more than The World of Order (Dubai and Dunces 2006)

The forces of disorder are placed in Lebanon and are ready to pounce on Israel. Israel is pictured as a pressured entity that has to accept what it does not want like 'The presence of international forces on its borders' in order to protect itself and to curtail the forces of disorder.

Other instances abound in the corpus of references to the 'World of Order', examples of which are in 'America should be galvanizing the forces of order into a coalition against these trends' (On the Eve of Madness 2006) which is another reference to the Israeli Lebanese war. Also, 'The Bush team needs to convene a coalition of The World of Order' (Order Vs Disorder 2006) which is a reference to the Islamic fundamental movements in the Middle East, against which the writer is calling for the grouping of the forces of order with America set as the anchoring leader once again.

Finally, readers get another reminder that

> Today, the world is divided between "the regions of order" and "the regions of disorder," and the regions of disorder are big enough and disorderly enough that they each require their own super sub-secretary of state to manage the chaos and mobilize the coalitions (Super (Sub) Secretaries 2009).

Which is a description of how strong and dangerous 'the World of Disorder' can be with the usage of lexical items like 'big enough' and 'disorderly enough'.

The second conceptual metaphor under the conceptual key CIVILIZATION IS ORDER is THE EAST IS THE WORLD OF DISORDER. Against this backdrop, the writer proclaimed that the events of 9/11 are the harbinger of the first war between America and the 'World of Disorder' '9/11 marked the first full-scale battle between a superpower and a small band of super-empowered angry men from the World of Disorder' (Peking Duct Tape 2003). The division of the world is further explained in the next quotation

> We're still dealing with a bipolar world, only the divide this time is no longer East versus West, but the World of Order versus the World of Disorder (Expanding Club NATO 2003).

Thus, the designations are made clearer, it is no longer just East versus West, but it is the World of Order pitted against the World of Disorder. The naming of the 'World of Disorder' versus the 'World of Order' suggests classic powers of 'good' and 'evil' pitted against each other with America heading the powers of good. This brings the enmity between the East and the West in a much nearer scope to the reader who may not be accustomed to it. The writer is presenting these conjectures in the form of assertions and facts that make it easier for the reader to accept at face value, since he sets himself as an expert in the politics of the Middle East. It also places the East in the role of the stereotypical enemy that stands for evil, chaos and 'disorder', a role which will be readily acceptable by the layman reader in the wake of 9/11.

Although the writer positions America as the leader of the World of Order, he still tells the rest of that world that they should help America in its task, whether in Iraq or in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict because the American people cannot take the brunt of such a battle alone

If America has to manage the World of Disorder alone, the American people will quickly tire (Peking Duct Tape 2003).

The personification of America as the person who has to manage the world of disorder puts the responsibility on its shoulders and makes it appear as an enormous mission for one country to manage a whole world, specifically if it is a 'World of Disorder'. It also effectively highlights that the Middle East is the entity that is meant by that title, since America was directly involved at the time in a confrontation with the Arab Muslim world.

To sum up, the two conceptual keys and the conceptual metaphors discussed above, are used by the writer to build the 'clash of civilizations' frame and to set it between the Western civilization and the Arab Muslim world. The fact that the metaphors were used from 2001 till 2010 indicates that these metaphors were used by the writer to frame his discourse throughout these years. Following Charteris-black's method (2004) the table below (fig. 1) shows the actual number of metaphors used, instances of which were given above, and the years during which the metaphors were used,

Metaphor	Number of times the Metaphor is employed in the discourse (tokens)	years
CONCEPTS ARE BUILDINGS	36	2001-2010
CIVILIZATION IS A WALL PROTECTING WEST FROM EAST	11	2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2006, 2007, 2010
CIVILIZATION IS A MENTAL WALL SEPARATING EAST FROM WEST	9	2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005,2007
CIVILIZATION IS A WALL SEPARATING EAST FROM WEST	16	2001, 2001, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010
CIVILIZATION IS ORDER	49	2001,2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2010
THE WEST IS THE WORLD OF ORDER	23	2001, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2010
THE EAST IS THE WORLD OF DISORDER	27	2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2010

Fig. (1) Clash of Civilization conceptual metaphors from 2001 till 2010

http://apc.aast.edu

It is important to note that according to Lakoff and Johnson (1980) a conceptual metaphor cannot be considered as such unless it is continuously present and used in the corpus under analysis. Consequently, it was important to trace the usage of the metaphors that were uncovered in the analysis to ensure that indeed the writer relied upon them to form the picture he wanted to convey about the Arab Israeli conflict. Thus, the table above serves to consolidate and corroborate the findings of the study. As can be seen in the table above most of these conceptual metaphors were used continuously throughout the ten years of the study. While others, were used in certain years which were also mentioned in the table. For instance, the conceptual metaphors and CIVILIZATION IS ORDER and CIVILIZATION IS A WALL SEPARATING EAST FROM WEST were not used during 2008 after which the writer went back to using them in 2009 and 2010. This fact is significant in proving that the metaphor is a basic part of the writer's repertoire to describe the conflict in the Middle East.

6. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, in the previous analysis we have tried to analyse the discourse written by Thomas Friedman in the period from 2001-2010. The study aimed at analysing the frames and the conceptual metaphors that were used to represent the Arab Israeli conflict.

The frame analysis paradigm proved very useful in unifying the conceptual metaphors under one big heading or direction through which we can focus the findings and allow them to cohere together in order for them to make more sense. it was noted that Huntington's clash of civilizations paradigm was heavily relied on as a general frame for the conflict and the events related to it in the writer's discourse from 2001 till 2010. This frame was used to structure the polarization between the East and the West and the ensuing conflicts and violence in a more accessible and easier manner to accept. In real-life events, the Clash of civilizations frame bore fruit and became a reality, when the events of 9/11 took place, and it became an accepted frame among many both as a reason and as a justification for the attacks (Said 2001). The frame, as was explained in the analysis, allowed political analysts, politicians and journalists to discuss the horrific events of 9/11 without delving into the Arab Israeli political conflict details and America's role in it. El-Nawawy and Powers (2008) maintain that journalists often adapt their presentation of events to suit the values and preconceived ideas of their audience.

In addition, Conceptual metaphor analysis permitted the analysis of the metaphorical expressions in the writer's discourse which would have otherwise not been noticed and which, consequently, offered a chance to probe into the ideologies that underlie the writer's discourse. The clash of civilizations frame was realised in the discourse through the use of conceptual keys and conceptual metaphors. The two major conceptual keys the were used are
- CONCEPTS ARE BUILDINGS
- CIVILZATION IS ORDER

In which the writer envisaged civilization as the border separating and differentiating 'us' from 'them or the West from the East. The other conceptual metaphors that came under these two keys are

- CIVILIZATION IS A WALL PROTECTING WEST FROM EAST,
- CIVILIZATION IS A MENTAL WALL SEPARATING WEST FROM EAST
- CIVILIZATION IS A WALL SEPARATING WEST FROM EAST.
- THE WEST IS THE WORLD OF ORDER.
- THE WEST IS THE WORLD OF ORDER.

These metaphors were also used to intensify the division between East and West and the conflicts that came to be considered as an expected and natural development of such a division.

REFERENCES

Abrahamian, Ervand. 2003. "The US media, Huntington and September 11." Third world quarterly 24, no. 3: 529-544.

Charteris-Black, Jonathan, and Timothy Ennis. 2001. "A comparative study of metaphor in Spanish and English financial reporting." English for specific purposes 20, no. 3: 249-266.

Charteris-Black, Jonathan, and Andreas Musolff. 2003. "'Battered hero' or 'innocent victim'? A comparative study of metaphors for Euro trading in British and German financial reporting." English for Specific Purposes 22, no. 2: 153-176.

Charteris-Black, Jonathan, and Jonathan Charteris-Black. 2004. Critical metaphor analysis. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Charteris-Black, Jonathan. 2006. "Britain as a container: Immigration metaphors in the 2005 election campaign." Discourse & Society 17, no. 5: 563-581.

Chomsky, N. 1986. The manufacture of consent. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

El-Nawawy, Mohammed, and Shawn Powers. 2008. Mediating conflict: Al-Jazeera English and the possibility of a conciliatory media. LA: University of Southern California.

Entman, Robert M. 1993. "Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm." Journal of communication 43, no. 4: 51-58.

Friedman, Thomas L. 1990. From Beirut to Jerusalem. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, New York.

Friedman, Thomas. 2001 'Foreign affairs: walls.' The New York Times. 20 January, 2001

Friedman, Thomas. 2002. 'George W. Sadat.' The New York Times. 17 April, 2002.

Friedman, Thomas. 2003. 'Let them come to Berlin.' The New York Times. 3 November, 2002

Friedman, Thomas. 2002. 'Wall of ideas.' The New York Times. 2 June, 2002.

Friedman, Thomas. 2003. 'The sand wall.' The New York Times. 13 April, 2003.

Friedman, Thomas. 2003. 'Vote France off the island.' The New York Times 9 February, 2003.

Friedman, Thomas. 2003. 'Peking duct tape.' The New York Times. 16 January, 2003.

Friedman, Thomas. 2003.'Expanding club NATO.' The New York Times . 24 December, 2003.

Friedman, Thomas. 2004. 'A war of ideas, part 1.' The New York Times. 8 January, 2004.

Friedman, Thomas. 2004. 'Origin of species.' The New York Times. 14 March, 2004.

Friedman, Thomas. 2005. 'When camels fly.' The New York Times. 20 february, 2005.

Friedman, Thomas. 2006. 'The energy wall.' The New York Times. 12 December, 2006.

Friedman, Thomas. 2006. 'Order Vs disorder.' The New York Times . 21 july, 2006.

Friedman, Thomas. 2006. 'Dubai and dunces.' The New York Times. 15 March, 2006.

Ferrari, Federica. "Metaphor at work in the analysis of political discourse: investigating a preventive war' persuasion strategy." Discourse & Society 18, no. 5 (2007): 603-625.

Gamson, William A., and Andre Modigliani. 1989. "Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach." American journal of sociology 95, no. 1 (1989): 1-37.

Huntington, S.P. 1997, The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order. London: Penguin Books.

KhirAllah, Ghufran. 2017. "Mental frames and conceptual metaphors of hijab and hijab-wearing in British and Spanish press." PhD diss., University of Autonoma.

Kort, Samia. 2018. "Metaphor in media discourse: Representations of 'Arabs' and 'Americans' in American and Arab news media." PhD diss., Bristol Center for Linguistics.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. 2008. Metaphors we live by. Chicago: University of Chicago press.

Lakoff, George. 1992. "Metaphor and war: The metaphor system used to justify war in the Gulf." Thirty years of linguistic evolution 11, no.3: 463-481.

Lakoff, George. 2003. "Metaphor and war, again." https://escholarship.org/content/qt32b962zb/qt32b962zb.

Lakoff, George. 2010. Moral politics: How liberals and conservatives think. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George. 2013. "Obama reframes Syria: Metaphor and war revisited." https://escholarship.org/content/qt8xm8z9s6/qt8xm8z9s6.pdf

Lewis, Bernard. 1990. "The roots of Muslim rage." The Atlantic Monthly 266, no. 3: 47-60.

Linkevičiūtė, Vilma. 2018. "Conceptual metaphors in donald Trump's political discourse: politics domain." Kalbų Studijos 34 (May): 46-55.

Musolff, Andreas. 2007. "What role do metaphors play in racial prejudice? The function of antisemitic imagery in Hitler's Mein Kampf." Patterns of Prejudice 41, no. 1 (spring): 21-43.

Musolff, Andreas. 2015. "Dehumanizing metaphors in UK immigrant debates in press and online media." Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict 3, no. 1 (Fall): 41-56.

Pew Research Center. 'Record public interest in Middle East conflict.', Pew Research Center (2002).

Prager, Dennis. 2011. 'Why Thomas Friedman abetted anti-Semitism, Real Clear Politics'. https://dennisprager.com/column/why-thomas-friedman-abetted-anti-semitism/

Rubin, Jennifer. 2011. 'Tom Friedman, hitting rock bottom', The Washington Post https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/right-turn/post/tom-friedman-hitting-rock-bottom/2011/12/14/glQAUvy9tO_blog.html.

Said, Edward W. 2014. "The clash of ignorance." Global Media Journal 5, no.: 7-27.

Wolfsfeld, Gadi, and Wolfsfeld Gadi. 1997. "and political conflict: News from the Middle East. Vol. 10.

Wolfsfeld, Gadi. "The varying role of the news media in peace processes: Theory and research." Annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco, California.