Rhetorical Characteristics of Arab Political Discourse in Israel

Rhetorical Characteristics of Arab Political Discourse in Israel

By

Aadel Shakkour

Rhetorical Characteristics of Arab Political Discourse in Israel

By Aadel Shakkour

This book first published 2023

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In this book we discuss rhetorical features in the Arabic political discourse of Arab politicians in Israel. We show how such politicians, especially Arab Members of Knesset (MKs), use a variety of lively rhetorical devices in order to convey their messages, to promote their ideological positions and to criticize the Israeli government's policies, which discriminate against Israeli Arabs and the Palestinian people and deprives them of their rights. The present book argues that the rhetorical devices used in this discourse possess unique features which contribute to focusing and structuring the message, in order to highlight the plight of Israeli Arabs and the Palestinian people, to impact positively on the Israeli government's discriminatory policies towards them, to emotionally manipulate the government and to bring about a significant change in its attitude towards them.

The thesis on which the present book is based maintains that the combination of rhetorical devices used in the political discourse of Arab politicians is not fortuitous, but the result of a choice whose objective is to serve politicians' political positions and to sharply criticize the Israeli government for its racist policies towards Israel's Arabs and the Palestinian populace. The choice affects the way in which addressees understand and perceive the world, and motivates them to take a stand. The following example of metaphor, one of the rhetorical devices used in this discourse, can be seen to be used manipulatively: The metaphor "crematorium oven" is associated with the Holocaust, and was used to express the catastrophe which the loss of tens of thousands of Arab votes would entail, if voting rates among the Arab sector in Israel's parliamentary elections were to be significantly lower. This manipulative metaphorical expression aims at urging Arabs who intended to refrain from voting in parliamentary elections to reconsider their position, which weakens the Arab political parties in the

Knesset and can affect their very existence. Voting for the Knesset is thus presented as an existential issue, just as the Holocaust threatened the very existence of the Jewish people. Another example of a warlike metaphor is "stoning" in the sentence "*stoning* the nationalist parties of racism with the *wāw*s of the Arab Front party at the ballot box" (*wāw* is the letter which represents the party on ballots). The metaphor "stoning" has a negative connotation, since stoning is a punishment usually associated with adultery. The manipulative use of this word thus presents the issue of going to vote as being part of the war of good against evil, of the occupied against the occupiers.

The corpus is taken from examples of the written and oral political discourse of Arab politicians, in particular from speeches in the Israeli Parliament. This method was adopted because the Knesset is the central area where Arab politicians express their political opinions on a variety of subjects. For the most part, the corpus is made up of examples in Hebrew, gathered at random from different time periods. It should be mentioned that this is necessarily an impressionistic approach. In no other serious political situation has an Arab Israeli politician discussed the political discourse. It was almost impossible to compile a wider corpus and identify further examples. Therefore, the conclusions of the study reflect our personal impressions and should be considerate accordingly and, as such, more comprehensive studies are needed.

There are good reasons why Arab politicians' discourse in Israel is focused so much on official discrimination against the country's Arabs, since this is a group which has not enjoyed equal rights in all domains from the time of the establishment of the State of Israel to the present. The Or Commission, tasked with determining the facts concerning the clashes of October 2000, interpreted its mandate very broadly and also delved into this issue. The commission's report defined the foundations of Arab society's standing in Israel, documented the inequalities from which it suffered, and determined that its discrimination was against the law. Among the commission's recommendations was a clear call on the government to act to close the gaps between Jewish and Arab citizens through equal budgeting and promotion of improving the situation of Arab society in areas such as education, employment, industrial development, land for construction, and addressing the problems of the Bedouin dispersion. The commission also

called for enabling Arab citizens to publicly and properly express their identity, culture and language, and to initiate activities that would encourage them to feel part of the country and to promote their integration. By now it has become clear that most of the commission's recommendations were not implemented. While some advances have been made on a number of issues, the fundamental problems remain unresolved, and the Arab sector in Israel still suffers from significant discrimination on the part of the Israeli government.

The study was based on the collection and classification method. Examples of a variety of rhetorical devices from different domains were collected and classified by type: Metaphor, personification, natural justice, analogy, hyperbole, rhetorical question, irony and more. After the rhetorical types were defined, we attempted to create a body of examples of each, analyze their rhetorical features, and show that they reflect directed speech acts aimed at influencing Israeli government policy in a positive direction.

The book was translated from Hebrew into English by a professional translator and copyeditor.

CHAPTER 2

THE HOLOCAUST IN ISRAELI POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Prior to the 1967 war, the Holocaust was not part of the everyday reality in Israel. It was not taught in schools and was rarely mentioned in survivors' homes. The decision by Egyptian ruler Gamal Abed al Nasser to close the Suez Canal and blockade the Straits of Tiran to Israeli shipping, coupled with the feeling that the country's survival was in jeopardy, led to tensions, mainly among the families of survivors. However, Israel's decisive and total victory in the war offered certain proof that the only way of ensuring the Jewish people's survival in Israel was a strong army. Israel would guarantee that there would never be another Shoah (Holocaust). Since then, almost every politician repeatedly uses the Holocaust in demands regarding the borders of Israel and its enemies, and in all negotiations over the occupied territories under Israeli army control (Keren 2015: 173).

In the period between 1967 and the 1973 war, Israelis' sense of security regarding the country's future and their feeling that Israel was morally in the right grew stronger. The threat posed to Israel's existence by these two wars only reinforced the belief held by many, including Holocaust survivors and the soldiers who fought in these wars, that Israel had a right to hold the occupied territories and to control their populations (Keren 2015: 174)

In the wake of these wars, the subject of the Holocaust arose whenever there were discussions or arguments about the control of the territories. For example, plans to enter into negotiations were termed, 'boarding the train to Auschwitz'. At the same time, strong criticism developed regarding the conduct of IDF soldiers towards Palestinian populations in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, and Professor Yeshayahu Leibowitz even compared their behavior to that of German soldiers during the Nazi era (Keren 2015: 174).

The most important event, in terms of the everyday use of the images and symbols of the Holocaust, at the beginning of the twenty first century was the removal of Jewish settlers from their homes in the Gaza Strip during the Disengagement from Gaza in 2007. During this contentious event, Jewish settlers employed symbols from the Holocaust, such as yellow stars, and the security forces were referred to by Holocaust-era terms, including 'Nazis' and '*kalgasim*' (a derogatory Hebrew word meaning 'troopers', cruel soldiers of an oppressive regime). The settlers also stated that they were Holocaust survivors or the children of Holocaust survivors, and sought to use this aspect of their identity as a reason for halting the Disengagement. Since then, the use of the Holocaust for every political purpose has proceeding unstoppably. This includes Israeli diplomacy, ranging from taking all high-ranking foreign diplomats to visit the Yad Vashem Holocaust Museum as the preamble to policy discussions with Israeli leaders, to Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's speeches to the United Nations.

Many on Israel's left have criticized Israeli political culture's emphasis on the uniqueness of the Holocaust as excessively focusing on Jewish victimhood. They believe that it has been exploited to justify Israel's aggressive policies towards the Arab world, and Israelis' moral blindness to the wrongs carried out against the Palestinians in their name (Margalit 1998: 61). In this context, the *Syrian Times* argued that 'a country that continually uses, and too often manipulates, Holocaust imagery to justify its policies of self-defense and "never again", cannot complain when the rest of the world uses those same standards to make judgments concerning its own policies' (Litvak and Webman 2009: 325).

Renowned Israeli Holocaust scholar Yehuda Bauer contends that the term 'Holocaust' has become flattened in the public mind because any evil that befalls anyone anywhere becomes a Holocaust: Vietnamese, Soviet Jews, African-Americans in American ghettoes, women suffering inequality, and so on (Litvak and Webman 2009: 325).

While no politician has based his or her entire campaign on Holocaust denial, a number have used it when it was in their interest to do so. Croatian president Franjo Tudjman wrote of the 'biased testimonies and exaggerated data' used to estimate the number of Holocaust victims, and in his book *wastelands*: *Historical Truth*, he always places the word 'Holocaust' in

quotation marks. Tudjman has good historical reasons for doing so: during World War II, Croatia was an ardent Nazi ally, and the vast majority of Croatian Jews and non-Jews were murdered by their fellow Croatians, not by the Germans. Tudjman obviously believes that one of the ways for his country to win public sympathy is to diminish the importance of the Holocaust (Lipstadt 1993: 7).

Van Dijk (1984: 13, 40) focuses on the 'rationalization and justification of discriminatory acts against minority groups'. He designates the categories used to rationalize prejudice against minority as 'the 7 D's of Discrimination'. They are dominance, differentiation, distance, diffusion, diversion, depersonalization or destruction, and daily discrimination. These strategies serve in various ways to legitimize and reinforce the difference of 'the other': for example, by dominating minority groups, by excluding them from social activities, and even by destroying and murdering them (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 22).

CHAPTER 3

CONCEPTUAL FRAME

3.1 Rhetoric

Language is the primary means through which humans understand the world. Speech is the expression of wisdom (*sophia*), allowing people to reason about a situation, construct a dialogue, understand, and investigate a subject. Humans have developed a strong ability and power for verbal and written expression, without which they could not realize any intellectual achievement beyond that of animals (Gitay 2010: 27; Searle 2002: 18). Communication is a fundamental action that unites and encourages a diverse, variegated society (Graber 1993: 305; Mio 1997: 113). Rhetoricians, knowing the importance and power of words adopt strategies that can be realized through use of words, their primary tools. They use words in a sophisticated manner, to create a new reality that their listeners will accept. This is done by first building a bridge of consent with listeners, after which the work of persuasion is undertaken on the basis of this created consent (Gitay 2013a: 120).[1]

Rhetoric has been called "verbal manipulation" (Wolman 1995) because, when used correctly and effectively, written or oral expressions can be intentionally used not only to convey information, but to influence, persuade, and motivate others to take a certain action. Oral and written rhetorical devices are widely used by many people and in many areas of life. People are social creatures, and their very existence and ability to act depend on their ability to communicate in an understandable way. While spoken and written words are used primarily for the exchange of information, virtually all people, rulers and ordinary citizens alike, have an instinctive urge to persuade others to accept their opinions, inclinations, and preferred lifestyle. The skill of persuasion is the ability to change others' opinions or

---

[1] See further Gitay, 2011, pp. 54-59; Gitay 2013b.

attitudes through some means of communication. Since the times of ancient Greece, rhetoric has been a significant area of public communication, and this no less true today (Kayam and Sover 2013: 43).

Aristotle (2002) defined rhetoric as "the faculty of discovering in any particular case all of the available means of persuasion." (Kayam and Sover 2013: 44). Rhetoric became a respected and integral part of the development of democratic patterns of governing in ancient Greece. Verbal persuasion was seen as essential for the advancement of public affairs, and a skill every citizen needed to establish a place in the social system (Aristotle 2002). Teaching the art of speech and the discipline of rhetoric began in the fifth century BC, led by Corax of Syracuse, who lived in Sicily. In 644 BC, the tyrannical regime of Syracuse was overthrown and replaced by a democratic regime. Many of the city's residents had been exiled or had fled, and upon their return, they discovered that the tyrants had expropriated their lands and property. A wave of property lawsuits followed. Two citizens of Syracuse, Corax and Tisias, designed a method of rhetoric to advise people on how to argue their cases in court. In the heyday of the Athenian State, rhetoric was used in the courts and in the assembly, and echoes of this style are also found in tragedy, comedy, philosophy and historiography from that time (Aristotle, 2002; Kayam and Sover 2013: 44).

3.1.1 Rhetoric in the Arabic Language

Rhetoric, in its classic sense of using language to influence and persuade, is particularly valuable in the Arab language. In Arab culture, rhetoric is understood as the ability to enthrall one's listeners through language that is used with subtlety, style, and rhythm (Patai 1973: 48). Arabic is a musical language, meant to be evocative, to affect listeners, and touch their hearts. The spoken word can evoke powerful emotions, shape behavior, and have an impact that reaches far beyond the scope of the content. American-Arab historian Hitti noted that the Arab people are particularly ardent in their admiration for literary expression, both spoken and written, and that the Arabic language is unparalleled in its ability to exert a strong and irresistible influence on its audience (Hitti as quoted in Darshan 2000: 3). For example, it has been noted that modern audiences in Baghdad, Damascus, and Cairo are deeply moved by the recitation of poems

or speeches in classical Arabic, which they only vaguely or partially understand. The rhythm, rhyme, and melodic quality of the language exert an effect on listeners, which is referred to as "lawful magic."

Another aspect of Arabic rhetoric (= *balāġa(h)*) is expressed in exaggeration (= *mubālaġa(h)*) and overemphasis as rhetorical devices (see Darshan 2000: 4 on Patai 1973). For example, on the eve of Israel's War of Independence in 1948, leaders of Arab countries made boastful statements that deviated far from the truth in order to evoke a certain impression of the situation and to generate enthusiasm for their political desires and aspirations. For example, the Syrian president announced: "I am happy to tell you, with confidence, that we even have an atomic bomb at our disposal, yes, a homemade one…" The prime minister of Iraq declared: "All we need is a few brooms to sweep the Jews into the sea" (Patai 1973: 49–50). These statements had no basis in reality, and a deep chasm separated their words and deeds.

Using rhetoric as a means of persuasion, particularly as a means of gaining control over the masses, has undergone changes in modern times, because people today understand reality primarily through the media. The phenomenal growth of the media has inarguably affected the process of transmitting and receiving messages (Schaffner and Sellers 2010). Television and the internet have created virtually unlimited possibilities to manipulate audiences, especially through messages and means that are used primarily for purposes of mass marketing and sales (Galili 2004; Kayam and Sover 2013: 44).

People may obtain power and advance their political positions through the effective use of rhetorical devices. Politicians in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries behave differently than did political leaders in previous, more traditional, periods. This phenomenon has been termed "new politics" by German researchers (Kayam and Sover 2013: 45). New politics refers to the emergence of industrialized democracies and the decline of political parties in Western liberal democracies, both the result of the expansion of mass media and the personalization of politics (Galili 2004).

In the past four decades, many scholars have discussed the sweeping social changes that led to the emergence of new politics in industrialized democracies in the West. These changes are reflected in the transition from materialist values to post-materialist values, and have led to the formulation

of a new paradigm. Some researchers have argued that this new paradigm represents a transition from "old politics" that were concerned with economic growth, maintaining public order, national security, and a traditional lifestyle, to a "new politics" that are focused on individual freedom, social equality, and quality of life. As a society achieves a certain level of economic prosperity, public attention shifts away from economic problems and towards issues related to quality of life. Therefore, people prefer leaders with a flexible governing style and strong communication skills, who tend to resemble effective managers able to empower their followers (Galili 2004; Kayam and Sover 2013: 45).

3.2 Classifying speech acts

The most famous classification of speech acts was proposed by philosopher John Searle. Searle (2002) classifies speech acts according to five groups:

(1) Assertive speech acts—the speaker is committing to the reality of something. Examples include describing, arguing, concluding, denying, confirming.

(2) Directive speech acts—the speaker tries to cause the addressee to do something. Examples include ordering, demanding, recommending, warning, asking.

(3) Commissive speech acts—commit the speaker to doing something in the future. Examples include promising, threatening, proposing, agreeing.

(4) Expressive speech acts—express the speaker's psychological state. Examples include apologizing, condemning, thanking, welcoming, offering condolence.

(5) Declarative speech acts—the speaker causes an immediate change in the world. Examples include declarations of war, names, court sentences, bans, marriages.

A sentence can contain more than one speech act, which can belong to different categories. For example, the sentence, "Study hard for your exam!" might be an order, a piece of advice, or a threat. The sentence, "Excuse me, I didn't hear your name" might be an apology, a request to the addressee to repeat his name, or both acts combined.

Austin identified three types of acts that are present in every utterance: (Austin 2006: 127-128).[2]

(1) The locutionary act—this is the statement itself, producing certain sounds which have meaning. The locutionary act employs language to convey content.

(2) The illocutionary act—the act that takes place when the utterance is said, namely an action with the power to perform a certain act. For example, warning, reporting, apologizing, and so forth. The speech act is expressed in the illocutionary act.

(3) The perlocutionary act—when a locutionary act, and hence also an illocutionary act, takes place, our words often affect others' emotions, thoughts, and actions as well as our own. An extra-linguistic result can be caused through speech. This result is called a perlocution.

It is known that we can distinguish between direct and indirect speech acts. Direct speech acts are acts wherein the locutionary act testifies directly to the illocutionary act. That is, the utterance content directly expresses the speaker's intention. Conversely, in an indirect speech act, the utterance content only hints indirectly at the speaker's intention and the action he wishes to perform through the utterance. For example, the utterance, "I want you to pass me the salt please" is a direct speech act of request, while the utterance, "Can you pass me the salt?" is an indirect speech act of request. Indirect speech acts reflect what Searle meant when he said that speakers often wish to express more than they say.

3.3 Target audience

The new rhetoric defines the target audience of the argumentation process as everyone whom the speaker wishes to influence through his or her arguments (Perelman 1994: 17). The starting point is therefore the goal of the speaker and his intentions: every speaker thinks, either consciously or unconsciously, about those he wishes to persuade, and they in turn create the audience whom the speaker has in mind.

Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969: 30) note three types of audiences, a division that can help us judge the rhetorical nature of arguments: the first

---

[2] See further Livnat 2014a, pp. 158-159; Sevi 2012, pp. 257-258).

type consists of the entire human race, or at least all "normal" adults. They refer to this group as "the universal audience." The second type is a single interlocutor whom the speaker addresses in a dialogue. The third type is the subject himself, when he engages in deliberation or gives himself reasons for his own actions.

Arab politicians in the State of Israel are addressing the Jewish Israeli audience, that is, the particular audience. They are not expected to demonstrate good faith just because they are an Arab member of the Israeli Parliament. They should do so only if they wish to be heard by Jewish Israelis. They are speaking in a media situation in front of a Jewish audience. As a target audience, Jews have a complex status. We see this from the two divergent discourse patterns used by Arab politicians in the State of Israel: the pattern of publically or implicitly recognizing the tragedy that the Jewish people suffered in the Holocaust, and the pattern of harshly criticizing the Israelis, which, as we will see, is reflected in the comparison of Israeli policy toward Palestinians to Nazi crimes against the Jews.

3.4 Topos

Topos is a term borrowed from classical Greek rhetoric that literally means "commonplace" and refers to a standardized way of constructing an argument, an intellectual theme found in a "stockroom" of topics. The speaker searches in the topos for persuasive rhetorical devices. The topos contains a treasury of social or ideological conventions that are meant to elicit the mental acceptance of a given topic by an audience. The topos is the "glue" that creates a common denominator between the speaker and the target audience based on a social consensus. If a leader or speaker who wants to be particularly effective addresses the nation, he or she must base his or her statements and appeal on what is commonly accepted by that society, in other words, on "the truth" of the society, its ideological narrative, collective memory, and cognitive patterns (Aristotle 2002: 28-32; Gitay 2010: 135-136).

A speaker who is concerned about the effectiveness of his or her speech must adopt the views of his or her audience (Gitay 2010: 137). According to Perelman, the speaker must not start with his or her own truth, but with the accepted consensus of the public he or she wishes to address. In other

words, the speaker must make the consensus and accepted patterns of his or her audience the starting point, because if he does not he loses his audience (Perelman 1982: 21). According to Eco and van Dijk, it is advisable for the speaker to open by adjusting to the views of his or her audience, and obviously not to mock or annoy it. The speaker must aim to connect with the audience and present the subject in a positive, noncontroversial way. For example, it would be ineffective for Tibi[3] to begin his address by calling his audience in the Parliament "fascists" or "racists." (Eco 2006: 44-65; van Dijk 2008: 189-190).

3.5 Ethos

According to Aristotle the ethos (character, reliability, professionalism) of the speaker is the way that he presents himself, his intentions, and his beliefs to his audience. Character-driven persuasion entails speaking in a way that makes the speaker seem worthy of the audience's trust. A speech without ethos will miss its mark. Character (ethos) is practically the strongest method of persuasion (Aristotle 1973: 13566a; Livnat 2009: 72; Gitay 2010: 132-133). The discourse itself should reveal the speaker's character. Often, it is not the speaker's ideas that affect and change his audience, but rather the speaker's character or image. In other words, the speaker's qualities and reliability are key factors in persuasion that carry more weight than different rhetorical strategies. Persuasion by means of one's character, says Aristotle, is effective when the speaker speaks in a manner that appears credible. We assume that the stronger the researcher's ethos, the greater the chances that his arguments will be favourably accepted (Livnat 2014b: 126).

The definition of ethos varies in different disciplines. Following Aristotle, pragmatists such as Ducrot (1984) and Maingueneau (1999) view the image of the orator as being built by the discourse itself. For them, ethos 'is constructed within verbal interaction and is purely internal to discourse' (Amossy 2001: 5). In sociology, however, ethos is not considered a purely discursive construction. According to Bourdieu (1991), the power of language and its ability to 'act' are determined by social circumstances and power

---

[3] An MK who frequently attacks the Israeli government's racist policies towards Israel's Arabs.

relations (Amossy 2001: 2). The force of discourse is not dependent on the image of the self that the orator produces in speech, but on his or her social position and 'the access he [or she] can have to the language of the institution' (Bourdieu 1991). Amossy thus proposes a distinction between 'discursive ethos' and 'prior ethos', the latter defined as the image the audience has of the speaker before he takes the floor.[4]

3.6 The Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approach

CDA, a multidisciplinary approach used in discourse analysis, focuses on how social and political power is created and maintained through language. CDA seeks to expose a discourse's biases and manipulations that serve political interests and advance controversial ideological positions, and highlights the methods or stratagems through which the discourse produces or maintains an unequal balance of power in a society. CDA aims to expose the linguistic, cultural, and historical roots that support practices— modes of action—that preserve the balance of power. The basic premise of the approach is that discourse has the capacity to shape social identities and establish relations between groups of people and individuals. It can help to maintain a social status quo but may also contribute to social change. The CDA approach focuses on the way social structures embody an existing balance of power and control in a society through discourse and explains how a discourse produces, approves, challenges, or legitimizes them. CDA seeks to understand, expose, and ultimately oppose social inequality (Livnat 2014a, Vol. 2: 361; Hart 2010: 13–4; Wodak 2001a: 10; van Dijk 2001: 352; Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 32; Meyer 2001: 15).

The term 'power' is the main concept in critical discourse analysis, the discourse mechanism being seen as a central way to actualize power in social context. This premise is nourished by the thinking of social philosophers such as Marx, Foucault, Gramsci, Habermas, Bourdieu and others who drew attention to the central role of language in constructing social reality (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 32; Meyer 2001: 15; Hart 2010: 13-14; Livnat 2014a, Vol. 2: 361).

---

[4] For more information on discursive ethos and prior ethos, see Livnat 2014b: 128-129.

For Michel Foucault, discourse is a representation of knowledge about a certain subject. Discourse is linked to knowledge production through language. Foucault argues that the term 'discourse' not only relates to language, but also to action modes (practices), rules, and regulations. Discourse constructs and defines the objects of our knowledge. It controls how we talk about a subject or act towards it; it determines the accepted ways to talk about it; and thus also limits other possibilities for knowledge construction about the same subject. A discourse will never consist of one statement, one text, one act, or one source; it will appear in a variety of texts and different institutional contexts in the society (Livnat 2014a, Vol. 2: 362).

According to Foucault, 'words/things' have meaning and can be called real only in a specific historical context. For example, 'mental illness' is not an 'objective' object with the same meaning in every era and every culture. Foucault and his followers argue that the connection between signifier and signified is far more complex than implied by semiotics: 'a simple combination between an idea and the sequence of sounds that expresses it'. Thus the term 'mental illness' does not signify something objective in the world. The object it represents is an outcome of the construction of knowledge that occurs within a certain discourse. The object is constructed by all that is said about it in a certain culture and in a certain period, by the way it is described, explained, judged, classified, etc. (Meyer 2001:15; Livnat 2014a, Vol. 2: 362). In other words, discourse constructs objects, instilling them with significance and meaning in a particular social and cultural context. Discourse determines how people see things and creates a picture of their world and their outlooks, thus influencing their actions as well. According to Foucault, the discourse on mental illness during the Enlightenment led to people with mental illnesses being incarcerated in institutions and mistreated (Livnat 2014a, Vol. 2: 362). According to van Dijk (1984: 13), prejudice is not merely a characteristic of individual beliefs or emotions about social groups. Such ethnic attitudes have social functions, e.g., to protect the interests of the in-group. The cognitive structures of prejudice and the strategies of its use reflect these social functions (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 21-22).

CDA scholars regard themselves as ideologically motivated and committed, and their research is a kind of intervention in the life of society

and social relations. Many researchers from this school are also active in movements against racism, feminist movements, peace movements, and so forth. They state their ideological intentions openly and stand with weaker social groups against more powerful ones. The quality of their research is not measured by 'objectivity' and academic remoteness, but by preserving the norms of systematic, rigorous, cautious analysis that are accepted in all scientific research (Meyer 2001: 15; Livnat 2014a, Vol. 2: 371).

CDA is not a school of linguistics or discourse research. While the stated goal of traditional scholars of discourse is to reveal and describe the linguistic system's structure and laws, critical discourse scholars tend to argue that the academic description they offer is sterile and has no social and ideological implications (Livnat 2014a, Vol. 2: 371).

While analyzing texts and 'linguistic events' requires some analytical method, CDA on principle is neither based on nor prefers a single theory or a uniform analytical method. Instead, CDA offers a kind of tool box for the researcher, a list of linguistic and textual characteristics that can be examined when one wishes to analyze a text critically (Wodak 2001b: 64; Livnat 2014a, Vol. 2: 366).

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Metaphor

In our discussion of metaphors, we will show how Arab politicians in the State of Israel, in particular Arab members of the Israeli Parliament (Knesset), rely on Hebrew metaphor as an important rhetorical tool for conveying their message, with the goal of advancing their ideological positions and criticizing the policies of the Israeli government, which discriminates against and disenfranchises Arab-Israelis and the Palestinian people. This book is based on the hypothesis that the way that Arab politicians in the State of Israel use metaphor in their political discourse has unique rhetorical aspects that contribute to sharpening their message, as part of the larger goal of emphasizing the suffering of the Palestinian people and Arab-Israelis, and changing for the better the Israeli government's discriminatory patterns of action against them. The vast majority (98%) of metaphors examined in this article are Hebrew metaphors.

Our study is based on the hypothesis that the use of metaphor in the political discourse of Arab politicians in the State of Israel has unique, identifiable, rhetorical characteristics that have the power to elucidate the ways in which the Palestinian people and Arab-Israelis suffer from the discriminatory action patterns of the Israeli government. Conveying this message through a reliance on metaphor as a rhetorical tool can contribute to the structuring of their message and to social change, reflected in a change for the better of the Israeli government's treatment of the Palestinian people and Arab-Israelis.

The thesis that underlies this book is that Arab politicians do not use metaphors randomly. Instead, their choice of metaphor is intended to serve political ends and to express pointed criticism of the Israeli government for its racist policies against Arab-Israelis and the Palestinian population. Their decision to use certain metaphors rather than others influences how their

audience understands and conceptualizes their messages and forces them to take a stance. For instance, metaphors connected to the historical events of the Holocaust, such as the crematoria (example 10), a metaphorical expression that emphasizes the damage that would result from the loss of tens of thousands of Arab votes if voter participation significantly drops. This metaphorical expression is manipulative: its goal is to rouse Arabs who intended or intend not to vote in the Knesset elections to take their actions seriously and see that it weakens the Arab parties in the Knesset and threatens their existence. In that sense, voting is just as much an existential threat as the Holocaust was for the Jewish people.

Another example of a military metaphor is the metaphor of stoning (example 3) in the sentence "the stoning of the racist, nationalist parties with the *vavs* of the Arab Front (Hadash) Party in the polls." The metaphor of stoning has a particularly negative connotation because execution by stoning was often the punishment for crimes of adultery. This manipulative metaphor transforms the issue of voting into a war of good versus evil and occupied versus occupiers.

We have adopted a cognitive approach in analyzing these and other metaphors. This approach does not rely on random similarities between two objects from different domains but instead on the conceptualization of one domain by means of another. For example, the metaphors discussed above (examples 3 and 10) reframe and reconceptualize the Israeli government's discriminatory policies against Arab-Israelis and the Palestinian population through terms borrowed from the domains of the Holocaust and the military. This new conceptualization serves clear political aims. It is worth noting that the use of Holocaust metaphors is a definitive characteristic of the political discourse of Arab-Israelis; it is very rare to find a Jewish politician who criticizes the policies of the Israeli government in such terms.

Holocaust metaphors reflect a rhetoric of double messages. For example, by using ghettos and crematoria in their metaphors, Arab politicians identify with Jews as the victims of the Holocaust, while at the same time expressing pointed criticism of the policies of the Israeli government against Arab-Israelis and the Palestinian population, as explained in the body of the book.

Metaphors are the essential core of human thought and creativity. Since the language of politics is characterized by metaphorical themes, metaphors are thus a powerful tool for getting to the heart of political thought.

Metaphorical expressions are considered expressions that nourish our worldview, shape our thinking, and, hence, our actual behavior (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 3-6; Thompson 1996: 185: Mio 1997: 117-126; Koller 2012: 25). The examination of the context where metaphorical expressions occur facilitates the understanding of such metaphors and the purpose which it is intended to achieve in that communicative event (Ifeanyichukwu, Kadiri & Ijem 2018: 95-96).

This book applies the cognitive theory of metaphor. One of the most influential works of the semantic cognitive school was George Lakoff and Mark Johnson's groundbreaking work on linguistics, which attracted world-wide attention, establishing the foundation for a cognitive theory of metaphors. Lakoff and Johnson wanted to examine the metaphoric nature of human cognition by focusing on our common, habitual, consensual metaphors. Their work makes clear that metaphors are supremely efficient tools for shaping and creating thoughts. Metaphors frame the world for us. Without metaphors, we cannot really think (Livnat 2014a: 368; Gavriely-Nuri 2011: 56). Metaphorical linguistic usages reflect how we perceive reality (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 3-6; Mio 1997: 117-126; Koller 2012: 25). George Lakoff took this idea a step further and showed that metaphors not only reflect how we see reality, they also influence our perception of it. In January 1991, on the heels of the First Gulf War, he analyzed the United States administration's political discourse and showed how the Bush administration used metaphors to justify going to war. In other words, he demonstrated how metaphor analysis can be critical analysis exposing discourse manipulations and disclosing normally hidden ideologies (Livnat 2014a, Vol. 2: 368-369; Kopytowska 2010; Kopytowska and Baider 2017).

Dalia Gavriely-Nuri (2009: 153-169; 2011: 93), who has studied metaphors in Israeli political discourse, shows how they help to portray war as a normal part of life. Such war-normalizing metaphors aim to naturalize and legitimate the use of military power by creating a systematic analogy between war and objects that are far from the battlefield.[5] For example, the metaphoric phrase "Golda's kitchen" was the popular nickname for the most intimate circle of Prime Minister Golda Meir's advisers.[6] This metaphor

---

[5] See further George Lakoff 1991, pp. 25-32.
[6] There are thos who think that it is possible to see this metaphor as feminist, because of the kitchen's traditional association with women and the fact that the prime

conceals a secretive and undemocratic decision-making process, even about security matters and other central issues. In other words, the "kitchen" metaphor hides what was, in fact, often a "war room" where Israel's burning security matters were decided. According to the critical discourse analysis approach, the use of such metaphors is manipulative, and helps depict war as a normal, mundane, and unsurprising state of being, expected and commonsensical, just like medicine or business.[7] In this way, the metaphor hides the true, terrible, and violent nature of war. Such patterns of discourse, which repeat themselves time and again in the discourse (as expressed by politicians, military leaders, academics, journalists, and internet commentators), help the public accommodate itself to this abnormal situation. In the same way, these metaphors help leaders convince the public of the rationality and necessity of war. For instance, Tony Blair defended his decision to send British soldiers to the Second Gulf War in 2003 by using metaphors of progress—the successful achievement of goals (in the future)—as opposed to metaphors of regression, which reflect the failure to reach goals (in the past). These metaphors reflect the choices faced by the Labor Party and its leader Blair, and thus establish the expected party policy: always go forward. Blair was only willing to accept progress, and thus presents himself as a strong and reliable leader who will not be moved by difficulty or criticism (Semino 2008: 81-85). The metaphoric description of a particular problem or situation reflects the speaker's perceptions of it and establishes his or her preferred solution (Chilton 2004: 202). In this context, it is worth mentioning the rhetorical power of metaphors of movement, which are widespread in political discourse. One example is the metaphor that depicts the European common currency (the Euro) as a train whose cars must move at the same speed and in perfect harmony in order to ensure that it will not derail. This metaphor reflects a specific perspective that sees the need for European governments to adopt the same monetary policy and to act in complete economic harmony in order to ensure the success of the European currency union (Musolff 2004: 30; Charteris-Black 2005: 54-152). Musolff brings examples of manipulative rhetorical baggage roused by means of metaphors. Musolff discusses metaphors that express hostility toward the language of immigrants in Britain, such as the description of roads in British

---

minister at that time was a woman.
[7] See Kopytowska 2010.

cities as streets in Bombay or Karachi, and the description of Coronation Street as having relocated to Pakistan from Britain (Musolff 2019: 257-266).[8]

4.1.1 Classification of Metaphors

Both single-word metaphors and metaphoric phrases were included when selecting metaphors. The metaphors were classified according to the field from which they were taken. The subjects that the speaker wished to address through the metaphors were examined, as were the metaphors' rhetorical characteristics.[9]

4.1.1.1   Military Metaphors

The domain of war has remained one of the popular sources of metaphor in politics and political activities are perceived as war. The domain of war is usually employed metaphorically for all types of human struggle and conflict (Ifeanyichukwu, Kadiri & Ijem 2018: 95-96).

(1) "The Palestinians are forced to contend with the American-Israeli war machine" (Azmi Bishara, from a speech intended to be delivered in the plenum of the Israeli Parliament).

The metaphor "War machine" emphasizes that Israel and the United States prefer to embrace the option of war as a continuous political strategy.

(2) "This government is not searching for an exit from the killing fields, but instead in a witch hunt" (Issam Makhoul, Knesset Protocols, July 4, 2001).

"Killing fields" serves as a metaphor for the many instances of carnage and death. The metaphoric picture is stained dark red, and is thus emotionally loaded and intended to deter violence. "Witch hunt" is a metaphor for exaggerated fear and the right's recoiling from holding any negotiations or connections with the head of the Palestinian Authority.

(3) "And the second is the stoning of the racist, nationalist Zionist parties with the vavs of the Arab Front Party at the polls" (Emile Habibi, "Stone Them with Vavs," March 27, 2006).

---

[8] See further Kopytowska, Grabowski and Woźniak 2015.
[9] See in this context Abadi 1998, pp. 56-67.

The metaphor "stoning" casts a bitter political enemy, meaning the extreme right-wing parties, in a particularly negative light because execution by stoning is generally considered a fit punishment for adultery, and this creates intense feelings among the Arab population and propels them to vote.[10]

(4) "The settlers are a bomb and can endanger the peace process" (Saleh Saleem, Knesset Protocols, December 25, 1995).

Bomb—a metaphor for the danger and threat posed to the peace process by Jewish settlers.

(5) "The state jams the history of the Jewish people down the throats of the Arab education system, but our history is not taught at the same time. Why do they amputate our national history?"

The metaphorical verb "to amputate" signifies the brutality of the state's policy to sever Arab-Israelis from their history and to graft the history of the Jewish people onto them.[11]

(6) "Now they are clearing out (lit. razing) houses there. This delight in destruction will never be satiated, never satisfied" (Abdulmalik Dehamshe, Knesset Protocols, November 20, 2000).

Razing—a metaphor for the brutality of the act of house demolition in the Palestinian territories.

(7) "This law is anti-citizenship, anti-peace, anti-democracy. This is an apartheid law" (Mohammad Barakeh, Knesset Protocols).

(8) "The Expulsion Law that passed tonight in the Knesset, according to which a special majority can expel a member of Knesset if his behavior deviates from what is expected, is a patently anti-democratic law. Member of Knesset Dichter wants to create a smokescreen so that people will talk about this and not about the central issue: the ongoing erosion of the democratic sphere" (Ayman Odeh, *Ynet* news interview, February 29, 2016).

---

[10] Stoning can be seen as a religious ceremony. The stoning of the Devil is part of the annual pilgrimage to the holy land Mecca in Saudi Arabia (Islamic Hajj). During the ritual, Muslim pilgrims throw pebbles at there walls (formerly pillars) called Jamarat in the city of Mina just east of Mecca. It is one of a series of ritual acts that must be performed in the Hajj.

[11] There are those who tend to think that amputation is categorized as a metaphor from the field of health. In this situation, Arabs are comparable to a cancerous growth that needs to be excised.

A smokescreen is a combat tool that uses smoke deliberately released into the air in order to mask the movement, activity, or location of a military force such as ground troops, tanks, aircraft, or ships. This phrase has been borrowed as an idiom for an intentional diversion.

(9) "The government is attempting to pass the Nation-State Law, which invalidates every Arab because of his identity and his affiliation. We are still bleeding from the Jewishness of this state" (Masud Gnaim, Knesset Protocols, November 24, 2014).

The metaphoric verb "bleeding" is a metaphor for discrimination, suffering, and the lack of the full equality enjoyed by Jews. The Nation-State Law can be seen as putting salt in the open wound of the Arab population of the State of Israel.

4.1.1.2   Metaphors Connected to Historical Events

(10) "raising the voter turnout among the Arabs, in order to prevent the incineration of tens of thousands of votes in the crematoria" (Emile Habibi, "Stone Them with Vavs").

Crematoria is a metaphor that emphasizes the magnitude of the damage that could result from the loss of tens of thousands of Arab votes if voter turnout is significantly low.

(11) "A well-oiled machine has overrun the loftiest of human values—the right to life of entire peoples" (Ahmad Tibi, speech given on the anniversary of International Holocaust Remembrance Day, January 27, 2010).

Ahmad Tibi used the phrase "a well-oiled machine" as a metaphor for the brutality of the Nazi regime against the Jews. Ahmad Tibi identifies explicitly with the Jews as the victims of the Holocaust.

(12) "This is the moment when a person has to take off his national or religious hat, shed any difference, and wear just one form (lit. cloak): that of humanity" (Ahmad Tibi, speech given on the anniversary of International Holocaust Remembrance Day, January 1, 2010).

The form ("cloak") of humanity is a metaphor for how people relate to themselves as human beings, removed from politics and religious, racial, and gender considerations. In his references to the Holocaust in examples 11 and 12, Tibi uses keywords that reflect a style of *dugri* speech ("straight

talking" in Hebrew) (Katriel 2016: 747).

(13) "The second demand concerns Ikrit and Biram. While it has been announced in principle that they should be returned, the size of each village has been reduced by 600 *dunam* and each parent can only bring back two children. This means that the families will be broken up and return to ghettos" (Taleb el-Sana, Knesset Protocols, December 25, 1995).

Taleb el-Sana indirectly compares the government's policy toward the residents of Ikrit and Biram to the Nazis' treatment of Jews in the Holocaust. "Ghettos" is a metaphor for the government policy to reduce the area of the villages of Ikrit and Biram and to break up the families of villagers from "Ikrit and Biram," and to limit their movement.

In examples 10–13, Habibi, el-Sana, and Tibi try to construct their ethos through a generally implied identification with the Jewish people as victims of the Holocaust. In order to persuade the universal audience that they identify with what happened to the Jews during the Holocaust, they use words associated with the Holocaust, such as the words "cloak of humanity," "well-oiled machine," "crematoria," and "ghettos." In other words, the fact that they do not deny the Holocaust can rehabilitate their ethos in the eyes of the universal audience and soften their anti-Zionist image, even though this is only hinted at, without having recourse to overt declarations of empathy and identification. The main objective for Habibi and Tibi is not to express their identification with the Jewish audience but to lambast Israel for racism against the Palestinian people and the Arab population in Israel.

Habibi, el-Sana, and Tibi use keywords (topics or commonplaces accepted by the audience) to establish strong feelings of identification in their Jewish audience, while at the same time endowing them with critical content. Their goal is to weaken their Jewish audience's preconceived resistance to their militant anti-Zionist ethos. We should clarify that in using keywords, the speaker aims to connect with the audience and present his subject in a positive and noncontroversial way. For example, it would be ineffective for Habibi, el-Sana, and Tibi to begin by calling their Jewish audience "fascists" or "racists." The metaphors in examples 10–13 show that Habibi, el-Sana, and Tibi have a dual message: empathy and identification with Jews as victims of the Holocaust, coupled with harsh criticism for