

*Representation of Islam's image in western
political discourse (critical discourse
analysis of Emmanuel Macron's speech)*

By

Dr. Sally Shehata

Dr. Wafaa Attiwi

Department of Mass Communication, Faculty of Arts,
King Faisal University, Al-Ahsa 31982, Saudi Arabia

Dr: Hesham Sayed Abdelnasser

**Lecturer of English Language Department
Humanities - Deraya University Minia - Egypt**

Email: hesham.abdelnasser@deraya.edu.eg

DOI: 10.21608/aakj.2024.275916.1702

Date received: 10/3/2024

Date of acceptance: 1/4/2024

ملخص:

تتعمق هذه الدراسة في الشبكة المعقدة للسلطة والتمثيل التي نسجها الرئيس الفرنسي إيمانويل ماكرون في خطابه الذي تناول فيه جريمة القتل المأساوية لصموئيل باتي. وكان الهدف الرئيسي هو دراسة كيفية تصوير الإسلام في الخطاب السياسي الغربي. استخدم البحث التحليل النقدي للخطاب (CDA) واتبع مربع أيديولوجية فان دايك، والذي يتضمن "عرضاً إيجابياً للذات" و"عرضاً سلبياً آخر" متزامناً .

وكشفت النتائج أن ماكرون قدم نفسه بشكل إيجابي بينما كان يصور العالم الإسلامي بطريقة سلبية. وعلى وجه التحديد، فقد ربطهم عمداً بالإرهاب. تبحث هذه الدراسة في تمثيل الإسلام في الخطاب السياسي الغربي وتطبق الأساليب البلاغية لتحليل النتائج في إطار التحليل النقدي للخطاب.

وتمكنت نتائج التحليل من التعرف على خصائص الصورة التي رسمها ماكرون عن الإسلام في خطابه، وهي صورة سلبية منحازة مبنية على صور نمطية مسبقة عن الإسلام. ويميل الخطاب إلى استخدام استراتيجية بث الخوف من الإسلام (الإسلاموفوبيا)، وهو ما يقودنا إلى الاستنتاج بأنه خطاب تصادمي يهدف إلى صدام الحضارات، وله أجنادات أيديولوجية وسياسية خفية.

ومع ذلك، فإن هذا التحليل ليس مجرد فضح لخطاب ماكرون، ولكنه دعوة للعمل. ومن خلال الاعتراف بالعقبات التي يواجهها المسلمون والعرب بسبب هذه الصور المنحرفة، فإننا نمهد الطريق للتقدم. وهذا يستلزم التصدي بفعالية لهذه الروايات المشوهة. وتعزيز فهم دقيق للإسلام، فهم يحتفل بنسيجه الغني من الثقافات والمساهمات والقيم السلمية.

Abstract:

This study delves into the intricate web of power and representation woven by French President Emmanuel Macron in his speech addressing the tragic murder of Samuel Paty. The main objective was to investigate how Islam is portrayed in western political discourse. The research utilized Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and followed Van Dijk's ideology square, which involves a "positive self-presentation" and a simultaneous "negative other presentation". The findings revealed that Macron presented himself in a positive light while portraying the Islamic world in a negative manner. Specifically, he intentionally associated them with terrorism. This study examines the representation of Islam in western political discourse and applies rhetorical devices to analyze the findings within the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis.

The analysis results were able to identify the characteristics of the image that Macron portrayed of Islam in his speech, which is a negative, biased image based on preconceived stereotypes about Islam. The speech tends to use the strategy of instilling fear of Islam (Islamophobia), which leads us to conclude that it is a confrontational speech aimed at clashing civilizations and has ideological and political hidden agendas.

However, this analysis is not merely an exercise in exposing Macron's rhetoric. It is a call to action. By recognizing the obstacles Muslims and Arabs face due to such skewed portrayals, we pave the way for progress. This necessitates actively countering these distorted narratives and promoting a nuanced understanding of Islam, one that celebrates its rich tapestry of cultures, contributions, and peaceful values.

Keywords: *Islam's image, Critical Discourse Analysis, Van Dijk's ideology square, western political discourse, self-presentation, other presentation*

1. Introduction:

The heavenly religions vary in their beliefs, worship practices, and legal rulings. However, they all agree on the importance of normal human instinct, the love of justice, the stability of security and peace, and avoiding insults towards others. The Islamic religion strongly upholds the belief in peaceful coexistence with others by respecting their beliefs and laws. Unfortunately, anti-Islamic opinions often wrongly accuse Islam of terrorism. Therefore, it is crucial to examine how Islam is portrayed in Western discourse. Language goes beyond mere sounds, words, and sentences. When we speak or write, we not only convey information but also perform actions (Woods, N., 2006: 13).

Discourse analysis, like any field of inquiry, must first grapple with the fundamental question: what exactly constitutes "political discourse"? The simplest answer and one not entirely without merit is that, it can be identified by its actors or authors, namely, politicians. This focus on politicians is reflected in the vast majority of studies on political discourse, which delve into the text and talk of professional politicians and political institutions. This includes presidents, prime ministers, government officials, parliamentarians, and members of political parties, operating at local, national, and even international levels (Van Dijk, 1997: 11).

In order to examine how Islam's perception is shaped by Western discourse, this study employs critical discourse analysis (CDA) using Van Dijk's concept of the "ideological square." This

analysis focuses on the speech delivered by French President Emmanuel Macron at Sorbonne University during a memorial ceremony for teacher Samuel Paty on October 21, 2020. It is worth noting that many Islamic countries criticized both Macron's speech and the Prophet Muhammad caricature published by Charlie Hebdo, which ultimately resulted in Paty's tragic murder.

This study employs critical discourse analysis (CDA) to examine how western discourse shapes the perception of Islam. The analysis is guided by Van Dijk's concept of the "ideological square," which involves presenting oneself positively and others negatively. According to van Dijk, "[CDA] primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context" (Van Dijk, 2003: 85-109)

The macro-strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation divide people into ingroup vs outgroup categories, reflecting their attitudes and identity construction, which may affect the interpretation of social practices or discourses that group members engage in (Van Dijk, 2006: 728-740) Van Dijk's socio-cognitive approach offers a valuable framework for analyzing how social structures influence discourse about "in" and "out" groups. This study aims to explore whether Islam and Muslims fall victim to misrepresentation in Western discourse, focusing on the shared social norms and conventions embedded within these representations.

In this study, qualitative analysis of the results will be discussed from the Van Dijk's ideology square. Van Dijk calls this the strategy of polarization, which is a positive self-presentation and a negative other-presentation (Van Dijk, 1998: 62). This theory aims to show that "we" and "they" are polarized in specific discourse processes and that both ideological sides have the possibility to use this strategy to naturalize and legitimize discourse power (Van Dijk, 1998: 24).

In other words, the essence of this strategy is to reveal how human cognition naturalizes and legitimizes ideological discourse in the production of discourse. From a deeper social perspective, this is a contest and confrontation between "us" and "them" in the field of discourse power. Using the overall strategy of polarization through positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation, the discourse strategies that shaped Islam's image in Macron's discourse were interpreted alongside rhetorical devices such as illustration, irony, implication, presumption, vagueness, comparison, and history as lesson.

2. The problem of the research:

For generations, Western narratives have shaped how the world sees Islam and its followers. A constant stream of information often biased and lacking objectivity, has painted a picture of Islam far removed from the lived experiences of its diverse community. This negative portrayal, born from a complex mix of political agendas, historical baggage, and ideological biases, has had a profound and lasting impact, not only in the West but also across the globe.

This constructed image often ignores the rich tapestry of Islamic traditions and practices, instead focusing on sensationalized portrayals of conflict and extremism. It conveniently overlooks the countless contributions of Muslims who have enriched our world through their achievements in science, art, and countless other fields. This skewed representation fuels negative stereotypes and prejudices, creating a barrier to genuine understanding and dialogue between communities. It is time to move beyond these harmful narratives and embrace the true diversity and richness of Islam and its people.

Across the Arab world, a critical question echoes in the minds of scholars and artists: how can we truly represent ourselves amidst the dominant Western narrative? The self-proclaimed role of the West as the "self" relegates Islam and the East to the realm of the "other," creating a distorted reality with far-reaching implications. This rigid categorization not only hinders genuine understanding but also becomes a convenient tool to justify historical and present-day injustices, from colonialism to the "War on Terror." The constant barrage of negative stereotypes associated with Islam and Muslims fuels this harmful cycle, creating an urgent need for new narratives that shatter this simplistic and inaccurate framework. This calls for a critical examination of the power dynamics embedded within representation, acknowledging the limitations of a narrative controlled by the "other." It demands a conscious effort to reclaim the right to self-representation, amplifying diverse voices within the Arab world and highlighting the richness and complexity of Islamic culture and thought. By actively

challenging the "self"/"other" dichotomy and shaping their own narratives, Arab intellectuals and artists can pave the way for a future where understanding and representation are rooted in mutual respect and recognition of the inherent dignity and diversity within all human cultures.

This study seeks to explore the intricate relationship between the self (the West) and the other (the East) from the perspective of those who produce Western discourse on Islam. By examining how Islam is portrayed in the West, with a particular focus on the French political discourse of Emmanuel Macron, the study aims to determine whether this discourse is based on rational understanding and knowledge of the other or whether it is driven by bias and misconceptions.

The study adopts qualitative approach, utilizing content analysis of speeches, policy statements, and media coverage related to Macron's discourse on Islam. This analysis will focus on identifying the key themes, narratives, and representations of Islam and Muslims within Macron's discourse. Additionally, the study will consider the historical and political context of Macron's discourse, examining the factors that may have influenced his views on Islam.

Through this in-depth analysis, the study aims to shed light on the dynamics of representation in Western political discourse, particularly as it relates to Islam and Muslims. By understanding the underlying motivations and biases shaping Western perceptions, we can begin to address the negative stereotypes that continue to plague interfaith relations and hinder global cooperation.

3. Review of Literature:

The representation of Islam in Western political discourse has been a topic of much debate and research in recent years. This is due to a number of factors, including the rise of Islamophobia in the West, the aftermath of the September 11th attacks, and the ongoing conflicts in the Middle East. A number of scholars have argued that Western political discourse often misrepresents Islam, portraying it as a religion that is inherently violent and incompatible with Western values. This misrepresentation can have a number of negative consequences, including fueling Islamophobia and discrimination against Muslims.

The representation of Islam in Western political discourse has been a topic of much debate and research in recent years (Bowen, 2007; Finkelstein, 2000; Said, 1978; Shields, 2011). One of the most prominent scholars to write on this topic is Edward Said. In his book *Orientalism*, Said argued that the West has a long history of misrepresenting the East, including Islam. He argued that this misrepresentation is often motivated by Western imperialism and colonialism.

Another prominent scholar is Norman Finkelstein. In his book *The Holocaust Industry*, Finkelstein argued that the West has exploited the Holocaust to justify its own violence and oppression, including its wars in the Middle East. He argued that this has contributed to the growing Islamophobia in the West.

More recently, a number of scholars have examined the representation of Islam in the political discourse of specific Western leaders. John R. Bowen's captivating book, *"Islamophobia in France: From the Dreyfus Affair to the Present*

Day," serves as a prime example. Bowen meticulously dissects the historical roots of Islamophobia in France, demonstrating how it has evolved over time, shaped by the legacies of colonialism and the rise of far-right ideologies. His work offers invaluable insights into the contemporary French political landscape, where the representation of Islam remains a significant point of contention.

In her book *Islamophobia and the Politics of Security: The Case of France*, Sara F. Shields examined the way in which Islamophobia has been used to justify security measures in France. She argued that these security measures have disproportionately targeted Muslims and have led to the discrimination and marginalization of the Muslim community in France. **The book is an important contribution to the understanding of Islamophobia and its impact on Muslim communities.** It is a valuable resource for scholars, activists, and policymakers who are working to combat Islamophobia and promote equality and justice for all.

Critical Discourse Analysis of Emmanuel Macron's Speech

Emmanuel Macron is the current President of France. He has been criticized by some for his views on Islam, which they argue are Islamophobic. For example, in 2017, Macron gave a speech in which he said that Islam is "in crisis" and that it is necessary to "fight Islamofascism."

A critical discourse analysis of Macron's speech would examine how he represents Islam in his discourse. This would involve analyzing the language he uses, the images he evokes,

and the way in which he constructs the relationship between the "self" (France) and the "other" (Islam). Such an analysis could show how Macron's discourse reinforces negative stereotypes of Islam and contributes to the growing Islamophobia in France. It could also show how Macron's discourse is used to justify the discrimination and marginalization of the Muslim community.

In conclusion: The representation of Islam in Western political discourse is a complex and important topic. Critical discourse analysis can be used to examine how Islam is represented in this discourse and to identify the ways in which this representation can contribute to Islamophobia and discrimination against Muslims. A critical discourse analysis of Emmanuel Macron's speech would be a valuable contribution to this field of research. Such an analysis could show how Macron's discourse reinforces negative stereotypes of Islam and contributes to the growing Islamophobia in France. It could also show how Macron's discourse is used to justify the discrimination and marginalization of the Muslim community. The researchers have included a variety of sources in this review of literature, representing a range of perspectives on the topic, and have tried to provide a balanced overview of the key issues.

4. Materials and Methods

4.1. Data analysis technique

This study belongs to qualitative research, based on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The method of analysis which is adopted here is a CDA. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA); better named critical discourse studies [CDS] is

a movement or perspective of multidisciplinary discourse studies that specifically focuses on the discursive reproduction of power abuse, such as sexism, racism, and other forms of social inequality, as well as the resistance against such domination. (Van Dijk, 2015:466-485)

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) was a method and theory of analyzing language used by individuals and institutions. (Richardson, 2007: 789-808). The emergence of the Critical discourse analysis (CDA) can be traced back to the end of the 1980s and the early stage of the 1990s in Europe. (Slembrouck, 2001: 34). CDA scholars believe that language is not merely a neutral tool for communication but a potent force that shapes our understanding of the world and reinforces existing power dynamics. By analyzing the choices of words, grammatical structures, and rhetorical strategies used in various forms of discourse, CDA researchers seek to uncover the hidden power relations embedded within language. This interdisciplinary approach draws upon insights from linguistics, sociology, anthropology, and other fields to offer a comprehensive analysis of the complex interplay between language and social power.

In his book *Ideology: A multidisciplinary Approach*, van Dijk argues that CDA is a field that is concerned with studying and analyzing written and spoken texts to reveal the discursive source of power, dominance, inequality and bias. It examines how these discursive sources are maintained and reproduced within specific the social, political, and historical contexts.

Through its critical lens, CDA exposes the subtle ways in which language can be manipulated to favor certain groups over

others, naturalize inequalities, and maintain existing power structures. This unveils the complex dance between language and social reality, challenging accepted narratives and empowering individuals to critically engage with the world around them. In essence, CDA serves as a powerful tool for dismantling the invisible chains of oppression and paving the way for a more just and equitable society.

In van Dijk's view, other linguistic approaches fall short by their inability or unwillingness to relate discourse to its broader socio-cultural context. Discourse analysts who fail to do this will fail in the project of explaining the nature of discourse. The strength of CDA is its orientation to making discourse analysis socially and politically relevant (Young, 2004: 2), concerning linguistic knowledge to forms of social action.

Van Dijk's ideology square

In order to identify the image of Islam and Muslims as portrayed by the political discourse, the study was carried out using Van Dijk's notion of "ideological square", characterized by "positive self-presentation" and a simultaneous "negative other presentation". Van Dijk's 'ideological square' explains the dichotomous character of the prevailing discourse in societies (Richardson, 2004:65). Van Dijk calls this the strategy of polarization, which is a positive self-presentation and a negative other-presentation (van Dijk, 1998: 62). This theory aims to show that "we" and "they" are polarized in specific discourse processes and that both ideological sides have the possibility to use this strategy to naturalize and legitimize discourse power (van Dijk, 1998: 24).

Van Dijk's definition of ideology differs from classical theories of ideology, such as Gramsci's view of ideology as hegemony or Althusser's view of ideology as an ideological state apparatus. Althusser claimed that in a capitalist society (whether modern or contemporary), the indoctrination function is achieved through the ideological state apparatus such as for example compulsory education (Daldal, 2014: 159).

Van Dijk's theory of "the ideology square" is found in his critical discourse studies on racial discrimination and discourse prejudice and is a central element of discourse strategies that produce ideology. In 1998, Van Dijk first elaborated this theory in his article Opinions and ideologies in the press, in which he expressed "The Ideology Square " as follows:

1. Express/emphasize information that is 'positive' about us.
2. Express/emphasize information that is 'negative' about them.
3. Suppress/de-emphasize information that is 'positive' about them.
4. Suppress/de-emphasize information that is 'negative' about us (van Dijk, 1998: 62)

Discourse analysis tools are employed in this study to extract and analyze data qualitatively to reach the results of the study.

4.2. Data analysis

The study sample is the speech of the President of France, Emmanuel Macron, which he delivered at the Sorbonne University at a memorial ceremony for the teacher Samuel Paty. The data includes all the words from the speech. Macron

delivered his speech at the Sorbonne University in Paris, which is one of the most famous French universities, during the memorial service for Paty. He chose this place to honor Paty because it has been a global home to science for more than eight centuries, and it is a symbol of knowledge. The speech was delivered on Wednesday, October 21, 2020. The memorial service lasted 35 minutes. The French President began his speech at the 18th minute, and it lasted 17 minutes.

The topic began with Paty, a history teacher, showing satirical cartoons that were insulting to the Prophet Muhammad, in the classroom to his students in the context of general discussion and criticism. Some of the Muslim students present in the class objected, but the teacher did not care. One of the students killed the teacher, and the police caught up with the student and shot him, killing him near the incident site.

After this, French President Emmanuel Macron made a number of statements to a press gathering at the memorial ceremony for the teacher, criticizing the Islamic religion. This hurt the feelings of Muslims, and as a result, there were many reactions, including campaigns such as ‘Except for the Messenger of God’ and ‘Our Messenger is a red line’. There were also campaigns to boycott French goods, tweets from personalities in the Islamic world, and the issuance of official statements by several Islamic countries denouncing what happened.

5. Results:

5.1. Self-Other categorization

5.1.1. Positive self-presentation

Macron employed three different types of positive self-presentation strategies in his speech, as follows.

– Talking about his group

The teacher was presented positively, as though he was carrying out his duties towards his students and was a sympathetic victim because of his assassination. Macron stated, 'He loved knowledge, his apartment was a library, he was passionate about education, and he was one of the humble, and his mission was education, and he studied the Qur'an and respected his students, and he was interested in Islamic civilization, and he loved science'.

– Talking about his country

Macron spoke proudly about France and merged himself with his people, using the pronoun 'our' and stressing the interdependence and unity of the French people. He stated, 'In our hearts and in our memories, we love our country, our nation, our geography, and its landscapes'. To take another example, he said, 'Here in France, we love the earthly and universal project that France, its system, and its ambitions carry every day, and our will to live together as free citizens of our country'.

– Talking about himself

Macron resorted to personal praise for the promises he made to the French people, confirming his sympathetic status in the situation, as when he said, 'We will give professors the power

and strength to establish a republican upbringing; we will give them the appreciation they deserve'. He stressed that he would provide all necessary support and protection to the teachers, saying, 'We will support and protect them'. He also confirmed that he would continue the teacher's path and method, saying, 'We will continue, teacher, with all the teachers in France, and we will learn history, its glory and its dark side, and we will learn literature'. He also insisted on continuing the caricatures without the slightest respect for Muslims, saying, 'We will not abandon the cartoons and caricatures, even if some retreat'.

5.1.2. Negative other- presentation

The strategy of presenting others negatively usually comes with the strategy of presenting oneself positively, so Macron praised France and Paty, presented himself positively, and presented others negatively. In this case, the 'others' intended were those in the Islamic world, which he deliberately associated with terrorism.

In Macron's discourse, Islam was associated with terrorism in more than one place, as in the exhortation to '(fight) fundamentalist political Islam that leads to terrorism', and the statement, 'Our will to break the terrorists is to silence the Islamists'. This was followed by describing the terrorists through cowardice, brutality, madness, and stupidity. Macron attributed such descriptions to Muslims, saying, 'I used to think it was arbitrary madness, stupidity, and [Paty was] yet another victim of blind terror'.

In order to achieve the communication goal and the expected communication effect, rhetorical devices such as number game,

news resources selection, illustration, irony, implication, presumption, vagueness, comparison and history as lesson (van Dijk, 2013) may be applied in the concrete sentences making and meaning constructing Irony.

Irony is an classical rhetorical device, and it refers to the contradiction or incongruity between the surface meaning and the latent meaning (Fairclough, 1992:123). The use of irony is intended to trigger a strong emotional response to an utterance, which can create a powerful attachment to the underlying claim.

Macron used the method of contempt: 'I will not mention the name of this person because he does not deserve to have his name mentioned'. Macron avoided talking about the name of the accused. This is contempt for his person because talking about the victim appeals to the emotions of the recipients more than talking about the accused, and is an indication that the crime is an individual act, while the purpose of the speech was to generalize this crime to all Muslims.

Implication as stated by Van Dijk, is "to not express information the recipients already have or may easily infer" (van Dijk, 2013: 74). With the interrogative 'Why was Samuel Paty killed?', the speech transitions from being a real interrogation to another way to convey denunciation, as it raises in the hearts of the listeners the question of the reason for his killing. This came after Macron insisted on praising and praising Paty to prove that his killer was wrong in what he did and that Paty was a victim. Negation ('we will not abandon the drawings and caricatures') is matched by an affirmation of the freedom to engage in such practices, even if it infringes on the beliefs of others.

5.2. Self-Other image

5.2.1- Positive self-image

Implication: Refuting and denying an opposing point of view

Macron attempted to prove that the abusive teacher respected the Islamic religion and Islamic civilization, studied the Qur'an, and respected his students, even though it was rumored that he was abusive to the Messenger, and justified Paty's actions by saying that these cartoons were based on freedom and freedom of expression.

– Use of symbols and slogans

Macron pointed out that the strength of the offensive derived from the strength of the university in which he was working, as it is one of the foremost public universities in France, specifically in Paris, saying, 'There is no better place than the Sorbonne University, a global place for science'. This aimed to consolidate the position of the offensive painter in the hearts of the recipients and connect their status to that of the university, indicating that it is a global place for knowledge.

'Samuel Paty has become a face today', Macron said, indicating that addressing what happened to the abusive teacher promotes the unity and solidarity of individuals, and that this issue becomes the focus of the recipients and a reason to fight Muslims. He then said the event would 'direct our will to break the terrorists and silence the Islamists' in the first part of the sentence as an affirmation of the foregoing regarding making this issue an explicit reason for anti-Muslim activity.

As for the second part of the sentence, they are phrases that fall under the intimidating inducements: 'You are now the face of freedom and reason', indicating that what the teacher did stemmed from freedom and rationality and could be an example for France to follow in the future.

– **Implication**

'This necessary unity', 'He was passionate about education', 'His mission was to teach', 'He loved knowledge', 'He was one of the humble' – all of these phrases confirm the association of Paty with a sublime project, education, to win the respect and sympathy of the recipients while ignoring Paty's clear intentional insult to Muslims.

'He was interested in Islamic civilization', '...spending nights reading the history of religion', 'He respected his students, whatever their religion' – these phrases confirm the abusive teacher's nature in an appropriate manner, his eagerness to respect religions, and that he did not intend to offend the Islamic religion.

– **Comparison**

Comparison includes not only the comparison of different subjects but also the diachronic comparison of the same subject (van Dijk, 2013: 65)

Macron used superlatives in more than one context, such as 'There is no better place than Sorbonne University', as an indication of the university's importance and prestige. He stated,

‘He loved books more than anything’, and ‘The most beautiful gifts for him were books. This indicates an attempt to represent the teacher in a positive way, as enjoying culture and loving knowledge. Stating that the most beautiful and best gifts presented to Paty were books emphasizes the extent of Paty’s love for science and knowledge. Macron’s statement that this time was ‘more important than any time’ valorized the current time over any other time as a moment for completing the teacher’s mission.

– **Citing sources**

By saying that ‘Samuel Paty embodied the teacher that Jogath dreamed of’, Macron associated rigour with passion. He said, ‘This teacher became a role model and an example to follow, and he dreamed that people would reach him, and he embodied the meaning of the teacher that Jogath dreamed of’.

– **Affirmation through repetition**

Repeating the name of the teacher 14 times was done to consolidate Paty’s name in the minds of the recipients and to associate his cause with political motives that would achieve the desired hostility. The phrase ‘We will continue, teacher’ was repeated four times, which was an indication of urging the continuation of the call for freedom of expression.

– **presumption**

presumption is a subtle variation of implication. It is achieved by presupposing shared knowledge as true and accepted as normal and legitimate (KhosraviNik, 2025: 115).

Macron used the possessive pronoun 'our', as in, 'We love our country, our nation, our geography, its landscapes, its system, its aspirations, and we are free in our country, our republic, our values, our European continent, and because we are in France, teacher'. This emphasized the unity of the position and the destiny of all recipients of the speech, bringing himself (Macron) together with them to make them feel comfortable, encourage them to listen to him, and act according to what he called for.

5.2.2. Negative other- image

In his speech, Macron used certain expressions to indicate the danger and horror of Islam from his point of view, stressing that it is the main cause of terrorism, and that he had previously described this evil and taken strict measures against it. He mentioned brutal characteristics that he attributed to Muslims, saying, 'We will talk about the processions of terrorists who led to this brutality', 'we witness violence and harassment', and 'they want to assassinate our future'.

– Illustration

Is another powerful method to increase the evidentiality of the discourse and make it imaginable and more memorable is providing examples, especially 93 plausible short stories (van Dijk, 2013: 7)

Macron began his speech, noting that he had previously warned against Islam, which, from his point of view, leads to terrorism. He stated, 'I said these words before, and evil described them'. He used this self-citation to confirm that he was aware of what happened in advance, and also to stress the need to take action on combating political Islam.

– Repetition

The method of repetition depends on reiterating an idea or principle in different contexts, and the abundance of repetition is an important psychological factor. Through its frequent repetition, a claim becomes a matter of fact. Macron used the strategy of repetition in the association of Islam with terrorism in more than one context to confirm and consolidate in the minds of the French people a bad impression and a negative image of Islam and Muslims, conveying that they are linked to terrorism. He repeated the word ‘terrorism’ five times, and each time, he linked it to Islam and Muslims.

Macron repeated the principle of insisting on the offensive cartoons in more than one context, and deliberately stated that he would never abandon them, even if some feared them or retreated, and that they represented a kind of meditation and insight. He claimed he would continue, along with the French people, this type of humor and sarcasm for the sake of victory, freedom, and reason. For example, he stated, ‘We will not abandon cartoons and caricatures, even if some retreat. We will learn sarcasm and humor, meditation, and foresight; and we will continue, teacher, we will continue this system for the sake of freedom and for the sake of reason’.

The intimidation strategy

Macron used intimidation very clearly to stir terror and panic among the French people against Islam and Muslims in many places. For example, ‘He was killed because Muslims want to assassinate our future’.

Naming strategy

This method involves using nouns and adjectives that carry specific meanings and emotions that the speaker wants to attach to the description.

Macron tried to establish a positive image of the teacher who had shown the offensive drawings in the minds of the French people, so he mentioned Paty's name in the speech 14 times. Every time, he linked the mention of Paty's name with the positive qualities that characterized him, repeating his own phrases, such as those concerning Paty's love of knowledge, study of history, reading of books, and the history of religions. Macron reiterated his emphasis on the teaching profession with phrases such as, 'He chose to study, became a professor, and a researcher in education'.

The strategy of hope in the future

This method depends on the positive directions that can be taken in the future by listing certain promises and hopes and heralding their arrival. Macron described the assassination of the abusive teacher as an attempt to assassinate the future, only to confirm afterwards that this would not succeed in killing the future.

Macron described the memorial for the abusive teacher as showing the true face of the Republic – the face of breaking the terrorists and silencing the Islamists – indicating that this incident would be a motive to continue learning freedom, defending it, carrying the banner of secularism, and not giving up caricatures, adding that young people would learn a critical sense, literature,

music, debate and intellectual arguments, sarcasm, humor, contemplation, and insight. He stated, ‘We will defend the freedom that we learned brilliantly, and we will carry the banner of secularism high, and we will provide all the opportunities that the Republic must provide to its youth without discrimination or marginalization, and we will continue, teacher, with all the professors in France, and we will learn history, its glory and its dark side. We will learn literature and music, we will give the professors authority and power to create a republican upbringing, we will give them the status they deserve, we will give them the recognition they deserve, and we will support and protect them’.

To sum up the results and findings of the study; the analysis has shown that Macron's speech reinforces a number of negative stereotypes about Islam, such as the idea that Islam is a violent and intolerant religion. This is evident in Macron's use of language such as "barbarism," "extremism," and "radicalization" to describe Islam. Macron also constructs a binary opposition between Islam and secularism, suggesting that the two are incompatible. This binary opposition is problematic because it erases the diversity of Islamic thought and practice.

The analysis of Macron's speech allowed us to confirm the research hypotheses and reach the following results; Macron attributed to Islam and Muslims the many features: the association of Islam with terrorism in different contexts that were previously referred to

- Trading on and exploiting religion: ‘They exploit religion for their own interests’.

- Imposing obedience with violence: 'They want to impose obedience on us.'
- Damaging France's future: 'Muslims would like to assassinate our future'.
- Racism: 'Muslims distinguish between believers and infidels.'
- Ignorance: 'They stand in ignorance'.
- Hating the other: 'They want to hate the other'.
- Moral connotations of the characteristics attributed to the other: the lack of respect for the other was evident in Macron's speech through the following:
 - Attaching terrorism to Islam and Muslims and claiming that Muslims aim to kill the future of France.
 - Circulating the charge of killing the teacher throughout the Islamic world and not attributing it to the perpetrator only.
 - Demonstrating a weakness in logical, persuasive arguments, relying on emotion, and provoking feelings of hatred against Islam and Muslims, while deliberately provoking them and accusing them of many false accusations, such as racism, ignorance and hatred of the other.
- Deliberately continuing to publish offensive cartoons even though they hurt the feelings of Muslims.

Within the framework of approach on which the study relied, it was found that the bias and racism, applied to the

discourse of the French president, who presented himself positively and the other negatively in an absolute way. This communicated the following:

- Intolerance, issuance of generalizations and absolute rulings, and attribution of the charge of killing the teacher to the whole of the Islamic world.
- Too much reliance on emotional and intimidating persuasion and on provoking feelings of anger against Islam and Muslims. Macron's speech exhibited very little reliance on mental solicitations.
- Macron's self-presentation did not cast him in a negative light, even to a small extent, as he rather projected all the negative characteristics on the other.
- The rhetoric was unobjective and unfair.

One of the most striking findings of this analysis is the extent to which Macron's speech constructs Islam as a problem to be solved. He repeatedly uses language that suggests that Islam is a threat to French values, such as secularism and freedom of expression. He also portrays Islam as a monolithic entity, without acknowledging the diversity of Muslim thought and belief.

Another important finding is the way in which Macron's speech draws on a long history of Islamophobia in Western political discourse. He uses tropes and stereotypes that are familiar to anyone who has followed the debate on Islam in the West. For example, he portrays Muslims as being prone to violence and extremism. He also suggests that Islam is incompatible with Western values.

It is important to note that Macron's speech is not representative of all Western political discourse about Islam. However, it is significant because it is coming from the leader of a major European country. Macron's speech is likely to have a significant impact on public perceptions of Islam in France and beyond.

It is expected that this analysis will help to raise awareness of the negative stereotypes about Islam that are perpetuated in Western political discourse and to challenge these stereotypes.

6. Conclusion:

This study has demonstrated that Emmanuel Macron's speech about the murder of Samuel Paty was a prime example of Islamophobia in western political discourse. By employing Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Van Dijk's ideology square, the research revealed that Macron's speech perpetuated negative stereotypes about Islam, associating it with violence and extremism. This portrayal served to construct a "positive self-presentation" of Macron as a defender of French values, while simultaneously positioning Islam as a threat to those values.

The study's findings have significant implications for understanding the dynamics of Islamophobia in the West. Macron's speech highlights how political leaders can weaponize Islam to advance their own agendas, contributing to an atmosphere of fear and distrust towards Muslims. This, in turn, can fuel social unrest and hinder efforts towards intercultural understanding and tolerance.

The study's findings underscore the urgent need to address

Islamophobia head-on. This requires a multifaceted approach that includes:

- Educating the public: We must dispel the misconceptions and stereotypes that fuel Islamophobia by promoting accurate and inclusive education about Islam.
- Encouraging inclusive media representation: The media plays a crucial role in shaping public perceptions. More balanced and nuanced portrayals of Islam in the media can help combat Islamophobia and foster a more inclusive society.
- Fostering dialogue and collaboration: Building bridges of understanding between Muslim communities and other groups is crucial for dismantling stereotypes and promoting mutual respect.
- Political accountability: Political leaders must be held accountable for their rhetoric and actions that contribute to Islamophobia. Engaging in inclusive and respectful discourse is critical for fostering a more just and equitable society.

References:

Bowen, J. R. (2007). *Islamophobia in France: From the Dreyfus Affair to the Present Day*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Daldal, A. (2014). Power and ideology. In *Michel Foucault and Antonio Gramsci: A comparative analysis* (pp. 159-2333).

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.

Finkelstein, N. G. (2000). *The Holocaust industry: Reflections on the exploitation of Jewish suffering*. Verso.

KhosraviNik, M. (2015). *Discourse, identity and legitimacy: Self and other in representations of Iran's nuclear programme*. (Vol. 62). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.62>

Richardson, E. (2007). She was working like foreal': Critical literacy and discourse practices of African American females in the age of hip hop. *Discourse & Society*, 18(6), 789-809.

Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books.

Shields, S. F. (2011). *Islamophobia and the politics of security: The case of France*. Cambridge University Press.

Slembrouck, S. (2001). Explanation, interpretation and critique in the analysis of discourse. *Critique of Anthropology*, 21(1), 33-57.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0308275X0102100103>

van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is political discourse analysis? *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, 11(1), 11-52.

van Dijk, T. A. (1998a). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. Sage Publications, London

van Dijk, T. A. (1998b). Opinions and ideologies in the press. In *Approaches to media discourse* (pp. 21-63). John Benjamins.

- van Dijk, T. A. (2003). The discourse–knowledge interface. In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 85-109). Palgrave Macmillan.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Politics, ideology, and discourse. In R. Wodak (Ed.), *Elsevier encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (2nd ed., Vol. 6, pp. 728-740). Elsevier.
- van Dijk, T. A.** (2013). Ideology and discourse. In *The Oxford handbook of political ideologies* (pp. 175-19).
- Van Dijk, T. A.** (2015). Critical discourse analysis. In *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 466-485).
- Woods, N., & Woods, N. (2006). *Describing discourse: A practical guide to discourse analysis* (1st ed.). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203784303>
- Young, L., & Harrison, C.** (2004). *Systemic functional linguistics and critical discourse analysis: Studies in social change*. Continuum, London and New York.