Degrees of Implicitness in the Expression of Ideology:

Freedom of Expression vs. Racism in the Prophet Cartoon Controversy

by Dr. *Akila Sellami Baklouti, Professor of Humanities*

Abstract

This paper argues that a piece of discourse may be multi-ideological (i.e. convey more than one ideology) and that different ideologies may be expressed with different degrees of implicitness. Focusing on anti-Muslimism as a form of racist ideology, the hypothesis posed in the first part of this work is that this ideology tends to be implicitly conveyed in public discourse. This hypothesis is empirically tested in the second part of the paper where a quantitative discourse analytic approach to a sampled corpus of opinion texts published online during the controversy over the Muslim Prophet Cartoons (September 2005-February 2006) shows that the writers of the texts apparently defend the freedom of speech while they implicitly pass on a racist anti-Muslim ideology.

Key Words: *Cartoons, Racist ideology, Freedom of speech, Us, Them, Multi-ideological, Implicit, Explicit, Discourse analysis, Quantitative Approach.*

0.   Introduction

When stating that "the word is the fundamental object of the study of ideologies", Vološinov (1929, cited in de Beaugrande, 1999: 259) stressed the importance of the linguistic expression of ideology. In fact, ideologies are made explicit in discourse through linguistic expression as people use language to express their ideas and thoughts. There are however different degrees of explicitness and this paper argues that ideologies may be more or less implicitly conveyed in discourse. The first part of the paper starts with a reminder of the definition of ideology and its relation to discourse, elaborating on the multi-ideological dimension of a given text and on the degrees of implicitness in the expression of ideology. Then, it deals with racism as an example of an ideology that tends to be implicitly conveyed in discourse with a focus on anti-Muslimism as a form of racism and on the role of the media in reproducing it. In the second part of the paper, these arguments are tested for validation studying a sampled corpus of opinion texts published online after some cartoons of the Muslim Prophet Mohamed had been published by the Danish newspaper Jyllands-Posten and re-published by some other European newspapers. The empirical study tries to show that, though apparently defending the freedom of expression, the corpus displays a more or less implicit racist anti-Muslim ideological structure conveyed by the depiction of the opposition between two entities 'us' and 'them' and their deeds.

1.   Ideology and discourse

As the concern of this paper is about the linguistic expression of ideology in a piece of discourse, a number of notions and the interaction between them need to be elaborated on. The relationship between ideology and discourse is dealt with by, i) exploring the way they interact; ii) examining the different degrees of implicitness in the linguistic expression of ideology; and iii) dealing with anti-Muslimism as an example of racist ideology and the role of the media in reproducing it.

1.1. The expression of ideology in discourse

Being defined as "the overall, abstract mental systems that organise such socially shared attitudes" (van Dijk, 1995: 18), ideology has a central position in discourse. Van Dijk et al. (2004: xviii) argue that "Ideologies may be exhibited in many social practices." Among these practices, "discourse, that is, socially situated text and talk" may be considered as "one of the most crucial social practices" (van Dijk, 2005: 3) because other social practices do not directly provide insights into ideologies; so, in order to study the content of ideologies, there is a need for systematic discourse analysis.

As ideology leaves 'traces' (de Beaugrande, 1999: §23) in discourse, the study of the latter can give insights into how ideologies are verbally expressed and communicated between in-group members and with other out-group members. As "the speaker (or writer) expresses ideological content in texts and so does the linguistic form of the text" (Dellinger, 1995: 2), studying ideology in discourse will be equivalent to studying the 'linguistic form' of the text, in other words its linguistic structure and the way its statements are organised.

The question that is worth asking is whether all levels of structure are equally informative about ideology. Van Dijk (1995: 22), on the one hand, argues that "virtually, all discourse structures are involved in the functional expression of mental models of events or communicative contexts, and, therefore, of the opinions that are part of such mental models"; but on the other hand, he admits that there are "preferential' discourse structures for the expression and communication of ideological meanings" which need to be "primarily attended to". The syntactic and lexical structures opted for in the analysis of the corpus understudy are selected from the list of these 'preferential' discourse structures.

The difference in the levels of structure at which ideology can be 'read off' implies that ideology cannot be equally easily deciphered from texts. For example, an ideology conveyed in a text by the lexical structure through the frequent use of lexemes with strong connotations can be more easily uncovered than an ideology that is conveyed implicitly through a recurrent syntactic structure where the analyst has to look for a recurrent pattern cov-

ering an underlying ideology. One may speak about different degrees of implicitness in ideological expression.

1.2. Implicitness in the expression of ideology in discourse

The same text may be multi-ideological i.e. it may display more than one ideology with different degrees of implicitness at the level of linguistic expression. In fact, a writer may explicitly defend one ideology while implicitly assuming or even passing on another ideology. Fairclough (1992) argues that all types of discourse are open to ideological investment but different types are not ideologically invested to the same degree. This notion was taken by de Beaugrande (1999: §37) who thinks that rather than speaking about 'degrees of ideological investment' (i.e. 'how ardently you support the ideology'), one would rather speak about "degrees of ideological overtness (how forcefully you express your support)". De Beaugrande speaks about 'strategic confusion' and gives the example of a "devious institution… covertly accepting one ideology (e.g. racism) while overtly promoting another (e.g. equal opportunity achieved by phasing out affirmative action)". This notion of strategic confusion will be exploited in the second part of this paper as it will be shown that, in the corpus understudy, two different ideologies may be "read off" from the same text.

Having pointed to the multi-ideological dimension of a piece of discourse, it may be argued that speakers/ writers may resort to implicitness while passing on an ideological message.

It should be noted, however, that implicitness and explicitness are not binary poles; they rather constitute two edges on a gradable scale, which gives rise to what Wood (2004: 40) calls:

a continuum of interpretation: from ideological content that is conveyed most immediately within a given language (for example, by a simple choice or a highly explicit relation) to the other extreme: where complex inferences are required in order to reconstruct ideological meanings in the interpretation.

This idea of a continuum of interpretation is related to a continuum of persuasive power where high implicitness correlates with a high persuasive intention on the part of the speaker/writer. The persuasive power of the implicit expression of ideology lies in the fact that the speaker/writer plays on the common sense of the reader, so the message passes smoothly because the reader does not develop any defensive strategies; as Fairclough (1989:85) puts it: "Ideology is most effective when its workings are least visible".

In addition to persuasive intentions, writers may resort to implicitness in ideological expression to save their face if they think that the ideology they are endorsing may be considered as 'negative'. This is for example the case of racist ideology which tends to be implicitly expressed (van Dijk, 2003: 6).

1.3. Racist ideology

Racism has been widely studied since the 1980s by such scholars as van Dijk who has tried to devise a theoretical framework for the study of such an ideology which is prevalent in European countries and unveil its manifestations in different types of discourse; namely, parliamentary debates (2000a), the press (1992b, 2000b, 2005), and in everyday communication (1992a).

Racism may be defined as "a system of ethnic or racial dominance, that is, of systematic power abuse of a dominant group (European 'white') against various kinds of non-European groups" (van Dijk, 2005:2). Racism, as a form of dominance, is backed by the belief in the superiority of in-group members and the inferiority of the out-group. As any other ideology, racism is inextricably linked to discourse, because on the one hand, discourse is one of the social practices of racism and on the other hand, it is the medium through which people develop racist beliefs. In van Dijk's words, discourse represents the "crucial interface between the social and cognitive dimensions of racism" (van Dijk, 2000b: 36). Studying racist discourse consists in unveiling the discursive features and strategies that make up such a discourse.

However, what makes racist discourse complex to study is the fact that people having a racist ideology would hardly admit they do. That is what is called 'New Racism' which "wants to be democratic and respectable, and hence first off denies that it is racism" (van Dijk, 2000b:34). This makes the task of the discourse analyst difficult as s/he would have to look for implicit messages which are less easy to decipher than the explicit expression of racism reflected in the lexical choice of derogatory words and the expression of negative opinions about others. On the contrary, in the discourse of new racism, "many negative things about minorities may not be stated explicitly, and thus are conveyed 'between the lines'" (van Dijk, 2000b:40).

As racism tends to be expressed as an underlying ideology, it is worth investigating the way such an implicit ideology is dealt with. Being aware that "the analysis of the implicit …is very useful in the study of underlying ideologies" (van Dijk, 1991, cited in Dellinger, 1995: 4) discourse analysts have tried to provide the necessary tools of analysis to lay bare the 'workings' of implicit ideology by exploiting the syntactic and semantic structure of texts.

It is this implicit expression of racist ideology that this paper undertakes to investigate in a corpus of opinion articles published in the scope of the debate over the (re)-publication of the Prophet Mohamed cartoons.

1.4. Anti-Muslimism as a form of racism

As the corpus understudy is a collection of texts published during the controversy over the Muslim prophet cartoons, this paper focuses on a specific form of racism: anti-Muslimism. Richardson (2006: 22) suggests that "a discourse may be considered anti-Muslim if it constructs, perpetuates or transforms racist social practices". This from of racism has been 'normalised' (Richardson, 2004: xvi) in the sense that "racist stereotypes are accepted as normal by the general public, and are therefore generally not recognized to be racist", (Micciulla, 2004:1).

Racism against Muslims has been a widespread phenomenon in the latest years, especially after September, 11th attack and the U.S. led war against terrorism in which a blur is made more or less purposefully between Islam and terrorism. In addition to racist social practices against Muslims in Western countries, anti-Muslimism has manifested itself discursively in the form of normalised prejudices against Muslims

where violence, irrationality, opposition to Western thinking and incapability of change have been prevalent themes to describe Muslims (Richardson, 2004: 14). It should be noted that the mass media have played an important role in spreading such stereotypes.

1.5. Reproducing anti-Muslimism through public discourse

Pointing at the importance of news reporting in the representation of Islam and Muslims, Richardson (2004: 33) states that "Islam and Muslims are represented and thereby 'made known' to us via, amongst other sites, the pages of newspapers". This stresses the role that this type of discourse plays in shaping people's minds positively or negatively about a given group. This, in turn, implies that, in the case of negative representation or racist prejudice, the press plays a crucial role, as has been stressed by van Dijk (2005: 4) who considers this type of discourse as a part of public discourse uttered by "symbolic elites such as politicians, journalists, scholars, teachers and writers". Van Dijk argues that "prejudices are not innate but socially acquired", so "the public discourses of the symbolic elites are the primary source of shared ethnic prejudices and ideologies" (p. 4).

Having admitted the role of the press as a form of public discourse in reproducing racist prejudices, this paper focuses on one form of public discourse: online articles. This type of discourse may be considered more influential than the printed press because of its accessibility to a much wider audience than the printed press (especially the local one). The influence of this type of discourse may be made more important if racial prejudice is implicitly conveyed while authors claim to defend a positive ideology, as will be shown in the corpus analysis.

2. Corpus study

The first part of this paper has argued that ideology may be expressed in discourse with different degrees of implicitness and dealt with anti-Muslimism as a form of racism. The objective of this part is to show empirically, through the study of a corpus, how the expression of anti-Muslimism may be conveyed with different degrees of implicitness.

2.1. Corpus description

The publication of the cartoons of the Muslim Prophet Mohammed by the Danish newspaper Jyllands-Posten and their re-publication by some other European newspapers have triggered a long debate over the issue of freedom of speech and its limits. A variety of articles expressing individual opinions about the cartoon controversy have been published online. The articles may be divided into two major trends: a first trend arguing against the publication of the Prophet cartoons seeing them as provocative; and a second trend defending the (re-)publication of the Prophet cartoons considering them as an exercise of the freedom of speech. A corpus of articles taking the second position has been collected; then, being aware that the use of samples in statistical study is "less time consuming and much easier to handle than large amounts of data" (Triki and Sellami-Baklouti, 2002: 39), a sample of six articles (about 7669 words) has been randomly selected. The following table displays the titles of the articles along with the names of their authors and their URL:

Article title	Author	Address
1. Muhammad Cartoons: Muslim Bites Dog	Ann Coulter	*HUMAN EVENTS ONLINE*: www.humaneventsonline.com/article.php?id=12500&o=ANN001
2. Democracy in a Cartoon	Ibn Warraq	*SPIEGEL Magazine*: http://service.spiegel.de:cache/international/0,1518,398856,00.html
3. Cartoon Rage vs. Freedom of Speech	Robert Spencer	*FRONTPAGEMAG.COM*: http://www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=21127
4. Muslim cartoons debate about speech freedom	Sean Cocca	*CSULB Online 49er*: www.csulb.edu/~d49er/archives/2006/spring/opinion/v12n73-muslim.shtml
5. Why I Published Those Cartoons	Flemming Rose	*SPEIGEL ONLINE*: service.spiegel.de/cache/international/spiegel/0,1518,418930,00.html
6. Something Is Rotten Outside the State of Denmark	Cinnamon Stillwell	*SFGate.Com*: http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/g/a/2006/02/08/cstillwell.DTL

Table 1: Corpus understudy

The ideology of freedom of expression is explicitly defended in the corpus and this can be clearly seen through its lexical structure where the derivations of the lexeme FREE and associated values are very frequent and where the assets of this value and its practice are praised. It can also be clearly seen that the writers get involved as in-group members defending their own ideology. This is linguistically reflected in the frequent use of the pronoun 'WE' and its variants.

However, a first reading of the corpus shows that the texts are not centred around praising the freedom of speech associated with in-group members but rather on a polarisation between in-group and out-group (or in van Dijk's terms 'Us' vs. 'Them'). That is why the need arises for a more scrutinising analysis using a critical discourse analytic framework.

2.2. Methodology

As the texts of the corpus display a polar structure 'Us' vs. 'Them', this study adopts the ideological square suggested by van Dijk (1995: 22) who argues that:

The structures of ideologies also suggest that such representations are often articulated along an *us* versus *them* dimension, in which speakers of one group will generally tend to present themselves or their own group in positive terms, and other groups in negative terms.

The analysis of the corpus will try to show the linguistic traces of this ideological structure by pointing first, to structural features, namely syntactic (through the study of NP modification and agency) and lexical (through the study of semantic fields); then to stylistic features displaying racist ideology (disclaimers, metaphors, illustrations, generalisations, counterfactuals and norm expression).

This framework is doubled by a quantitative approach thought to be useful in unveiling the mechanisms of an implicit ideology. De Beaugrande (1999:§24) argues that "research with large corpora may well discover that far less conspicuous selections and combinations of discourse options are also sensitive to ideological pattern". The reliance on a corpus in this study has the goal of discovering regular common linguistic patterns that may reveal an underlying implicit ideology.

2.3. Structural and stylistic features of racist discourse in the corpus

Adopting the structural, discursive and quantitative tools outlined in the previous section, this section will proceed to the analysis of the corpus. After showing the polar structure of the corpus through the frequency of the two entities 'Us' vs. 'Them' [1.3.1], the study will deal with the syntactic and lexical features underlying the description of the two entities through their attributes [2.3.2] and their actions [2.3.3.]. Then stylistic features typical of racist ideology will be dealt with [2.3.4].

2.3.1. Frequency of the two entities in the corpus

Despite the variety of writers, the texts display a common polar pattern where two entities are put in opposition: Us vs. Them. The first feature of this polar pattern can be seen in the frequency of references to 'us' and its variants i.e. we, our, west(ern(er(s)))…, and that of references to 'them' and its variants, i.e. they, their, muslim(s), immigrants…as the following table shows:

US	Number of occurrences	THEM	Number of occurrences
We	43	They	21
Us	8	Them/themselves	11
West	19	Their	12
Western	11	Muslims	42
Westerners	4	Muslim	31
Europeans	12	Immigrants	2
Our	22	Psychotics	1
		Zealots	1
		These people	1
Total	**120**	**Total**	**122**

Table 2: Number of occurrences of 'Us' and 'Them'

The table shows that references to 'them' outnumber references to 'us'. The second step of the corpus analysis consists in finding out how these entities are described.

2.3.2. Description of the two entities in the corpus

Examining the occurrences where the in-group 'us' is referred to, it can be seen that the description of this entity is syntactically realised through two main forms:
- An attributive structure where the entity in question occurs in a pre-/post-modified noun phrase. In addition to providing positive attributive qualifiers of 'us', as for e.g. in "the Free West", "The free world" or "democratic societies", modification

in this type of structure has also an appositive function with the goal of further identifying the in-group members as can be seen in "we Europeans", "We as a nation" or "we in the West". The inference of this apposition is: the West is Free, we are the west, so we are free. This positive image of 'us' is strengthened by another class of

noun phrases where the determiner is the first person plural possessive as for example in "our freedom of expression", "our support for freedom of expression", "our values" coupled in one instance with the use of a superlative pre-modifier "our most precious freedom".

- A predicative structure where the description of "us" is realised as an identificational predicate preceded by a copular verb as, for example, in "Freedom of expression is our western heritage", or "One of the most important and hard-won rights in the West is free speech". The writers resort to this type of structure when they want to enumerate the positive values of 'us' by means of coordination as for example in:

1. The west is the source of the liberating ideas of individual liberty, political democracy, the rule of law, human rights and cultural freedom. (Ibn Warraq)

At the level of the lexis, these two syntactic structures are filled in with lexical items belonging to the same semantic field as 'freedom' and expressing positive connotations. The following are some examples of the 'values' associated with 'us': Freedom (46 times), Free (23), precious, important, democracy, democratic, debate, discussion, equal, equality, heritage, idea, justice, law, liberalism, liberals, liberating, liberty, opinion, pluralism, tolerance, tolerant, value, virtue...

The first thing that is worth noting in the depiction of the out-group is that they are not geographically or politically anchored. Contrary to the depiction of 'us' as 'a nation' in the 'West', the other group has been depicted just as 'Muslims', giving thus the impression of their lack of belonging or rather their belonging to a medieval times as can be seen from such expressions in the corpus as "societies with a **medieval** mindset" or "**medieval** fortress".

The description of 'them' is through a blend of both the attributives and the predicatives as can be seen in:

2. Their **immediate response** to all bad news is **mass violence.** (Ann Coulter)

It seems clear that writers resort to a predicative structure of the type Subject + copula + predicate (logically translated by X (subject) = Y (predicate), where Y is an identifying subject complement) because it allows them to use modifiers on both sides of the equation (immediate, mass, increasingly, so…). This is confirmed by the examples where modifiers are stacked in the

same structure through a process of enumeration:

3. It is a freedom sorely lacking in the Islamic world, and without it Islam will remain unassailed in its **dogmatic**, **fanatical**, **medieval** fortress; **ossified**, **totalitarian** and **intolerant**. (Ibn Warraq)

The same exaggeration effect is obtained when 'them' is presented as the agentive complement in a nominal structure as in:

4. The **mass** violence **by** Muslims over **some** cartoons… (Ann Coulter)

where Muslims are presented as the agents of violence that is massive. The use of the nominal structure in this example gives this violence an everlasting effect as it is not bound by the limits of time normally expressed by the tense and the aspect of the verb. In addition to that, the writer of this occurrence suggests that this violence is rather disproportionate through the use of the quantifier 'some' opposing it to the modifier 'mass'.

As for the lexical structure associated to 'them', it can be seen that most of the lexemes are hyponyms of the lexeme "VIOLENCE" repeated 23 times. The lexical items collocating with "them" may be classified under two interrelated sets. The first set relates to 'their' system of beliefs and contains words such as: discrimination, dogmatic, fanatical, frenzy, hatred, hostile, hostility, intolerant, prohibition, totalitarian, tyrant...The second set concerns 'Their' actions which result from their ideology: burning, censorship, force, murder, oppression, rage, rioting, terror, violence, vandalised... In addition to the frequency of VIOLENCE and related lexemes, the writers resort to different techniques to make the relationship between "them" and violence seem as natural as possible. Coulter, for example, states that this violence is "their default mode" to which they "revert" taking the "offence to Islam ruse" as merely "an excuse".

So far, the analysis of the corpus has tried to show the mechanisms through which an opposition between 'us' and 'them' is achieved. It is to be noted that this opposition between the positive image of 'us' and the negative image of 'them' is to a certain extent explicit in the corpus, and the analysis consisted in discovering its linguistic manifestations.

The same cannot be said of a more implicit opposition dealt with in the next section.

2.3.3. Actions performed by the two entities

This section tries to answer the question: What do these entities do? At this level, the two opposed entities in the corpus are analysed in terms of their actions. The analysis is focused on the case where the agency of 'us'/ 'them' is involved because of the importance of agency in establishing the responsibility of humans for deeds (whether good or bad). This fact may be exploited by the writers of the articles in presenting a positive image of 'us' by presenting 'us' as the agents of good deeds and a negative image of 'them' by presenting 'them' as the agents of bad deeds. The following two examples illustrate this point:

5. By **defending** our values, we are **teaching** the Islamic world a valuable lesson, we are **helping** them by **submitting** their cherished traditions to Enlightenment values. (Ibn Warraq)

6. Islam is not a race; the problems with it are not the product of fear mongering and fiction, but of ideology and facts -- facts that have been **stressed** repeatedly by Muslims around the world, when they **commit** violence in the name of Islam and **justify** that violence by its teachings. (Robert Spencer)

These two examples show clearly that 'us' is presented as responsible for good deeds and 'them' as responsible for bad deeds. In fact, the same pattern can be found in the whole corpus, complementing, thus, the opposition created by the positive vs. negative attributes assigned to the two entities.

However, a careful reading of the texts may reveal a more subtle pattern of opposition. Considering the cases where the two entities in question play the thematic role of agent and the grammatical function of subject, it may be seen that in these occurrences, the predication is either modified by a status operator (such as modality, negation, interrogation, conditional…) as, for example, in:

7. We <u>must protect</u> our freedoms, even at the cost of angering a few religious zealots who would rather encourage violence than peaceful negotiations. (Sean Cocca, deontic modality)

8. <u>Unless, we show</u> some solidarity, unashamed, noisy, public solidarity with the Danish cartoonists, <u>then</u> the forces that are trying to impose on the Free West a totalitarian ideology will be won; the Islamisation of Europe will have began in earnest. (Ibn Warraq, conditional)

9. Are we in the west going to cave into pressure from societies with a medieval mindset, <u>or are we going to</u> defend our most precious freedom (Ibn Warraq, interrogative)

Or the predicate is not modified indicating a factitive action, as for e.g. in

10. These are the people we are fighting in the War on Terror

11. Muslims immediately engage in acts of mob violence when things don't go their way.

The following table shows the number of modified and non-modified predicates related to 'us' and 'them':[1]

	Agent/modified predication	Agent /non-modified predication
US	21	11
THEM	3	37

Table 3: Modified vs. non-modified agency

Looking at the table, there seems to be a correlation between modified predicates denoting 'our' agency and non-modified predicates denoting 'their' agency. Testing this hypothesis statistically, Yule's coefficient of correlation is obtained:

$$Q = \frac{A-B}{A+B} = \frac{(11x3)-(21x37)}{(11x3)+(21x37)} = -\frac{744}{810}$$

$$Q= -0.91$$

The coefficient obtained indicates a strong correlation, validating thus the posed hypothesis; so what can be the implication of that?

The occurrences of modified agentive predicates may be classified into different types of modification:

- In 3 occurrences, 'our' agency is negated, e.g. "and **we certainly didn't intend to trigger** violent demonstrations throughout the Muslim world".
- In 6 instances, 'our' agency is a hypothetical condition for the achievement of some 'good' action; e.g. "**Unless, we show**

---

[1] See Appendix for the totality of occurrences.

some solidarity, unashamed, noisy, public solidarity with the Danish cartoonists, then the forces that are trying to impose on the Free West a totalitarian ideology will have won; the Islamization of Europe will have begun in earnest".

- In 7 occurrences, 'our' agency is presented as a compulsion, an obligatory action to be carried out in order to achieve a 'good' goal; in this case the agentive predicate is modified by deontic modality i.e. should, must, have to, legally required to, e.g. "Western countries **will have to decide** where to draw the line …".
- In 5 occurrences, 'our' agency is modified by a polarity interrogative in the form of a yes-no question, e.g. "Are we in the west going to cave into pressure from societies with a medieval mindset, or **are we going to defend** our most precious freedom?". It is a kind of rhetorical question whose communicative purpose is to show the obviousness of the necessity of our agency.

It may be inferred from these occurrences that "we" think about our actions before carrying them out (we must, will we? what would happen if we?, unless we…). Even when some of 'our' actions have caused an undesirable effect, the writers resort to the negation of intention which is the primary condition of agency. The implicit message is that our actions are well-thought of and studied; and this, in turn, implies that 'we' have a sense of responsibility. Even, in the cases where the predicates denoting 'our' agency are not modified, the majority of the verbs denote mental actions; e.g. *raise, defend, teach, help, pay homage, integrate* and *stand by* (See Appendix). The image of 'us' conveyed here is that 'we' are a people of thought. This 'mental' image of 'us' is opposed to a 'physical' image of 'them' conveyed through a strong correlation between 'them' as subject/agent and factitive actions belonging in most occurrences to a register of violence (burn, torch, commit violence, beat…). In some instances, the writers may resort to linguistic techniques to make it evident that these actions are not at all thought about as, for example, the use of modification through adverbials in "The amazing part of the great Danish cartoon caper isn't that Muslims **imme-**

diately engage in acts of mob violence when things don't go their way"

The implicit message conveyed by this correlation is that 'they' commit actions (modified as violent) without thinking about them, their actions are immediate (engage in, took to the streets) and devoid of thought, so 'they' do not have a sense of responsibility. As thought is a defining characteristic of civilisation if not humanity, this image presents 'them' as primitive and even deprived of the status of humans.

To sum up, it can be said that the polar structure opposing 'them' to 'us' has been elaborated through two interrelated aspects: attributes and a way of behaviour. The image conveyed is, on the one hand, that freedom of thought is 'our' heritage, so we think about our actions before carrying them out; and on the other hand, violence is the default mode, so 'They' engage in violence without thinking about the consequences.

This polar structure has been built through explicit and less explicit linguistic mechanisms. Explicitness can be seen in the lexical structure through the use of semantic fields and antonymy. At the level of syntax, the use of modification, coordination of modifiers and superlatives has helped convey this opposed image of 'us' vs. 'them'. A less explicit linguistic feature conveying the polar structure is the statistically proved correlation between 'us' as a people of 'thought' and 'them' as 'irrational' and resorting to immediate and violent physical action. This technique, it may be argued, is more persuasive as it is more stylistically subtle because the writers do not explicitly involve themselves (as it is the case of modification).

The message conveyed by the writers is not only that these people are different from 'us', but also that 'They' are inferior to 'us', which is typical of racist ideology as defined in [1.3].

The persuasive power of this message lies in its implicitness as the writers, for reasons of "impression management" (van Dijk, 2000a: 40), explicitly defend 'good' values such as freedom and tolerance, for which they are credited by their readers. Meanwhile, they pass on a racist message, for which

they are not blamed because it is implicit, so it works on the readers' minds without awareness on their part that they are being manipulated. This conclusion will further be proved by other features of racist discourse displayed by the corpus.

2.3.4. Stylistic features of racist ideology

In addition to the racist message conveyed by the syntactic and lexical features of the corpus, the texts under-study display other stylistic features considered typical of racist discourse.

2.3.4.1. Disclaimers

Disclaimers are "specific semantic moves that realize in one sentence the strategy of Positive Self-Presentation and Negative Other Presentation" (van Dijk, 2000b: 41). The corpus contains instances of disclaimers such as the following two examples:

12. I agree that the freedom to publish things doesn't mean you publish everything. Jyllands-Posten would not publish pornographic images or graphic details of dead bodies; swear words rarely make it into our pages. So we are not fundamentalists in our support for freedom of expression. **But** the cartoon story is different. (Flemming Rose)

This is an example of apparent concession: our positive aspect highlighted is that we self-censor ourselves, we do not publish things that hurt the sensibility of others, **but** the publication of the cartoons is considered different (on which basis?) as it is not supposed to hurt. So, the negative aspect of 'them' is their oversensibility in that they have made much fuss about nothing.

13. I acknowledge that some people have been offended by the publication of the cartoons, and Jyllands-Posten has apologized for that. **But** we cannot apologize for our right to publish material, even offensive material. (Flemming Rose)

This is an example of apparent effort: 'our' positive face is stressed through acknowledging and apologizing. The implication is that 'we' are making an effort to remedy the situation, **but** what the others ask 'us' to do is beyond our capacities, so their negative aspect is that 'they' are overdemanding because 'they' ask 'us' to apologize for something which is our right.

"Very typical of any prejudiced discourse" (van Dijk, 2003:34), this semantic move of the disclaimer can be seen to be allowing the writers to pass negative atti-

tudes towards 'them' without being blamed for that because they give the prominent thematic position in the sentence to stating 'our' positive side.

2.3.4.2. The use of metaphor

Metaphors may be used in racist discourse to enhance positive self-presentation and negative other presentation. The corpus displays examples of animal metaphors as for example in:

14. Muhammad Cartoons: Muslim Bites Dog (title by **Ann Coulter**)

15. Yet strange as it may seem to Western non-Muslims, the rage over them seems to grow with each passing day. (Ann Coulter). The word 'rage' used 5 times in the corpus.

16. Jihad **monkey** talks tough; jihad **monkey** takes the consequences. Sorry, I realize that's offensive. How about "**camel** jockey"? What? (Ann Coulter)

17. After an Egyptian ferry capsized recently, killing hundreds of passengers, a whole **braying** mob of passengers' relatives staged an organized attack on the company. (Ann Coulter)

In example 14, the writer takes the expression "dog bites man"- used in the text to denote that the situation of Muslims getting angry is not strange but rather familiar- and uses it in the title with a play on words replacing dogs by Muslims giving to Muslims the role of dogs biting where the victims of their biting are dogs. The dog metaphor is extended by the recurrence of the word 'rage'. Muslims are also likened to monkeys, the animals that imitate without much understanding what they do, to camels –the animals that live in the desert with the absence of civilisation, and to donkeys- the animal whose sound is very annoying. The animal aspects of 'them' are complemented by a metaphor belonging to the medical field through the use of the expression 'berserk psychotics' in**:**

18. Maybe they do, maybe they don't, but you can't take chances with **berserk psychotics**. (Ann Coulter)

The exaggeration is also conveyed by the use of the expression zealots in:

19. We must protect our freedoms, even at the cost of angering a few **religious zealots** who would rather encourage

violence than peaceful negotiations. (Sean Cocca).

Reference to the religious field is complemented by the metaphorical use of the word *chant* in "On Tuesday, demonstrators **chanted** "War on Denmark, death to Denmark" as they burned Danish flags", where the use of the verb *chant* suggests that violence is a religious ritual. Here again, the irrationality image is reinforced as religious rituals do not involve rational thinking.

These expressions depict a negative image of 'them' as wild animals and irrational extremists out of control. More than "discursive, rhetorically persuasive ways of expressing properties of mental models", these metaphors, van Dijk (2000a: 109) argues, "may be associated more deeply with thought and judgement". In fact, the writers are not only giving their negative judgement about 'them' but also inciting the reader to endorse the same judgement. Again, the implied inference is: do these people deserve to live in the West side by side with 'us'?

2.3.4.3. Examples and Illustrations

In racist discourse, examples are given, in the form of stories "about Our good deeds and their bad behaviour". According to van Dijk (2003), these examples function as premises in argumentation which serve to support/ give a proof of an opinion about "us" or "them".

Giving examples is a recurrent technique used by the writers of the articles understudy. Some illustrations present 'our' good deeds as can be seen in this long enumeration by Ibn Warraq of the good deeds that the British 'presence' did for India:

23. Do we still have to apologize, for example, for the British Empire, when, in fact, the British presence in India led to the Indian Renaissance, resulted in famine relief, railways, roads and irrigation schemes, eradication of cholera, the civil service, the establishment of a universal educational system where none existed before, the institution of elected parliamentary democracy and the rule of law? … (Ibn Warraq)

However, most of the examples in the corpus illustrate their bad behaviour, they are presented to give evidence for

the intolerance of Muslims, as Cinnamon Stillwell states: "The Danish cartoon controversy is certainly not the first example of European writers and artists trying to tackle subjects relating to Islam and encountering resistance". The examples presented illustrate either Muslims' unmeasured reaction as in:

24. After an Egyptian ferry capsized recently, killing hundreds of passengers, a whole braying mob of passengers' relatives staged an organized attack on the company, throwing furniture out the window and burning the building to the ground. **Witnesses** say it was the most violent ocean liner-related incident since Carnival Cruise Lines fired Kathie Lee Gifford. (Ann Coulter)

Or Muslims' intolerance as in:

25. The murder of Dutch filmmaker Theo Van Gogh in 2004 was an earlier wake-up call. … (Cinnamon Stillwell)

And:

26. Similarly, in 1989 when the late Iranian leader Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini issued a fatwa authorizing Muslims to murder British author Salman Rushdie for his allegedly blasphemous book, "The Satanic Verses," Western apologists for radical Islam said nothing. (Cinnamon Stillwell)

As an argumentative strategy, these examples may have a strong persuasive power as they present concrete proofs of previous violent behaviour by 'them'. What is worth noting is that none of the illustrations given told the whole story and what provoked such events; they rather focused on reactions giving only one side of the story. In addition to that, the source of the illustrations presented as an evidential is sometimes not reliable as for example, the indefinite noun

'witnesses' in illustration 24. In some instances, examples are used to draw generalisations.

2.3.4.4. Generalisation

In generalisation, "concrete events or actions are generalised and possibly abstracted from, thus making the claim broader, while more generally applicable" (van Dijk, 2003: 51). Lexically, generalisation is achieved through the use of quantifiers (e.g. most, all), expressions of time and frequency (e.g. always, constantly), or place (e.g. everywhere). The following table displays some examples of generalisation in the corpus:

Example	Comment
27. Muslims in Syria torched the Danish Embassy a few weeks ago, burning it to the ground. According to **everyone**, the Syrian government was behind the attack -- **the prime minister of Denmark, Condoleezza Rice and White House spokesman Scott McClellan**. (Ann Coulter)	Generalisation consists in the use of the universal quantifier everyone which is later equated to three people.
28. On Wednesday publications **all over Europe** — in **France, Spain, Germany, Italy, and Holland** — published the cartoons to demonstrate their support for this principle. (Robert Spencer)	Four countries are equated with 'all over Europe'.
29. And do not, for one second, think Westerners could not and would not feel any differently if the cartoons concerned something sacred to us. It happens **every day**. (Sean Cocca)	Does it really happen every day that something sacred to 'us' is concerned?
30**. All across Europe, newspaper after newspaper** has expressed solidarity with Jyllands-Posten by reprinting the cartoons. (Cinnamon Stillwell)	Is there any statistical evidence about the number of newspapers in Europe that have shown solidarity with Jyllands-Posten

These generalisations show examples of people, countries and newspapers supporting the publication of the cartoons as a general trend. This may be used to persuade readers that what is done by those people is the right thing to do and it is right because everybody does so, which may be considered as a "typical fallacy of argumentation" (van Dijk, 2000a: 112).

2.3.4.5. Counterfactuals

Counterfactuals have the special conditional formula: "What would happen if …". Van Dijk (2003:46) considers the use of counterfactuals in ideological discourse as an argumentative strategy "because they allow people to demonstrate absurd consequences when an alternative is being considered". In the corpus understudy, there are many instances of counterfactuals hav-

ing different linguistic forms. Counterfactual argumentation may be conveyed through the use of double negation, as for example in:

31. A democracy cannot survive long without freedom of expression, the freedom to argue, to dissent, even to insult and offend. (Ibn Warraq) where the use of modal negation and the negative preposition 'without' denote the absurdity of a democracy where freedom of expression is absent. The implication is that 'they' want to suppress 'our' freedom of expression, and freedom of expression is a requisite of democracy, so 'they' want to suppress 'our' democracy. The implicit message is that 'they' represent a danger for 'our' democracy. This danger is also stressed by counterfactual conditionals conveyed through

the use of negative conditional adverbial clauses (introduced by unless/ the instant that/ insofar as) as in:

32. Unless, we show some solidarity, unashamed, noisy, public solidarity with the Danish cartoonists, then the forces that are trying to impose on the Free West a totalitarian ideology will have won; the Islamization of Europe will have begun in earnest. (Ibn Warraq) where the author incites in-group members to act because their action is a necessary condition for their future if they do not want Europe to become a Muslim continent. So, Islam is presented as a danger and the facts are reversed as the assault is presented as first led by Muslims rather than by 'us'.

Another linguistic technique used to convey counterfactual argumentation is

the conditional use of the coordinator 'or' as in:

33. Freedom of expression is our western heritage and we must defend it or it will die from totalitarian attacks. (Ibn Warraq)

As a logical relation, counter-factuality is strongly linked to causality (A is a cause of B if and only if B would not have happened if A had not happened). As an argumentative strategy, the goal of the counterfactuals in the corpus is to show to readers that what would happen is the logically necessary outcome if they did not react. Presenting what would happen as gloomy (Islamisation of Europe, ideological straitjacket, freedom dying, totalitarian ideology), the writers are playing on people's emotions by inciting fear and hatred ('they' not only do not deserve to live with 'us' because they are so different but also they represent a threat to our future). In consequence, 'We' should react, so what type of action is called for by the authors?

2.3.4.6. Norm Expression

According to van Dijk (2003: 56), norm expression is a feature of "anti-racist discourse" which is "strongly normative, and decries racism, discrimination, prejudice and anti-immigration policies in sometimes norm-statements about what "We" should or should not do". In fact, norm expression is supposed to be a characteristic feature of any ideological discourse as any ideology would entail a number of actions and it is the role of ideological discourse to set the norms for these actions in the form of what should be done and what should be avoided.

As a piece of ideological discourse defending the freedom of speech, the corpus understudy is expected to contain normative expressions about what should be done to defend the freedom of speech, hence the recurrence of such examples as:

34. The free world should be standing resolutely with Denmark, ready to defend freedom of speech. (Robert Spencer)

35. We must protect our freedoms, even at the cost of angering a few religious zealots who would rather encourage violence than peaceful negotiations. (Sean Cocca)

However, what goes against the expectations of such discourse are statements like:

36. This is exactly why Karl Popper, in his seminal work "The Open Society and Its Enemies," insisted that one should not be tolerant with the intolerant. (Flemming Rose)

In this example, Rose is explicitly calling for intolerance while using two techniques to save his face; the first is quoting and the second is presenting the reason for being intolerant. By quoting, Rose minimizes his own responsibility for such a statement though he presents it as a logical consequence of what happened trying thus to persuade the readers not to be tolerant. In the statement itself, the call for intolerance is justified by the intolerance of the 'other', but one may wonder about the legitimacy of such a claim. If the West claims that tolerance is one of its values, would that value work with 'us' but not with 'them'? This would confirm that the West has double standards, which is typical of a colonial ideology that has justified, and is still being used as a justification of Western intervention in other countries.

37. In addition, I believe we are legally required to be bombing Syria right now. (Ann Coulter)

In this example, while explicitly calling for violence, Coulter saves her face through the use of the passive voice and the adverbial 'legally'. The use of the passive presents 'us' as patients of an obligation (It is not that we want to be bombing Syria but that we have to). In addition, this obligation has a legal basis, so 'our' violence is 'needed' whereas 'their' violence is unjustified. The writer is reflecting an overall colonial policy using a 'legal' justification as a pretext for a political or military intervention in another country.

What can be deduced from these two examples is that the writers fall in the trap of calling for what they are strongly 'condemning': intolerance and violence. Racist ideology is explicit in these instances because for the writers, positive values are not absolute: they are good for 'us' but not for 'them'. This translates the view that they are inferior to 'us' so on the one hand, they do not deserve what we are enjoying and on the other hand, any action that we take against them is justified.

2.4. Concluding Remarks

So far, the analysis has shown that the corpus understudy displays structural and stylistic features of racist discourse. Being more or less explicit, these features can be ranked on a scale going from the more implicit messages to the

more explicit ones calling for intolerance or violence. Although the analysis of the implicit and the explicit features has been carried out separately because of methodological considerations, it is worth noting that implicitness and explicitness are not characteristic of separate occurrences of the corpus but rather alternate in the same piece of discourse.

This scale of implicitness correlates with persuasive power; the more implicit the expression of the message is, the more persuasive it becomes. The impression that one can get from these texts is that the authors of the articles seem to start with an implicit racist discourse and then when they feel they have won the argument, they seem to come out and be more explicitly racist. In fact, though the writers try their best to hide their racist ideology to save their face, in some instances, this ideology comes to surface and is explicitly expressed leading the writers to fall in the trap of contradicting themselves by condemning a behaviour and calling for it or to express prejudiced statements like:

38. Or is NATO -- like the conventions of civilized behaviour, personal hygiene and grooming -- inapplicable when Muslims are involved? (Anne Coulter).

where the writer is making the general claim that Muslims do not respect conventions which civilized people are supposed to respect.

Being published online and accessible to a wide range of readers, this prejudiced claim and any other racist claims in the corpus form a part of a public discourse uttered by symbolic elites. This makes this piece of discourse highly influential as it helps readers acquire such racist ideologies, c.f. [1.5].

3. Conclusion

Dealing with ideology in general and anti-Muslimism as a racist ideology in particular, the first part of this paper has focused on the importance of discourse as one of the social practices allowing groups to express ideologies and get in-group members through persuasion processes. It has been argued however, that in a piece of discourse, the expression of ideology may

be more or less explicit and that implicitness may be a stronger tool of persuasion. The study of the corpus, consisting in a collection of opinion texts apparently defending the issue of freedom of expression raised by the re-publication of the Prophet Muhammad cartoons, has shown that a piece of discourse may be multi-ideological in the sense that more than one ideology may be defended in the same text but with different degrees of implicitness. In fact, it has been proved empirically that, though the writers of the texts studied explicitly defended freedom of speech, they displayed an affiliation to racist ideology, which they tried to pass implicitly to save their face though not being able to help letting it appear to surface through explicit statements of racist prejudices.

It would be a speculation to state that the whole issue of the (re)-publication of the prophet Mohamed cartoons was initiated by anti-Muslim feelings, as such a conclusion would require a multi-disciplinary study of the issue (including growing racism in Denmark, the role of the press and the conservative background of Jyllands-Posten). What this paper can affirm, however, is that the cartoon controversy has offered an opportunity to some "Westerners" to pass on their racist attitudes while apparently defending "freedom of speech".

Acknowledgement

References

- de Beagrande, R. (1999) 'Discourse studies and ideology: On 'liberalism' and 'liberalisation' in three large corpora of English', *Discourse Studies* 1/3: 259-295. U.R.L.: http://www.beaugrande.com/DiscStudiesIdeology.htm
- Dellinger, B. (1995) *Critical Discourse Analysis*, http://users.utu.fi/bredelli/cda.htms
- Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language and Power*. London: Longman Group UK Limited.
- Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity.

- Micciulla, L. (2004) Book Review: *(Mis)Representing Islam: The racism and rhetoric of British broadsheet newspapers.* LINGUIST List 15.1973: http://linguistlist.org/issues/15/15-549.html

- Richardson, J. E. (2004) *(Mis)Representing Islam: The racism and rhetoric of British broadsheet newspapers.* John Benjamins.

- Richardson, J. E. (forthcoming) On delineating 'reasonable' and 'unreasonable' criticisms of Muslims. In Allen & Birt (eds.) New Approaches to Islamophobia. Leicester: Markfield.

www.languageandcapitalism.info/wp-content/uploads/2006/08/richardson_04_09_islamophobia.pdf

- Trik, M. & Sellami-Baklouti, A. (2002) *Foundations for a Course on the Pragmatics of Discourse*. Sfax: Imprimerie Reliure d'Art.

- van Dijk, T. (1992a) Text, talk, elites and racism, *Discourse Social/ Social Discourse* (Montreal), 4(1/2), 37-62.
- van Dijk, T.(1992b) Racism and argumentation: "Race Riot" Rhetoric in Tabloib Editorials. In van Emeren et al. (Eds.), *Argumentation illuminated* 242-259. Dordrecht: Foris.
- van Dijk, T. (1995) Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis, Shäffner, C. and Wenden, A. (eds.), *Language and Peace* 17-33. Aldershot: Darmouth Publishing.
- van Dijk, T. (2000a) Ideologies, Racism, Discourse: Debates on Immigration and Ethnic Issues, in ter Wal, J and Verkuyten, M. (Eds.), *Comparative Perspectives on Racism* 91-116. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- van Dijk, T. (2000b) New(s) Racism: A discourse analytic approach, in Cottle, S. (Ed.), *Ethnic Minorities and the Media* 33-49. Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.
- van Dijk, T. (2003) *Ideology and discourse: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, Internet Course for the Oberta de Catalunya: www.discourse-in-society.org/ideo-dis2.htm
- van Dijk, T., Aertselaer, J & Pütz, M. (2004) Introduction: Language, Discourse and Ideology, Pütz, M. et al.(eds.) *Communicating Ideologies: Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Language, Discourse, and Social Practice* xiii-xxx. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- van Dijk (2005). 'Reproducing racism: The Role of the Press'. First draft of a paper for the Congress on Immigration, Almería, April 21-23, 2005
- Wood, T. (2004) 'The power of prior discourse', Pütz, M. et al.(eds.) *Communicating Ideologies: Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Language, Discourse, and Social Practice* 39-56. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Appendix : Agency of 'Us' vs. 'Them'

US: modified agentive predicates:
- Perhaps we could put aside our national, ongoing, post-9/11 Muslim butt-kissing contest and get on with the business at hand: Bombing Syria back to the stone age and then permanently disarming Iran.
- I believe we are legally required to be bombing Syria right now.
- Are we in the west going to cave into pressure from societies with a medieval mindset, or are we going to defend our most precious freedom.
- Unless, we show some solidarity, unashamed, noisy, public solidarity with the Danish cartoonists
- Do we have to go on apologizing for the sins our fathers?
- Do we still have to apologize, …
- On the world stage, should we really apologize for Dante, Shakespeare, and Goethe?
- Freedom of expression is our western heritage and we must defend it or it will die from totalitarian attacks.
- The free world should be standing resolutely with Denmark, ready to defend freedom of speech.
- We must protect our freedoms, even at the cost of angering a few religious zealots who would rather encourage violence than peaceful negotiations.
- And I still believe that this is a topic that we Europeans must confront, challenging moderate Muslims to speak out.
- The West prevailed in the Cold War because we stood by our fundamental values and did not appease totalitarian tyrants.
- … and we certainly didn't intend to trigger violent demonstrations throughout the Muslim world.
- We certainly did not ask them to make fun of the prophet.
- Did we achieve our purpose?
- If we are to truly integrate Muslims into our societies, it must be on an equal footing.
- Western countries will have to decide where to draw the line -- or find themselves overtaken by tyranny.

US: non-modified agentive predicates:
- It is the west that has raised the status of women, fought against slavery, defended freedom of enquiry, expression and conscience.
- By defending our values, we are teaching the Islamic world a valuable lesson, we are helping them by submitting their cherished traditions to Enlightenment values.
- And it may yet turn out that as the West continues to pay homage to its idols of tolerance, multiculturalism, and pluralism, it will give up those hard-won freedoms voluntarily.
- These are the people we are fighting in the War on Terror.

- We are integrating you into the Danish tradition of satire because you are part of our society, not strangers.
- The West prevailed in the Cold War because we stood by our fundamental values and did not appease totalitarian tyrants.

THEM: modified agentive predicates:
- What if they start having one of these bipolar episodes with a nuclear bomb?
- Why should they, in the words of the African-American writer James Baldwin, want to integrate into a sinking ship?
- Why do they all want to immigrate to the west and not Saudi Arabia?

THEM: non-modified agentive predicates:
- The amazing part of the great Danish cartoon caper isn't that Muslims immediately engage in acts of mob violence when things don't go their way.
- After an Egyptian ferry capsized recently, killing hundreds of passengers, a whole braying mob of passengers' relatives staged an organized attack on the company, throwing furniture out the window and burning the building to the ground.
- The "offense to Islam" ruse is merely an excuse for *Muslims* to revert to their default mode: rioting and setting things on fire.
- So it's not exactly a scoop that Muslims are engaging in violence.
- Muslims in Syria torched the Danish Embassy a few weeks ago, burning it to the ground.
- Syria has staged a state-sponsored attack on our NATO partner on Danish soil, the Danish embassy.
- Unless, we show some solidarity, unashamed, noisy, public solidarity with the Danish cartoonists, then the forces that are trying to impose on the Free West a totalitarian ideology will have won; the Islamization of Europe will have begun in earnest.
- No, the west needs no lectures on the superior virtue of societies who keep their women in subjection, cut off their clitorises, stone them to death for alleged adultery, throw acid on their faces, or deny the human rights of those considered to belong to lower castes.
- Gaza: On Monday, gunmen seized an EU office, demanding apologies from Denmark and Norway (where another publication later reprinted the cartoons).
- On Tuesday, demonstrators chanted "War on Denmark, death to Denmark" as they burned Danish flags.
- Libya and Saudi Arabia recalled their ambassadors from Copenhagen, while in Saudi Arabia, an angry mob beat two employees of the Danish corporation Arla Foods, which has been subjected to a crippling boycott throughout the Islamic world – a boycott that has been endorsed by, among others, the Sudanese Defense Minister.

- Islam is not a race; the problems with it are not the product of fear mongering and fiction, but of ideology and facts -- facts that have been stressed repeatedly by Muslims around the world, when they commit violence in the name of Islam and justify that violence by its teachings.
- Muslims across the Middle East took to the streets and began protesting against the cartoons in great numbers.
- Protesters became increasingly violent, throwing rocks through the windows of Danish embassies and governmental buildings in the Middle East and then burning them down.
- Muslims leaders in countries like Iran and Syria started making public speeches demanding righteous Muslims to bomb Denmark for publishing the cartoons and advocating the death of the artists.
- It is these radical fundamentalists who take to the streets, burn down buildings and threaten the lives of others, all in the name of religion, who we must overcome.
- We must protect our freedoms, even at the cost of angering a few religious zealots who would rather encourage violence than peaceful negotiations.
- Somehow Muslims inciting hatred toward other religions on a regular basis has become acceptable, while honest analysis of Islam has not.