Van Dijk's ideological square in sourcing: was the Arab silenced or quoted in the Western media's coverage of the 2011 revolution in Egypt?

Dr. Ayyad Echine

Laboratory of Comparative Humanities and Applied Language Studies (CHALS). Faculty of Economics and Management, Guelmime, Ibn Zohr University, Agadir, Morocco.

Abstract— *This paper examines the Western media's coverage of the 2011 revolution in Egypt and its sourcing patterns using Van Dijk's ideological square framework. The study implements the research tools provided by Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to investigate the representation of Arab voices and analyzes whether they were silenced or adequately quoted. The findings reveal that the selected media outlets perpetuated power imbalances and social inequalities through their sourcing practices. The media over-quoted statements that supported Western narratives and marginalized or excluded statements that challenged these narratives or portrayed positive aspects of Arab culture and religion. This bias in sourcing patterns reflects a reproduction of dominant ideologies and reinforces the classical Orientalist discourse that positions Islam and Islamists as inferior entities. Furthermore, the study highlights the creation of dichotomous divisions between the Westerner and the Arab. The Westerner is portrayed as powerful and authoritative, while the Arab is depicted as subservient and in need of instruction.*

Keywords— Ideological square, Sourcing, Editorials, Orientalism

I. INTRODUCTION

The Arab revolutions, which swept across the Middle East in 2011, had a profound impact on Egypt, serving as a catalyst for widespread social and political change. The revolutionary wave that engulfed the country led to the overthrow of President Hosni Mubarak, who had ruled for nearly three decades. The protests, driven by a desire for democratic reforms, social justice, and an end to corruption, united Egyptians from diverse backgrounds in their quest for a more inclusive and equitable society (El-Mahdi, 2013). However, the aftermath of the Arab Spring in Egypt was marked by a complex and tumultuous transition, characterized by power struggles, political instability, and the rise of various factions competing for influence. The events of the Arab Spring in Egypt continue to shape the country's political landscape and have had far-reaching implications for the region as a whole.

The coverage of international events by news media shape public opinion and construct narratives that influence global understanding. Within this context, the 2011 revolution and aftermath in Egypt served as a significant socio-political event that garnered extensive media attention from various countries, including the United States and the United Kingdom. This paper aims to examine the sourcing patterns in American and British editorials' coverage of the revolution, utilizing the research tools provided by Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and drawing inspiration from Van Dijk's ideological square framework. Specifically, the study focuses on analyzing the sourcing patterns in editorials published by prominent media outlets, including the New York Times (NYT), the Washington Post (WP), the Telegraph (T), and the Guardian (G), between the years 2011 and 2018. By investigating these sourcing practices, the study seeks to shed light on the underlying ideological

biases, power dynamics, and potential perpetuation of Orientalist narratives by these media outlets.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) provides a valuable framework for understanding the intricate relationship between language, power, and ideology in media discourse. By analyzing the social context, and the linguistic choices within discourse, CDA makes it possible to uncover hidden meanings, ideological biases, and power dynamics embedded within media narratives (Fairclough, 1995). In this study, the focus is on sourcing patterns, that are found to have a primordial role in shaping the news narrative and influencing public perceptions. By examining how these influential broadsheets selected and framed their sources during the coverage of the 2011 revolution in Egypt, we aim to reveal the underlying ideological biases and power dynamics at play. The analysis of sourcing patterns through the lens of CDA and Van Dijk's ideological square framework is expected to provide valuable insights into the construction of news discourse surrounding the event under scrutiny. By examining editorials published by the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Telegraph, and the Guardian, we can gain a nuanced understanding of how dominant ideologies and power relations influenced the media's portrayal of this significant event.

Therefore, this study aims to investigate the following research questions:

1) Do the sourcing patterns in American and British editorials' coverage of the 2011 revolution in Egypt reflect ideological biases and power dynamics?
2) Do the sourcing patterns in the coverage of the same event by the same media perpetuate Orientalist narratives?

The paper hypothesizes that the analysis of sourcing patterns in editorials published by the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Telegraph, and the Guardian will reveal significant differences in the selection and representation of sources, reflecting the underlying ideological biases and power dynamics that project the Western and the Arab as two opposing entities.

II.   REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The influence of Western media outlets in shaping global narratives and perceptions is undeniable. Western media often relies heavily on a limited number of sources, or on specific ones, leading to a narrow and potentially biased portrayal of international events and perspectives. This can result in a skewed understanding of complex issues,

particularly when it comes to regions outside the Western world.

In his seminal work *Racism in News*, Van Dijk (1991) sheds light on the contrasting treatment of white and black individuals in media sourcing. Van Dijk's research highlights how Western media often exhibits a preference for white sources, while black individuals are disproportionately marginalized or underrepresented. This pattern reinforces existing power structures and perpetuates racial inequalities in news coverage. Van Dijk's goes further as to highlight a concerning pattern in Western media sourcing where black individuals are often given the floor to speak primarily on topics such as crime, sport, and music, while white individuals are consulted on more serious issues such as economy and politics. This discrepancy reinforces racial stereotypes and perpetuates systemic biases within media coverage (1991). The media's selective sourcing practices contribute to the marginalization and limited representation of black voices in matters of significant social, political, and economic importance. By relegating black individuals to specific topics, the media reinforces the perception that their perspectives are only relevant in certain limited areas, while perpetuating the notion that white individuals possess the expertise and credibility to discuss weightier subjects.

Building upon Van Dijk's insightful analysis of sourcing disparities between blacks and whites in Western media coverage, it is essential to extend our examination to specific instances where these patterns manifest. In this context, this paper aims to explore the sourcing patterns employed by Western media during the coverage of the 2011 revolution in Egypt, specifically focusing on the differential treatment of Western and Arab voices. By scrutinizing the extent to which each group is quoted or silenced, we can gain further insights into the dynamics of power, representation, and potential biases in the media's portrayal of this significant geopolitical event. While Van Dijk's work provides a foundation for understanding the broader systemic issues of sourcing disparities, applying his framework to a specific case study such as the Egyptian revolution allows us to delve deeper into the complexities of media practices. Through this analysis, we can uncover whether Western media outlets prioritized and amplified the perspectives of Western sources over Arab sources, thereby influencing the narrative and shaping public perception. By examining the sourcing patterns in this particular context, we can identify potential biases, power dynamics, and the extent to which diverse voices were included or silenced.

Understanding Critical Discourse Analysis and Methodology

In the realm of media analysis, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) developed by Norman Fairclough has emerged as a prominent framework for understanding the relationship between language, power, and ideology (Fairclough, 1995). CDA aims to uncover hidden meanings, ideologies, and power structures embedded within discourse. The review below explores the key principles of CDA and demonstrates its application in analyzing sourcing in news media, drawing inspiration from Van Dijk's ideological square.

This multidisciplinary approach combines linguistic analysis, social theory, and critical thinking to investigate how language functions as a tool for power and social domination (Fairclough, 1995). Fairclough contends that discourse is not merely a reflection of reality but actively shapes and constructs it. CDA seeks to uncover the social, political, and ideological implications of language use, highlighting how power relations are embedded within various discursive practices. It also emphasizes the social context in which discourse occurs. It recognizes that language is influenced by and influences social structures, power relations, and historical contexts (Fairclough, 1995).

For Fairclough, CDA recognizes that discourse is not isolated but interconnected with other texts and discourses. It explores how texts refer to and draw upon existing discourses, ideologies, and cultural frameworks (1995). Analyzing interdiscursivity and intertextuality for example, helps unveil the ways in which power and ideology are reproduced and reinforced within discourse. Linguistically speaking, the approach under scrutiny here uncovers hidden meanings and ideological underpinnings within discourse. It examines linguistic choices, such as lexical choices, metaphors, and rhetorical strategies, to reveal how power is exercised and legitimized through language (Fairclough, 1995).

As a research tool, CDA is particularly relevant in analyzing sourcing practices in news media, which play a crucial role in shaping public perceptions and constructing reality. By applying this approach to sourcing, one can uncover the ideological biases, power dynamics, and hidden agendas that may influence the news narrative. It helps identify power imbalances in sourcing practices. It examines the selection of sources, the framing of their viewpoints, and the degree of access granted to different perspectives (Fairclough, 1995). Through CDA, one can reveal how media outlets may amplify or marginalize certain voices, perpetuating power disparities in public discourse.

Drawing inspiration from Van Dijk's ideological square, I intend to apply this framework to analyze the sourcing patterns in a few selected American and British editorials' coverage of the 2011 revolution in Egypt. Specifically, I will examine whether or not the Arab voice is quoted or silenced, and how and when it is quoted or silenced. Equally, the same attention will be given to how the Western subject was consulted. This approach will help uncover the ideological biases and the hegemonic discourse maintained by these media outlets in shaping the narrative surrounding the revolution. By utilizing Van Dijk's ideological square, I aim to provide a comprehensive analysis of the sourcing practices employed in the coverage of this significant socio-political event. CDA allows for the examination of discursive strategies employed by news media to manipulate public opinion. It uncovers techniques such as selective quoting, framing, omitting, foregrounding, backgrounding, presupposition, modality, and the use of persuasive language that can skew the representation of sources and influence audience interpretation (Fairclough, 1995).

III. DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The Egyptian and the Westerner: Silenced or Quoted

In Orientalism, Said (1979, p.xi) referenced one of Karl Marx's highly quoted sentences that read: "they cannot represent themselves; they must be represented". Said uses the sentence as an epigraph in his book to show the dialectic representational relationship between the West and the Middle Eastern 'orient' in which the latter is stereotyped and 'Othered' by the former. Similarly, when reporting the Egyptian revolution, the individual Egyptian protester is silenced and never given a chance to voice out his or her version of the story.

The selected papers, more often than not, opt for presupposition instead of giving the floor to those Egyptian people involved in the revolution to give their opinion or evaluation of the events. Egyptians were quoted as a group and referred to as "most Egyptians" think that ... (NYT, 1 Dec 2011 "Egypt's Vote"), "The vast majority of Egyptians regard ..." (WP, 29 Jan 2011, "The U.S. needs to break with Mubarak now"), "many Egyptian analysts believe ..." (WP, 31 Dec 2011, "Misconceptions about the Egyptian crisis"), or the "young protesters" see that ... (NYT, 24 March 2011, "Egypt's Unfinished Revolution"). Here, the Western journalists are assuming the ability to have access to their subjects' minds and reveal their authentic attitude about the revolution. On the other hand, Western officials, such as president Obama, Hillary Clinton, the white house

press secretary, vice president Biden and secretary of state John F. Kerry (quoted by The WP), the White House, Obama, and secretary of state John Kerry (quoted by The NYT), David Cameron and Obama (quoted by The Telegraph), Tony Blair, the Quartet's envoy and The Guardian's former Cairo correspondent Jack Shenker (quoted by The Guardian), are given large space to give their evaluation of the revolution, express their worries of Islamists and of the possibility of losing an ally in Egypt, and threaten to suspend aid and support of Egypt. Sourcing, in this case, is used as a way to achieve hegemony, as Van Dijk's formulation goes, because access to media is not made available to everyone but to "members of more powerful social groups and institutions, and especially their leaders (the elites) have more or less exclusive access" (van Dijk, 1998b, p.5).

However, the analysis reveals that individual Egyptian officials and public figures are quoted by the American papers, but uniquely when they are critical to their own religion, culture and society. Put differently, the Egyptian is not consulted by editorials unless what he or she communicates "will precisely be defined as a confirmation of prevailing stereotypes and prejudices" (Van Dijk, 1996, p.94). Consider the following excerpts for clarification:

1) His [Omar Suleiman] recent public statements have been chilling. He said he does not believe it is time to lift the three-decade-old emergency law that has been used to suppress and imprison opposition leaders. Most alarming, he said the country's "culture" is not yet ready for democracy. (NYT, 08 February, 2011, "Mr. Suleiman's Empty Promises".

2) "Mr. Suleiman was asked if he believed in democracy." For sure," he answered. But "you will do that . . . when the people here will have the culture of democracy."" (WP, 07 February 2011, "Wrongly choosing Egypt's generals over the democrats".

3) "Mr. Suleiman has said Egypt is not ready for democracy." (WP, 10 Feb, 2011, "Hosni Mubarak offers Egyptians far less than they demand"

Clearly, Omar Suleiman, former intelligence chief and former vice president in Mubarak's regime, deserved quoting three times as he reiterated that Egypt was not ready for democracy. The first excerpt shows also Suleiman's statement that it is not high time to withdraw

the emergency law[1]. Suleiman's words imply that time is not ripe yet to stop suppressing Egyptians. Suleiman's cited description of Egyptians as not viable for democracy informs on the stance of editorial boards of the papers; The NYT and The WP. Seemingly, the Egyptian is considered trustworthy, and their utterances are as authentic and value-laden just when he or she is consolidating the West's version of the story; in this case that Egypt is not ready for democracy. Mr. Suleiman's voice has been sourced as a well-informed knower who stresses a purely Orientalist view of the 'other' as, in Bernard Lewis's formulation, 'congenitally undemocratic' (Said 2003, p.343).

Likewise, an entire editorial entitled "Egypt's jailing of democracy activists shows how far it has backtracked", written by The WP's editorial board, is a discussion of an op-ed written by Ahmed Maher, "a founder of the April 6 Youth Movement and one of the leading lights in the Egypt democracy campaign that brought down Hosni Mubarak" (WP, 21 June, 2014). Maher is found worth quoting at length by The WP because the gist of his op-ed suits the line of reasoning the selected papers adopt. Consider the following for clarification:

4) Two weeks ago, from prison, Mr. Maher wrote an op-ed for these pages [for The WP] in which he declared, "Egypt is ruled by a military regime that does not tolerate criticism or even advice." ... "There is no path of democracy" in Egypt today, Mr. Maher said, "it is all a comical farce." (WP, 21 June, 2014, "Egypt's jailing of democracy activists shows how far it has backtracked")

Maher's attitude is critical of the Egyptian military regime, and he openly expressed the impossibility of promoting democracy in Egypt. 'Mr.' is always written before his name to make him appear as an informed knower and a reliable source of information. The aim here is not to provide a counter argument that disavows Maher's statements, but to show when exactly the

---

[1] The emergency law is a tool in the hands of the executive power to storm many basic rights and freedom guaranteed by the Egyptian Constitution. The emergency law grants to the authority broad power to impose restrictions on the freedoms of assembly, move or residence; the power to arrest and detain suspects or those deemed dangerous, and the power to search individuals and places without the need to follow the provisions of the Criminal Procedure Code. (www.fidh.org, 2011)

Egyptian individual's voice is worth quoting and citing in Western media text.

Equally, the selected data do not yield a single voice of the Muslim Brotherhood[2] wherein a positive or a neutral tone is felt. Accordingly, Mr. Mohamed Morsi, the former Egyptian president and one of the Muslim Brotherhood's leaders who led an Islamist government in Egypt, is found worth quoting by the selected media journalists, namely The Guardian. Morsi's utterances were given prominence as long as they confirm by a way or another the Western media discourse. The instances wherein Mr. Mohamed Morsi was referred to are restricted to certain kinds of topics, Sharia, Israel, non-Muslims and women's rights. Consider the following for more elaboration:

5) "He [Mohamed Morsi] has called for barring women and non-Muslims from the presidency on the basis of Islamic law, or Shariah." (NYT, 25 April, 2012, "Egypt's Chaotic Election".

6) "He [Mohamed Morsi] has made inflammatory statements about Israel, describing its citizens as "killers and vampires." (NYT, 25 April, 2012, "Egypt's Chaotic Election".

The excerpts above position Mr. Morsi as a religious fanatic ("barring non-Muslims from the presidency"), women oppressor ("barring women from the presidency"), and Israel hater ("made inflammatory statements about Israel, describing its citizens as "killers and vampires""). The NYT sees that such attitudes Morsi adopts are based on Islamic law, or Shariah. Quoting Morsi to have said all these serves as a confirmation of the already constructed stereotypes about Muslims and Islamic law, and leaving out stories that might challenge these stereotypes is also a strategy that leads to the same results. This is a technique of silence that is used to conceal the good aspect of Mr. Morsi and the Muslim Brotherhood. Van Dijk's ideological square (1998b) is

---

[2] The Muslim Brotherhood, or *al-Ikhwān al-Muslimūn* in Arabic, is the world's oldest Sunni revivalist organization in the Arab world. Its model of charity work combined with political activism has inspired similar movements in Turkey, Syria, Iraq, Sudan, Bahrain, Palestine, Jordan, Morocco, Kuwait, and others. Founded by the Egyptian Islamic scholar and teacher Hassan al-Banna in Cairo in 1928, the group began as a small religious and charitable society that aimed at spreading Islamic values and purging Egypt of its British occupiers. Under its famous slogan, "Islam is the solution," the group built religious schools, provided social services, and combatted the spread of Western cultural values. It advocated Islam as a comprehensive system of governance distinct from the secular political systems in the West. (Aljazeera, 2017)

relevant in this regard in the sense that the media keeps on emphasizing how bad are 'them' and understate the opposite.

In the same vein, another Islamist's voice is given room to communicate his opinion in the editorials. It is the conservative Islamist Adel Abdel Maqsoud Afifi. Afifi is quoted for blaming the female rape victims at Tahrir square during the street mass protests. He says that "Sometimes, a girl contributes 100 percent to her own raping when she puts herself in these conditions" (NYT, 28 March 2013, "Terror in Tahrir Square"). Afifi's statement is foregrounded in the editorials for it consolidates the Western stereotypical narratives about women's degrading status in the Arab world.

Following the same sourcing patterns, by The WP this time, two public figures in Egypt are found worth quoting by the media. These two men's; Nabil Elaraby, the foreign minister of the interim civilian cabinet, and Amr Moussa, the former head of the Arab League, contribution to the overall content of the editorial gives them the advantage to be referred to by full name and political affiliation in the editorial. Consider the following for more elaboration:

7) There's nevertheless a case for concluding that Egypt's policy changes may end up benefiting the United States and Israel. First, both Mr. Elaraby and Mr. Moussa said that Egypt will keep its peace treaty with Israel and continue close relations with Washington. (WP, 10 May, 2011, "Egypt's new foreign policy").

The two Egyptian politicians, quoted in the excerpt, express an attitude that is appealing to the U.S. They are anticipating a scenario wherein the U.S. will benefit and fulfill its ambitions in Egypt and the Middle East. They are given a voice because they prophesied about a political stability for Israel in the Middle East and a promising foreign policy for the U.S. in the same region.

It becomes clear that the Egyptian's voice is excluded from the coverage unless he/she emphasizes and reinforces pre-existing Western rhetoric that defines 'the Other' negatively, or expresses an opinion that serves Western interests. Moreover, the sourcing patterns followed by the editorials' writers unfold also a dichotomy of Muslims versus non-Muslims or Westerners. This is to say that the selected media allows Western voices to provide statement that are always placed in opposition of what Egyptians, namely Islamists, say. Consider the following excerpts for illustration:

8) "Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton called publicly on Mr. Mubarak to make reforms and not to block peaceful protests." (NYT, 27 January 2011, "Mr. Mubarak Is Put on Notice".)

9) "Ms. Clinton's calls to lift internet controls and respond to the grievances of Egyptians became more strident." (G, 29 January, 2011, "Egypt: A pivotal moment")

10) Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton spoke forcefully this week against the street attacks on women, noting, correctly, that "this systematic degradation of Egyptian women dishonors the revolution, disgraces the state and its uniform and is not worthy of a great people. (NYT, 20 December, 2011, "Egypt's Military Masters")

11) "There can be no going back on the democratic transition called for by the Egyptian people." She added, "They're doing something they've never done in 5,000-plus years of history. They have had elections." (WP, 2 August, 2013, "No going back on democracy in Egypt")

The excerpts above show some of the American Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's speeches, statements or declarations. Linguistically speaking, the writers, when sourcing Clinton, use the following verbs and phrases: "calls", "called publicly on", and "spoke forcefully against". Calling for something, according to Cambridge English Dictionary, means "to say publicly that something should happen". With such reporting phrases, Clinton is presented as someone equipped with power, authority, courage and ability to call 'publicly' and 'forcefully' for actions. In addition, Clinton's statements are rendered valid and correct by the reporter's evaluation as shown in excerpt 10: Ms. Clinton "noting, correctly, that".

Equally important, Hillary Clinton is positioned as calling solely for favorable actions, such as making reforms in Egypt and tolerating peaceful protests (excerpt 8); lifting Internet control and responding to Egyptians' demands (excerpt 9); and condemning the mistreatment of women in the streets (excerpt 10). Accordingly, Clinton is given the role of guaranteeing the human rights the Egyptian authorities are violating. She is presented as a rescuer and women's rights defender (this is when, as mentioned earlier, the elected president Mohammed Morsi, for example, is quoted to have "called for barring women and non-Muslims from the presidency on the basis of Islamic law, or Shariah" (NYT, 25 April, 2012, "Egypt's Chaotic Election"). Such juxtaposition implies that 'we' are liberating woman while "They" are repressing her, or the Egyptian regime is suppressing its people while 'We' are calling for liberating it.

Relatedly, Clinton is quoted to have considered attacking Egyptian women in the street during the revolution a 'systematic' deed; and, therefore, makes of it an organized, planned and a regular action against the well-being of women. This is obviously a mere reflection of the classical Orientalist discourse that portrays Arab countries as a space wherein women are subjected to constant mistreatment.

Similarly, a comparable amount of coverage was given to the then American President Barak Obama. Obama's statements are tinged with a great deal of modality which positions him as having unlimited authority to address dictations to the then Egyptian head of state. By using modality, especially 'obligation modality' or modal verbs, such as 'must' and 'should', the speaker claims a superior position above others:

12) "Mr. Obama said that he had told the Egyptian leader that "an orderly transition must be meaningful, it must be peaceful, and it must begin now."" (NYT, 1 February,2011, "Beyond Mubarak"; WP, 1 February 2011; T, 02 February 2011, "Egypt: the West must weigh its words carefully").

13) "President Obama said the right things last week when he demanded that democratic change in Egypt start "now."" (NYT, 08 February 2011, "Mr. Suleiman's Empty Promises").

14) "On Thursday night, a White House statement attributed to President Obama rightly said that "too many Egyptians remain unconvinced that the government is serious about a genuine transition to democracy."" (WP, 10 February, 2011, "Hosni Mubarak offers Egyptians far less than they demand").

Obama's statement in the excerpt 12 shows an excessive use of 'obligation modality' expressed through the use of auxiliary model 'must' three times. This modality signals power and it is the vehicle through which Obama sends his strong instructions and lays out orders. Additionally, the term "now" in the same excerpt assigns urgent action. In fact, quoting Obama giving orders to an Arab president consolidates the pre-existing social inequalities wherein the West is powerful and the Arab world is otherwise.

Needless to reiterate here that there are other ways to express modality than through auxiliary verbs. The use of adjectives (e.g., probable, likely) and adverbs (e.g., supposedly, possibly) by editorials' writers is another form of modality wherein a point of view or an evaluation of a reported item is given. Simpson calls this form of modality an 'evaluative modality' that is based on three patterns: "positive, negative, and neutral shadings" (1993,

p.55). A positive shading occurs when the reported item is proved assertive and strong; negative shading stories are characterized by the use of a word that denotes alienation and uncertainty; and neutral shading stories are stories without modality or modal judgment (i.e. something is or is not") (Lyons, 1977, p.726). In the excerpts above, Obama's statements are made positive shading stories of high value: "president Obama said the right things ..." (excerpt 13) and "a White House statement attributed to President Obama rightly said that ..." (excerpt 14). Obama's speech is therefore accredited, made valid and strong. Similarly, the same shading patterns were used to refer to Clinton's statements.

Like Hillary Clinton, Obama is referenced only calling for what guarantees the Egyptians better life conditions; an orderly transition that must be meaningful and peaceful, and an urgent democratic change. This is while Islamists, as shown earlier, were reported to oppose the Western liberating actions, to violate women's rights and to make inflammatory statements about Israel. Similarly, secular Egyptians are reported only when they are critical of Egyptian culture and Islam, or when they make statements that harmonize with the West's attitudes and ambitions.

In the same vein, the British papers, The Guardian and The Telegraph, sourced the then Prime Minister David Cameron once each. Noticeably, the same quoting techniques, the same point of view of positive shading given by the editorials writers and the same messages that Obama and Clinton were quoted saying are reflected in the following excerpts wherein David Cameron is referenced:

15) "[David Cameron] told MPs that the transition to democracy in Egypt needs to be "rapid and credible and it needs to start now"." (T, 02 February, 2011, "Egypt: the West must weigh its words carefully").

16) "David Cameron expressed fairly promptly the view that Egyptians are entitled to political freedom." (G, 6 February 2011, "Cairo protests: The west has a duty to nurture democracy").

David Cameron is given authority and power to say what is needed to be done urgently. He is presented solely when calling for the best for the Egyptians; "transition to democracy" and "political freedom". Additionally, the point of view implied in the wording reflects positive shading. Cameron's statement is made also of a high value by the reporter's evaluation of it; it is stated that Cameron expresses "fairly promptly" his views.

IV. CONCLUSION

The study shows how the sourcing patterns adopted by the selected media reflect a reproduction and reinforcement of relationships of dominance and social inequalities. Additionally, Van Dijk's ideological square is useful to the extent that it shows the way the Westerner and the Egyptian were sourced, over-quoting statements that show how good are 'us' and how bad are 'them', and excluding statements that show how bad are 'us' and how good are "them'. This is to say that the selected media finds the Arab and the Islamist worth-quoting when they are either critical to their culture and religion or when they are implicitly giving credit to the classical discourse that sees Islam and Islamists as inferior entities. The analysis demonstrates how, through various ways of modality, the editorials' writers evaluate the quoted statements, consolidate power relations between Western and Arab social actors, and create dichotomous divisions between the Westerner and the Arab. Such divisions are created through giving the Westerner and the Arab opposite roles by referencing the former as powerful and the one who has authority to give instruction to Arab leaders, while the latter is represented as someone who should execute orders. Relatedly, the opinions of both parties are often placed in opposition. For example, when one is repressing women the other is liberating them. It is plausible to conclude that such divisions created by the sourcing patterns employed in the editorials go hand in hand with the classical Orientalist discourse that divides the world into 'us' and 'them', 'superior' and 'inferior'.

REFERENCES

[1] Aljazeera (2017). What is the Muslim Brotherhood?. Available at https://www.aljazeera.com/features/2017/6/18/what-is-the-muslim-brotherhood (accessed 29 October 2021)

[2] El-Mahdi, R. (2011). Orientalising the Egyptian Uprising. Available at https://www.jadaliyya.com/Details/23882 (accessed 11 June 2011).

[3] Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: the critical study of language*. London: Longman.

[4] International Federation for Human Rights (2001) The emergency law in Egypt. Available at: https://www.fidh.org/en/region/north-africa-middle-east/egypt/THE-EMERGENCY-LAW-IN-EGYPT (accessed 12 October 2021).

[5] Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[6] Said, E, W. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books

[7] Said, E, W. (2001b). *Power, Politics and Culture: Interviews with Edward Said*. Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.

[8] Said, E, W. (2003). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books

[9] Simpson, P. (1993). *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London : Routledge.

[10] Van Dijk, T, A. (1996). Discourse, power and access. In Rosa C, Coulthard C and Coulthard M (eds) *Texts and Practices Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis.* London and New York: Routledge, pp.84-104.

[11] Van Dijk, T, A. (1998b). Opinions and ideologies in the press. In Bell A and Garrett P (eds) *Approaches to media discourse*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 21-63.