

The Concepts of Competition and Gain in Arab Spring Metaphors

Ashwaq Yahya Ali Almahbashi¹ & Imran Ho Abdullah

*School of Language Studies and Linguistics,
Faculty of Social Science and Humanities, UKM*

This study investigates two conceptual domains in the metaphors of Arab Spring as reported by Al Jazeera's online articles. The concept of competition is explored from the identified metaphor "Arab Spring is Game" and the concept of Gain is explored from the identified metaphor "Arab Spring is Business". Mainly, two approaches in cognitive linguistics are used; conceptual metaphor and critical metaphor theory to identify metaphors of Game and Business and to interpret the conceptual mappings. The analysis showed how the concepts of Competition and Gain viewed Arab Spring as a pie or a gain to all parties competing to get. They played different types of games that involved gambits and manipulation such as dominos, cards and football. Moreover, they made transactions and offers to maintain existing power for the ex-ruling systems, gaining support for the revolutionaries, manipulating and using revolution to get power in the case of opposition groups.

Keywords: *Arab Spring Metaphor, Competition, Game, Business, Gain*

INTRODUCTION

Arab spring as described by Torlakova (2014) is a compensation of "ethnic name" (p.6) which refers to Arab nation and "spring" which refers to a season of the year in which nature restore good conditions such as good weather, new growth of trees and blossom of flowers. It is a metaphorical term describing the political movements of protests, uprisings, sit ins and social unrest in most of the Arab countries of the middle east since 2011 until now in some countries. This movements of uprisings and revolutions tended to topple and change corrupt ruling regims as indicated by Khondker (2011).

The literature of conceptual metaphor reported the common utilization of the concept of competition in the metaphors of conflict such as war, rebellion and revolution where opponents and enemies compete to win. The concepts of competition and game in the metaphors of Arab Spring is reflected in many conceptual frames mainly the frame of game and the frame of transaction by online articles of Al Jazeera. This study investigates how the concept of competition is used to report Arab Spring and what are the conceptual and semantic implication it has in supporting Arab Spring in Yemen. The first part will explore the concept of Competition as a domain in the literature and the second part will elaborate on the concept of Gain.

THE CONCEPT OF COMPETITION

¹ Corresponding author: ashwaqalmahbashi@gmail.com

The concept of competition maps to a range of metaphoric themes in the form of activities described by different scholars. According to Goatly (2007) and Lakoff (1980 & 1992), it covers the following themes:

- i. Sport: “competition is a race, competitive success is winning a race, important is first” (Goatly 2007: 337).
- ii. Game: “activity is game, ball, card, board, gambling” (Goatly 2007: 337).
- iii. Attack: “argument is war, arguing /criticizing is fighting, arguing/criticizing is attacking- hitting/ punching or shooting or wounding/ cutting” (Goatly 2007: 337) (Lakoff 1980: 9; 1992: 8).

In this study, the concept of competition is envisaged in the metaphor of Game. It works very well to reflect specific semantic implications of Arab Spring in Yemen. The following is brief account about the metaphor which reflect the domain of competition to facilitate the explanation of this conceptualization.

ARAB SPRING IS GAME

The conceptual frame of Game is successfully utilized by Al Jazeera to describe the revolution, revolutionaries and the counter revolution party which is Saleh. In fact, the conceptual domain of game involves features like competition, skill, mobility and great motivations. All these features are missing in the domino effect policy. Lesson and Dean (2009) argued that the domino political theory claims when democracy in a country decreases or increases, it infects the neighboring countries and result in their democracy either to be increased or decreased. They further found out that the proposition of the theory regarding the domino effect is not significant. Only 11 percent of democracy influence is transmitted to the neighboring countries. Moreover, they mentioned that even the military intervention itself cannot bring a big change in democracy, which is more direct than infectious effects. Likewise, some of the game competitions such as the domino effect Al Jazeera drew for Arab Spring are not real and do not express the facts of Arab Spring. Rather, such Games are only trying to create certain convictions in the readers’ minds about Arab Spring that serves its own ideologies and purposes. In the subsequent sections brief analysis is provided to some of the instances exemplifying metaphors of Arab Spring as a game. To achieve the goals of this study, a three-stage analysis has been made:

- i. The identification stage in which two main categories will be identified namely the conceptual metaphors and the themes implied in them.
- ii. The interpretation stage in which the conceptual elements will be mapped between the source domains and the target domains.
- iii. Explanation stage through which justification for the selection of the identified conceptualizations will be provided.

This justification will reveal the intention, attitude and ideology of Al Jazeera as a house of media of selecting those concepts.

THE CONCEPT OF GAIN

Arab Spring is Business

This metaphor is used widely in the political language that is concerned with war and political conflict; mainly to describe the conflict in terms of Gain and Loss where the political phenomena is not more than a transaction to maximize profit and minimize loss. A famous example of the transaction or business metaphor is the Expert metaphor indicated in Lakoff (1992) in his paper entitled “*Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System Used to Justify War in the Gulf*”. As a country decides to go to war, they consider that the cost of getting involved in war higher than the cost of not getting involved. Whatever the reality of the situation or the war and its reasons and whether it is legal or illegal, it is easily justified by means of a set of selected concepts.

Lakoff asserted an important aspect in employing the political language for metaphor to justify war (which is unjustified). He identified that the differences disappear between what is real and what is metaphorical. The deliberate selection of metaphor bridges a gap which is unbridgeable. The reality is “pain, disarmament, death & starvation” and many more whereas the metaphorical scene is not more than a transaction through which an offer is made. The famous metaphor in politics Lakoff referred to is the Expert metaphors. The Expert metaphors originally introduced by a military expert who looked at war based on the cost benefit bases. Moreover, Lakoff (1992) described the relation between war, politics and business as “Politics is Business”, which is a result of two metaphors: “War is Politics” and “War is Business” (1992: 7).

In addition to these two metaphors, Lakoff established that based on the state as person metaphor where the state acts based on the interest of the country, actions taken by the state at the international level namely “politics” (p.7) is merely business activity, which means international politics is business (Lakoff 1992: 7).

Abdel-Raheem (2013) described the expert metaphors explained by Lakoff (1992) as a definition for “a rational approach” in Lakoff’s terms “a causation”. They are a system of metaphors to justify war based on gain – cost analysis to obtain an economic national interest and the actual debate is whether the cost of getting involved in the political phenomena such as war worth it or not. It has never been whether getting involved in such a phenomenon is appropriate or not.

So, what is rationality from the point of view of the expert metaphors? In fact it has a different point of view of the actual rationality as (Abdel-Raheem 2013) clarified. Rationality indicated by the Expert metaphors is based on the gain – cost analysis including the rationality metaphor “rationality is maximization of self-interest” (Abdel-Raheem 2013: 146).

Furthermore, Lakoff argued that the hidden logic for this metaphor is that the country is considering itself rational to seek maximizing its wealth and military force. Moreover, he argued that “violence can further self-interest” (1992: 3) which means violence and aggression are used for gain and benefit. This metaphor which links violence with self-interest urgently calls for the need to counter such violence. That counter violence can be combated by possible three-way hidden logics, as follows:

- i. To set a balance of powers so that no power can overcome or be a potential threat to other states.
- ii. To establish a conviction in the community that violence is against self-interest.
- iii. To make a coup supported by the whole community to stop violence for the benefit of self-interest of the community and to set a punishment and sanctions on the power imposing the threat of violence.

These systems of metaphor established by Lakoff (1992) are applicable to Arab Spring context but as revolution which is a political context not war. There are number of entailments or mappings within the concept of transaction that were reported by Al Jazeera to describe the situation of revolutionaries and the revolutionary activities. The gain in the context of war indicated in Lakoff (1992) signified real economic assets such as oil and gas. However, the gain in the context of revolution signifies a set of concepts such as support, strength, power and authority.

By looking at the metaphors above with other metaphors established by Lakoff to conceptualize war, these metaphors interact together to make a chain of metaphors in which there are a collaboration of many concepts. Such as; "War is Gain//Loss" and "State as a Person" characterizing a country as a person who get involved with neighbors and society in relations, such relations signify the political relations with other states. This person should act rationally through politics and "rationality is maximizing self-interest". All these concepts are used as well through the concept of business or transaction to express Arab Spring by Al Jazeera's articles. It used the concepts of Gain, Loss, Offer and Bargain to reflect the different reactions of power groups to get as much gain as they can and to minimize their losses which resulted from the mass of demonstrators to leave power and change many systems in the country. Lakoff argued also that since "wellbeing is wealth" then "wellbeing is gain" (1992, p.6) because wellbeing is an increases of wealth and decreases of wellbeing are costs (Lakoff 1992). These metaphors have some conceptualizing effects; the first effect is that it makes qualitative characteristics quantitative; second, it makes them comparable in terms of quantity. It tackles them from a mathematical point of view such as increase of gains and decrease of costs which might be called mathematizing metaphor.

METHODOLOGY

Online reports of Al Jazeera English were chosen as a population of the study. A purposful sampling was made for ten analyticeal articles written on Arab Spring of Yemen 2011-2013. The articles were retrived from the section entiteled Openion of Al Jazeera English websit. Only articles published from 2011 untill 2014 were included in the population and sample of the study because this is the time span of the revolution in Yemen.

This study was analyzed by means of an integration of the following three instruments to achieve its objectives:

- i. The Conceptual Metaphor Theory by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) is used to identify the conceptual metaphors of game and business//transaction and the mappings between the source domain of game and business/transaction to the target domain of revolution.
- ii. The Critical Metaphor Theory by Charteris-Black (2004) which is a complementary method to identify the conceptualization of metaphors of revolution as game and business/transaction too. It depends on the identification of incongruity of meaning that Black described as the tension of meaning between the source domain and the target domain, which is revolution. Context is the main pillar in this theory as it provides the necessary socio-political background for interpretation and explanation. The concepts competition and gain are explored through this method because they were recognized as the main domains of mappings through this method though it was not quite sufficient. However, one of the shortcomings of this theory is that it doesn't provide a precise mechanism for metaphor identification.

- iii. The Metaphor Identification procedures by Group (2007) bridge the gap of a clear mechanism of metaphor identification. It is utilized for specifying precisely the conceptual metaphors with reference to the basic and contextual meaning to the metaphorical lexical unit.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In this section a three-phase analysis is provided; the identification, interpretation and explanation of the two main concepts named as the Competition and the Gain as explored under the two frames which are Arab spring is Game and Arab Spring is Business. The first frame analyzed is ‘the game frame’ and the second part covered is ‘the business frame’.

Arab Spring is Game

When Arab Spring is viewed as a game that means, there are mutual properties between the two domains, Arab Spring as a target domain and Game as source domain. These properties are reflected in the mappings made from the source domain ‘Game’ to the target domain ‘Arab Spring’. This mapping is established within many games that inherently reflect the features of the source domain in Arab Spring. The following table clarifies the mapping of each game according to the examples provided.

Table 1: The Mapping of Conceptualization of REVOLUTION IS A GAME

No.	Game	Mechanism of Game	Rivalries	Winner	Loser	Instrument	The Conceptual Association
1	Domino	A stone is hit by another one to fall	Revolutionaries and Saleh	Revolutionaries	Saleh	Stones which are revolutions	The strong and fast effect of stones are falling.
Example – The ouster of Saleh could set off a domino effect, published on 23 March 2011							
2	Table	Competition for power	Revolutionaries & Saleh	Revolutionaries	Saleh	Stones & table	Victory of revolutionaries
Example – Demonstrations turned the tables of power on Saleh, published on 21 March 2011							
3	Football	Competition for power	Saleh and power groups	Opposition	Saleh	Ball, court & field	Power
Example – The ball is now in the opposition’s court, published on 11 June 2011							
4	Cards	Competition for power	Saleh and America	-	-	Card which is the cooperation on the war on terrorism	A point of strength
Example – To play the terrorism card, published on 11 June 2011							

The conceptualization of “Arab Spring is game” as described in Table 1 is detailed below:

Arab Spring is Domino

The domino game is representing Arab Spring in terms of the mechanism of the game which originally traced to the domino theory (Leeson & Dean 2009), however (Shimko 1994) stated that the term is made by the American administrations in the cold war to justify their intervention. By examining the example above, the lexical unit provoked this metaphor is “set off the domino effect” (Aljazeera 2011) involves that the effect assumed by domino theory and successive American administrations might be suspended by the Saleh stepping down from authority. As the example in the table indicates, the ouster of Saleh will make an end to the domino effect of Arab Spring. The domino effect is claimed by Al Jazeera to be the responsible factor for the breaks out of Arab Spring in a chain mechanism like the falling stones of dominos. The obvious analogy made through the domino game is the infectious effect of domino stones falling.

Arab Spring is Table Game

As indicated in the example “demonstrations turned the tables of power on Saleh” (Al Jazeera, 2011), revolutionaries and Saleh are the competing teams in the table game where Saleh played for a long time. However, when the revolutionaries scored higher than Saleh and turned the table, it was a sign of two things. The first is the game came to an end, second the winner is the one who turns the table after scoring higher than his competitor. The semantic association between the game of table and Arab Spring is the way the winner announces victory which is turning the table.

Arab Spring is Football Match

The conceptualization of Arab Spring as a football game reveals a significant fact that competing teams are Saleh and Opposition Parties only, but revolutionaries were absent from this game. The absence of revolutionaries from the scene of football game has an implication for Arab Spring in Yemen that will be highlighted in the following interpretation.

At the beginning, the ball was in Saleh’s field, “Saleh is in a very tenuous position, but the ball may still be in his field” (Al Jazeera 2011) and afterwards it was in the opposition’s field “the ball is now in the opposition’s court” (Al Jazeera 2011). In fact, the ball is mapping to power and competing teams are running after the ball. The normal case is that, revolutionaries are competing with Saleh for the victory of the revolution but because the aim of the competition is getting power which is a kind of profit not an ethical value like freedom or human rights, revolutionaries are absent in this game.

This conflict is resolved through an interpretation provided by game theory, which is basically a mathematical modelling and has great applications in international relations especially security and economics (Correa 2001: 189). It is possible to use it to interpret the political language used by Al Jazeera to conceptualize Arab Spring as a game. It involves a kind of relation between players, which is grounded on upgrading profits regardless of ethical values; when one player wins, it is quite equal to that the other one loses.

Tema (2014) also argued that players in this interrelated relation are on a competition and both are aiming at profit maximization and lose minimization, which applies to the competition between Saleh, opposition parties and other power groups. This interpretation in fact resolves the problem of excluding the revolutionaries from the football game as they are not running after profits and gains of power, which is true in the competition between Saleh and power groups. Furthermore, this conceptualization exposes the reality of the oppositions’ support to the revolution which is meant only to gain power and authority through leading the revolutionary surge.

Arab Spring is Playing Cards

As illustrated in the table, the example “He continued to play the terrorism card” (Al Jazeera 2011) established a conceptualization for Saleh playing cards. This game involves great deal of smartness to predict the choices of other players, which are America and the international community. As Saleh was an international partner on the war on terrorism launched by America after the attacks of September 11, 2001, the terrorism card for Saleh was a significant one against the revolution card, because it involved the security of international community and playing that card made Saleh competent for the support of international community against Arab Spring revolution. It was the deal of terrorism for the revolution card.

According to the analysis of source domain mapping of game discussed above, there are three players; the revolutionaries, Saleh and the opposition. Revolutionaries competed with Saleh to defeat and exclude him to bring a change for a better future of the country while opposition competed with Saleh for their instrumental interests and power. This was indicated through the game of football where revolutionaries were replaced by opposition as a player in the game.

ARAB SPRING IS BUSINESS

Among the set of source domains of revolution which involves the mutually exclusive concepts of gain and loss, is the conceptual domain of Business/Transaction. It is connected metaphorically with war and politics as Lakoff (1992) established. Arab Spring is a revolution which is basically a political act at the first place more than a violent act. Therefore, it is natural for politics to be business as indicated by Lakoff (1992) through the metaphors: “War is Politics” and “War is Business.” Therefore, “Politics is Business”. (p.8)

Metaphors of ‘Revolution as Business’ is a complicated concept as it involves processes such as offer, demand, bargain, gain and loss which means it is not simply a matter of buying and selling. In fact, they make up the conceptual mappings of the metaphor “Revolution is Business”. The main components of the ‘Revolution is Business’ are included in the following equation:

$$\text{DEMAND} + \text{OFFER} = \text{GAIN or LOSS}$$

The different mappings under the frame of business/transaction and the analysis of the examples containing words which triggered a business/transaction mapping is illustrated in Table 2 below:

Table 2: The conceptual mappings of REVOLUTION IS BUSINESS metaphor

No.	The Dealer	The Customer	The Deal	Result of the Deal	Gain	Loss
1	Saleh	Revolutionaries	Offer of Concessions	Failed	-	Power
	“He must not wait until the demonstrations have gained such momentum that any concessions he offers fail to meet the protesters” demands” 01 March 2011					
2	Opposition	Revolutionaries	Offer of Support	Succeeded	Support	-
	“He must not wait until the demonstrations have gained such momentum that any concessions he offers fail to meet the protesters” demands” 01 March 2011					

3	Saleh	Revolutionaries	1 Bargain his way out 2 offer not to run for re-election	Rejected	-	Power
	"He attempted to bargain his way out.... Saleh initially offered not to run for re-election in 2013.... This time round, the nation would reject his offer" 11 June 2011					
4	International Parties	Saleh	Grant of Immunity	Accepted	Immunity from prosecution	-
	"Saleh bowed to months of protests and international pressure by agreeing in November to a deal that granted him immunity from prosecution over his violent crackdown on a popular uprising" 05 Jan 2012 and 27 Feb 2012.					
5	International Parties	Saleh	Grant of Immunity	Accepted	Immunity from prosecution	-
	"Saleh resigned in February 2012 in exchange for a parliamentary immunity deal to cover him and his cohorts" 24 June 2013					
6	Islah Party (opposition)	Revolutionaries	Buy revolution	Accepted	Support	-
	"They- Islah party- think they can buy this revolution" 11 June 2011.					
7	Saleh	Revolutionaries	Offer of Concessions	Rejected	-	Power
	"Saleh's offer rebuffed" 12 March 2011					

The following is the interpretation and explanation of the mappings summarized in Table 2. The set of the entailments of the source domain business/transaction includes the domains: gain, offer, customer, and commodity. The following mapping clarifies how the concept of gain mainly is resolving the relations between the different groups involved in revolution. These mappings are established based on the analysis of the examples retrieved from Al Jazeera online articles’.

- i. Gain is Power (For Saleh)
- ii. Support is Gain (For the Revolutionaries)
- iii. Arab Spring is Gaining Support

"He must not wait until the demonstrations have *gained such momentum* that any concessions he *offers fail* to meet the protesters' demands" (Al Jazeera, 2011).

The italic words in the above example provoked the above mappings; they all create a context of business and a transaction. As indicated in the first example, on one hand Saleh as a dealer should offer revolutionaries concessions to end up the protests but they are most likely to reject this offer if they gain support as reported in the example. Revolutionaries were expected to gain support. Gain and loss are terms that are used in a transaction context Lakoff (1992, 1980). The word "gain" in the context of business based on Longman dictionary definition means advantage, increase, profit which is financial. In the transaction context, there are many elements such as a business identity who is a person or a company, the business identity makes transactions which are business deals, or offers. Through the business deal, the dealer either gets financial profit, basically money, and in this case, he gained. The other case in a business deal or a transaction is to lose money. The implication of the concept of a transaction associates with the concept of Arab Spring because Arab Spring through the domain of gain as revolution is believed to have a positive increase such as increase in support and allies. Yet, the Arab Spring loses when it experiences a decrease in support and all what brings momentum to it.

In the example above, Arab Spring is more likely to get a positive increase which is a gain, Saleh considers himself as a dealer who likes always to gain money and attempt to avoid any loss. It becomes clear that as much as money is important for a businessman, authority and power is equally valuable for Saleh. He thought if Arab Spring

gains support, it will ultimately gain power and authority which he will losses in return. This transformation of money which is quantifiable as a gain into the qualitative gain of power in the case of both Saleh and the opposition and support in the case of revolutionaries is a conceptual transformation from what is quantitative into what is qualitative as indicated by (Abdel-Raheem, 2013).

- i. Gain is Power
- ii. Revolution and Opposition are Customers/Sellers
- iii. Arab Spring and Immunity are Gains/Commodities

The expressions which evoked these mappings most likely highlight the role of a customer and seller as well. Bargaining, rejecting/agreeing on an offer or a deal are performed by a customer and a seller. Saleh wanted to gain his safety after he offered at the beginning some concessions. The following is the examples in which they appeared:

“Saleh’s offer rebuffed” (Al Jazeera 2011).

“He attempted to *bargain* his way out.... Saleh initially *offered* not to run for re-election in 2013.... This time round, the nation would *reject his offer*” (Al Jazeera, 2011).

“Saleh bowed to months of protests and international pressure by *agreeing* in November *to a deal* that granted him immunity from prosecution over his violent crackdown on a popular uprising”(Al Jazeera, 2012).

According to Al Jazeera’s editorials the Arab Spring for Saleh is a competing bid for immunity and power, and he must make compromise so that he lasts maintaining at least some gains. Therefore, he made offers, these offers are a kind of reconciliation; he promised not to run for the second term of elections, but he wanted to guarantee enjoying all political rights as a political leader which is a gain. Moreover, the businessman’s offer either to be accepted or rejected by the customers who are the revolutionaries. The bargaining indicated in example 3 is over immunity and power for Saleh whereas for the revolutionaries it is over freedom of the nation which is a precious commodity for them. The gain for revolutionaries is freedom, development, change and better future which they think is impossible in case Saleh gained power or any type of guarantees to last in power. So, it was difficult to accept such an offer.

There is contradiction between the position of Saleh as a dealer who offers a deal and his position as a customer who bargains to get a deal. This contradiction is resolved when we figure out that the other party of the deal which is the revolutionaries. Saleh considers revolutionaries as less authority than him on one hand; he regards himself as the one who is holding power. He considers himself addressing a less powerful group who is revolutionaries or at best, a party of opposition not more than that. On the other hand, he is a customer not a dealer any more when he bargained with international community to help him to get guarantees of safety and political rights. He did not bargain with the revolutionaries, but he was negotiating with the Gulf Cooperation Council who sponsored the reconciliation initiative because he wanted to get as much gain from this deal as he can. The gain for Saleh was immunity from punishment over the attack he committed on protesters and maintaining political rights and power until the end of his presidential tenure in condition that he will not run for a new tenure.

Arab Spring is Gain (for the Opposition)

“Saleh resigned in February 2012 in *exchange* for a parliamentary *immunity deal* to cover him and his cohorts” (Al Jazeera, 2013).

“They- Islah party- think they can *buy this revolution*” (Al Jazeera, 2011).

Saleh and the Reform party 'Islah' wanted to make a deal by which they will get great gains. As Saleh sought to gain power and maintain immunity and political rights, whereas the 'Islah' opposition party wanted to gain the revolution itself. For Islah, Arab Spring is the gain for some reasons; it has the element that they lack though they have power. They have money resources, allies and outreaching strong leadership. Yet, they lack the legacy that Arab Spring has as a national approach to justice and freedom which attracts massive public support.

The mappings of the two distinct concepts, revolution and business show that there is a semantic and cognitive association between the mappings of these two concepts. The participants in transactions viewed as either a dealer or a customer represented by the former president Saleh who appear as a dealer once when he presented offers for revolutionaries and as a customer another time when he bargains for immunity and staying in power until the end of his tenure. However, revolutionaries are viewed as dealer when the opposition is offering support for them with the intention to buy their revolution. They were considered also as a potential competitor bidder to accept Saleh offer of concessions; they are also the customers for offers made by Saleh. Moreover, Arab Spring is conceptualized as gain by Islah party, the opposition party when their support for revolution is taken as a deal to take over revolution which was reported by Al Jazeera and protesters in the protesting squares.

CONCLUSION

The exploration of the metaphor of game in Arab Spring showed that Al Jazeera tended to view the relation between the revolutionaries, Saleh and other power groups as a competition, in which Saleh is viewed as the loser, revolutionaries and opposition as winners. However, there was a conflict of intentions among the revolutionaries, opposition and Saleh. Examples of Al Jazeera viewed only Saleh and the opposition as competitors in a football game, whereas revolutionaries were totally absent from the game. Game theory solved this conflict, as it regarded players as actors in interrelated relations based on a competition and both are aiming for profit maximization and loss minimization. Thus, the aim of Saleh and the opposition in the football game is to get power, which is totally different from the aim of the revolutionaries. A similar argument applies also to the conceptual metaphor Arab Spring is business where different parties hold deals and make transactions to get gains which vary based on the intentions and motivations of each party. For example, deals and offers made by Saleh to maintain power and authority and at his worst times, he was bargaining immunity and some political rights. On the other side, opposition groups were offering revolution and revolutionaries support with the intention to ride the surge of revolution and ultimately gain power after ousting Saleh.

Considering the frame of game, it was used manipulatively in creating impression that the revolutions in Arab Spring have a powerful effect to evoke the break out of new revolutions through the domino effect. However, a revolution need a potential power of its own in addition to hard and systematic efforts to make it come into existence. It involves campaigns of members of intelligentsia and organizations of civil society to alert and mobilize people to work for it. Furthermore, the assumed domino effect in politics is proved to be very weak as Lesson and Deen (2009) identified. It was used as a justification for the American intervention in the cold war (Shimko 1994). These conceptualizations revealed the attitude of Al Jazeera and the role they played successfully in supporting Arab Spring.

REFERENCES

- Abdel-Raheem, A. 2013. Metaphor of the global financial crisis after 2008: Reconstructing confidence by Arab and Western financial medias. *L'organizing: Une Question De Langage, Discours et Communication* 88: 160-182.
- al-Jazeera. 2011. Al Jazeera Opinion. Retrieved from <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/>.
- Charteris-Black, J. 2004. *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Correa, H. 2001. Game theory as an instrument for the analysis of international relations. *Ritsumeikan Annual Review of International Studies* 14(2): 187-208.
- Goatly, A. 2007. *Washing the Brain—Metaphor and Hidden Ideology*. Vol. 23. t.tp.: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Group, P. 2007. MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol* 22(1): 1-39. doi:10.1080/10926480709336752
- Khondker, H.H. 2011. Role of the new media in the Arab Spring. *Globalizations* 8(5): 675-679. doi:10.1080/14747731.2011.621287
- Lakoff, G. 1992. Metaphor and war: The metaphor system used to justify war in the Gulf. In Putz, Martin (ed.). *Thirty Years of Linguistic Evolution: Studies in Honour of René Dirven on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday*, pp. 463-481. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. 1980. Conceptual metaphor in everyday language. *The Journal of Philosophy* 77(8): 453-486.
- Leeson, P.T. & Dean, A.M. 2009. The democratic domino theory: An empirical investigation. *American Journal of Political Science* 53(3): 533-551. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5907.2009.00385.
- Shimko, K.L. 1994. Metaphors and foreign policy decision making. *Political Psychology* 15(4): 655-671. Doi:10.2307/3791625
- Tema, M. 2014. Basic assumptions in game theory and international relations. *International Relations Quarterly* 5: 1-4.
- Torlakova, L. 2014. Metaphors of the Arab Spring: Figurative construals of the uprisings and revolutions. *Journal of Arabic and Islamic Studies* 14: 1-25.

About the Authors

Ashwaq Yahya Ali Al-Mahbashi is a postgraduate researcher at Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM) in the School of Language Studies and Linguistics. Her research interests are in the areas of cognitive linguistics particularly conceptual metaphors of Arab Spring, semantics, methods of teaching English and curriculum design. She can be contacted at ashwaqalmahbashi@gmail.com

Prof. Dato' Dr. Imran Ho Abdullah @ Ho Yee Beng is a Professor of Cognitive and Corpus Linguistics at the School of Language Studies and Linguistics, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM). His research interests are in corpus linguistics, cross-cultural semantics/cognitive semantics and the natural extension of these interests to translation and the use of corpus methodologies in translation studies. He can be contacted at imranho@pkrisc.cc.ukm.my