

# A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF THE PORTRAYAL OF ETHIOPIA IN *SAVING THE FORGOTTEN JEWS* MOVIE

**\*Abebe Asres Mengistu**

*(PhD ,Assistant Professor of Applied Linguistics and Communication) Department of English Language and Literature,  
College of Social Science and Humanities, University of Gondar*

---

## ABSTRACT

*The study is aimed to critically analyze the discourse of the portrayal of Ethiopia in Saving the Forgotten Jews (2015) movie. The movie was selected purposively for the reason that it is dealing with Ethiopia. Van-Dijk's (2006) framework of triangular socio-cognitive approach is used as a model of analysis from linguistic perspective. The results of the study revealed that there are seven themes with negative representations by which Ethiopia is portrayed in the movie. The results also revealed various discursive manifestations of ideological discourse which the moviemakers used to exhibit the positioning of Ethiopia which traces back its past unfortunate events and occurrences such as: famine and civil war, which are identified as the nodal discourses contributed to the negative portrayal of Ethiopia in the movies. Based on the analysis, recommendations are given to: a) policymakers and media practitioners to work on the positive images of Ethiopia so as to change the western movie writers' negative perceptions to Ethiopia b) researchers to cover the nonlinguistic aspects of movies and to analyze movies taken from different parts of the world in addition to the Western ones.*

*Keywords: Movie, Portrayal, Critical Discourse Analysis*

## INTRODUCTION

Following the development of latest technologies, today media have become an essential part of the modern society. Especially since recent years, as Hamelink (1997) explains, the film industry is considered as one of the main tools of information transmission. Hollywood, which is often used as a metonymy for American cinema, is the birthplace of some of the biggest film productions which have been in charge of the production of the most famous blockbusters of all times. As a matter of fact, "not only does Hollywood have a negative impact on society, but it is also becoming an obsession with people living around the world" (Miller, 2007).

This obsession has become even epidemic in both Western societies and the rest of the world. People, especially the adolescents, follow the celebrities lead on movies and try to look like them both physically and morally. They not only follow their dressing style and material choices, but also take as true and

accept what the big stars and the moviemakers present in their movies. This problem becomes even much bigger when other societies, countries, continents are depicted in a certain wrong way. According to Amirian (2012), the abovementioned negative effects are only a handful of what is really happening in the real world due to the dominance of the cinema and the movie productions among the adolescents. As these same depictions are presented repeatedly in movies, the audience of these movies become to have similar and common images about what they watch based on how it is portrayed.

As Van Dijk (2006) claims, ideologies are foundational beliefs that underlie the shared social representations of specific kinds of social groups. These representations are in turn the basis of discourse and other social practices. Besides, ideologies are largely expressed and acquired by discourse, that is, by spoken or written communicative interaction. When group members explain, motivate or legitimate their group-based actions, they typically do so in terms of ideological discourse. According to Van Dijk's (2006), these expressions of ideologies are achieved through different discursive manifestations, such as positive self-representation and negative other-representation which have different forms of discourse features.

Ethiopia as a country has been presented in many Western movies both positively and negatively. There are two main reasons for this research study to be conducted. Firstly, the researcher's personal experience of viewing Western movies Secondly, to the best of my knowledge, there are no local researches done related to this topic. Hence, by taking *Saving the Forgotten Jews Movie* where Ethiopia is taken as a story line. This study is, therefore, conducted to analyze how Ethiopia as a country is portrayed in this movie.

## RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The study is aimed to answer the following research questions:

- How is Ethiopia portrayed in the *saving the Forgotten Jews'* movie?
- What kind of discursive strategies do moviemakers use in the portrayal of Ethiopia?
- Why do the moviemakers portray Ethiopia the way they do?

## THEORETICAL AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

The study has employed CDA as its methodological framework. Among the different approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis, Van-Dijk's (2006) model is selected purposely because it is a well-known model in elaborating the different types of ideological discourse strategies since ideology plays vital role in the portrayal of countries by movies. Although Van-Dijk's (2006) article focuses on the ideological analysis of political discourse, the researcher finds the model useful because his classification of ideological

discourse structures is very helpful to understand the strategy of 'Portrayal'. Therefore, from the model, the strategies that are important for the purpose of this research are selected and used in the analysis.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study used a movie, which is released and viewed worldwide. It took a documentary *Saving the Forgotten Jews (2015)*, which is broadcasted on global television channel on BBC. These sample movie is chosen purposely because it has ideologically laden contents with Ethiopian based stories and characters. The rationale of using purposive sampling technique helped the researcher to find different scenes, dialogues, and conversations from the movie in which different thematic categories are emerged during data selection. The amount of the movie from which the data taken and the extent of the extracts taken from the movie were restrained in a minimal size for the sake of limiting the data from being overly extended. The reason for limiting the data in minimal size was that doing a critical analysis on video records requires a great deal of energy as well as time in organizing the discourse used in the recordings.

The data were classified in two main divisions, which the analyses could be made from. The first one is utterances from characters, narrators, and interviewees. In this classification, the analyses are made from extracts taken from these utterances. In the analyses, each of the dialogues of the utterances, which were selected to analysis, are displayed along with their analyses.

Then, the data analysis in this research follows the following steps:

- First, the data containing discursive strategies of portrayal were identified.
- Then, the identified data were classified and catalogued according to their appropriate classification under Van-Dijk's (2006) model.
- After that, the data were described and interpreted in order to be able to answer the research questions.
- Finally, conclusions and recommendations were made.

## DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

### Background Information and Plot Synopsis of *Saving the Forgotten Jews*

Made by BBC in 2005, *Saving the Forgotten Jews* movie is a 24 minutes long documentary about two of Israeli government operations, namely 'Operation Exodus' and 'Operation Solomon', which took place in Sudan and Ethiopia, respectively. The introduction given to the movie by BBC reads as: "In the 1980s and 1990s a Manchester textile merchant, a Mossad spy, and a seasoned diplomat saved the forgotten Ethiopian Jewish community in tow unprecedented and-record breaking airlifts. Flying out of Sudan and war-torn Ethiopia, they went undercover and negotiated with dictators to save the forgotten Jews in peril." (www.bbc.co.uk, 2015). Although most of its plot rotates around the sacrifice the Israeli government paid to take the Ethiopian Jews out of Sudan and Ethiopia, in doing so, the movie is clearly

made on glorifying the government's power and the brilliance of the people who involved in executing the operation. Additionally, through this means of glorification also, it portrays the negative side of the countries where the operation took place, especially on Ethiopia. The movie is broadcasted on BBC One on Sunday 13:15, 13th December, 2015; BBC Two on Friday 00:45, 29th January, 2016. Narrated by Tracy-Ann Oberman, it was executive produced by Aaqil Ahmed, produced by Richard Pearson, and production coordinated by Kieran Tench, with the interviewees Professor Saul David, Mahrata Bharuch-Ran, Gad Shimron, Uri Lubrani, and Lord David Alliance.

### Analysis of the Movie

The movie was a BBC made advertised documentary based on a biased and side-taking assertions of both the narrator and the interviewees. A true documentary aims at informing and enlightening from a neutral perspective while this one aims at embellishing the power and extraordinary skill of the Israeli government and Mossad by stating the embarrassing images of Ethiopia. The subsequent extracts taken from the movie below clearly show how Ethiopia is portrayed and ideologically positioned by the movie in particular and the western world in general.

#### Extract 1

**Narrator:** The plea comes from Sudan. Flying famine, civil war, and religious persecution from their homeland, a desperate cry for help reveals a lost community of Jews in Ethiopia.

In the beginning of the movie, as it could be seen from the above extract, the narrator, Tracy-Ann Oberman, claims her first negative representation by victimizing Ethiopia as the reason for the Ethiopian Jews leaving their homeland "Ethiopia" is because of the *famine, civil war, and religious persecution* they encounter. Here, there are three main subjects used to negatively portray Ethiopia. To begin with the first subject, *famine*, by the time of both operations, 'Operation Exodus' and Operation Solomon', which was between 1980 and 1990, the country was in two great famine strikes-the 1974 and the 1984 famines.

Also in the second subject case, which is *civil war*, by the time the operations took place, Ethiopia was under the administration of a military regime where different rebels were fighting against the government in most parts of the country especially, the Northern part where the Ethiopian Jews lived. The *victimization* is achieved through the discursive technique of *vagueness*.

The moviemakers have tried to present the Ethiopian Jews community as the only victim of the *famine* and the *civil war* who was forced to leave the country due to these reasons. The *vague* presentation is revealed when we raise the question "What about the rest of Ethiopians? Were they not part of the suffering? Why did only the Ethiopian Jews claimed to leave the country?"

According to Van-Dijk (2006), discourse makers use expressions that are concealed because they do not give enough information. The reason for this is to achieve their discourse delivery through blinding their recipients with fewer and only aimed details by leaving out some facts. Hence, as can be in the above extract, the makers of this movie have tried to show Ethiopia's worst conditions by concealing the detailed facts, which helped them to show the reason that the operation was apparently their heroic deed.

### Extract 2

**Narrator:** Israel assembles a team to work undercover; out-weep dictators; and overcome a civil war to rescue the last tribe.

The *national self-glorification* is made by exhibiting the Israeli government as well as the Mossad as successful bodies in their tasks. Throughout the movie, the 'heroic' undercover deed of the executers' of the two missions, Gad Shimron, a former Mossad Operative, as well as Uri Lubrani, a former Israeli Ambassador, is told. Most of Tracy-Ann Oberman's narrations and the interviewees' claims were about how a great work these two individuals achieved through a tactical and brilliant undercover mission. Once again, around the beginning of the movie this 'heroism' is claimed, as indicated in the phrases "work under over.....to rescue the last tribe".

Also, the excellence height of the government and the agency is also perpetuated as capable of removing other countries' leaders in the phrase the narrator used – "out-weep dictators". The great capability of Israel, who is the right hand of the Western world, is not the only implication found in the phrase. The phrase is also intended to negatively portray Ethiopia and Sudan by referring their leaders' as *dictators*. Accordingly, the positive self-glorification act is attained through a negative other-representation technique of stating Ethiopia and Sudan as *undemocratic* nations who are suffering from *dictator leadership*. As evident in the above extract, Ethiopia as a country is described as a land of '*civil war*', which is repeatedly indicated throughout the entire movie in both the narration and the interview.

In the phrase "and overcome a civil war", by labeling Ethiopia's context as "*civil war*", the early mentioned acts of *national self-glorification* is also accomplished to brag about the potential of the operations' executers. Although Israel is not a Western country and the movie is made by a Western television channel, BBC, however, the reason this analysis claims the positive presentation of Israel as a positive self-glorification is due to the fact that the country is an advocate of the Western world's ideology and a right hand of the region.

The act of relating Ethiopia with "*civil war*" is not limited in the above claims. In the following two extracts of the narrator and one of the interviewees' statements, Gad Shimran, who was part of the operation and a former Mossad operative, we find civil war restated as a reason for the Ethiopian Jews to go to Sudan.

### Extract 3

**Shimran:** The mid 70's, there was revolution in Ethiopia, and Civil war, and the Jews, many of them, fled to Sudan.

**Narrator:** Having escaped civil war in their homeland, the Jews are stuck in Temporary refugee camp.

As Van Dijk (1993; 1998; 2006; 2015) notes, in categorizing people in in-group (our) and out- group (their), the expression of polarized cognitions is dominant. According to his explanation, polarized discourse is used to make a convincing point by glorifying one's own actions and practices and stating the negative characteristics that the outgroups have. In the above two extracts taken from the movie under analysis, we find a polarized discourse technique. The polarization is not stated directly. Throughout the movie, the refugees are referred as "Ethiopian Jews". However, in some cases, they are denoted as "Jews".

As it is mentioned above, the movie is made to portray the extraordinary work of Israel and its intelligence agency, by a television channel who advocates the same ideology to the country [Israel]. As a result, the magnification is made through categorizing the refugees as 'ours' and Ethiopia and Sudan as 'them'. When we see in the case of the above two extracts, rather than referring the refugees as "Ethiopian Jews", unlike it is done throughout most of the movie, they are addressed as "Jews" in order to distinct the refugees from Ethiopians. The reason for doing so was to show the "Jews" as they are not part of the civil war because they are not originally Ethiopians for the reason that they are migrated from 'Israel'.

This polarization technique was mainly used to accuse Ethiopia as if it has made suffer the "Jews". The *polarization* is also used along with the technique of *victimization* to portray Ethiopia with a negative image. In the interview with Gad Shimran, he states the condition which Ethiopia was in the 70's. He asserts that "*revolution*" and "*civil war*" were the conditions which Ethiopia was suffering from. By pointing out these two conditions which he used to tell the bad story of the country, he has tried to achieve his aim of perpetuating the refugees as victims of the worst destiny of the country, which is 'not' their home.

In the narrator's statement, there are also two ideas that contrast with each other: *their homeland* and *the Jews*. As clearly seen in the above analysis, the use of the term "Jews" separated from "Ethiopians" is a polarizing technique of victimizing Ethiopia. However, in the next extract of the narrator's statement, we find Ethiopia denoted as a homeland for the refugee Jews. Despite this denotation, she [the narrator] is found referring the "Ethiopian Jews" as only "Jews". This is another polarization method she used to portray the negative image of Ethiopia. This negative portrayal is proved in her statement as she says 'they [the refugees] have got away from a civil war going on in Ethiopia. Similarly to Agent Shimran's intention of presenting the Jewish descendants as fatalities of the crisis in Ethiopia, she has tried to make

the viewer have a picture of *'civil war'* about the country. This accusation and negative portrayal does not only show the negative faces of Ethiopia, but also leads the viewers to reach at a conclusion that the country is in *"disintegration"* of its society and ethnic groups. As the movie continues, after it states the rescue mission of the Ethiopian Jews who fled to Sudan has failed, it presents another negative portrayal of Ethiopia by linking this topic with the previously discussed ones. This topic is another discursive technique used by the moviemakers and the interviewees to glorify their tactical immensity of the operation. This positive self- glorification is addressed by linking Ethiopia with *"dictatorship"*.

#### Extract 4

**Professor David:** Ethiopia's dictator was Colonel Mengistu, known as 'The Bucher of Addis Ababa' because he came to power in a military coup in 1977. In fact, there was a rumor that he personally suffocated the former emperor, Haile Selassie, with a pillow. Now this was the time of the Cold War, and for most of the 1980's, Mengistu was fighting a civil war with military aid from the Soviet Union. And in return, he has agreed to expel not only all U.S. diplomats, but those of the allies, including Israel. By 1990, the Soviet Union was no longer in the position to give him military aid. So, he turns to Israel as a way of building bridges with the United States. He offered chance to Israel to resume relations.

In the analyses so far, it has been discussed that the moviemakers as well as the interviewees have tried to portray Ethiopia negatively by relating the country with its misfortunes, such as poverty, dictatorship, and mainly civil war. In this selected extract as well, one of the interviewees, Professor Saul David, who is an English military historian, continues his negative portrayal of the country by pointing out historical facts which have no other significances rather than strengthening the moviemakers' and the interviewees' aim of glorifying the success of Israel and Mossad on the operations. In his statement, Professor David begins by describing the former Ethiopian president, Colonel Mengistu Hailemariam, in a negative way by illustrating him as *"undemocratic"* and *"cruel"* person.

At the very beginning of his statement, he mentions that the president was a dictator. As Van- Dijk (2006) proclaims, the way actors are described in discourses depends on the discourse makers' ideologies that they tend to describe in-group members in a neutral or positive way and out-group members in a negative way. As we can see in Professor David's description of Colonel Mengistu, the president is described in a negative way. This is done due to two major reasons.

The first one is that the professor is trying to make a *positive self-glorification* through the fact that Israel has succeeded the mission over beating a dictator leader. Also secondly, is used to indicate that the in-groups [the Jews] were being persecuted by a dictator and undemocratic leader. These two indications are reaffirmed by the professor's following descriptions of the president. He describes Colonel Mengistu as *"The Bucher of Addis Ababa"*. In this description, he has used the deplorable phrase *'The Bucher'* to show its viewers how *"killer, merciless, and ruthless"* the president was. Next, he also claims that it is

through a *military coup* that he came to power. In this technique of *victimization*, we find two main aims of Professor David to state about the way the president came to power: a) he is providing additional negative description of the president; b) he is also telling a bad story about Ethiopia by stating a negative history of the country (Van Dijk, 2006), which is *civil war [coup]*.

Professor David also adds another negative descriptive statement to strengthen his negative portrayal of the country by illustrating its president as a *“killer, merciless, and ruthless”*, as discussed above. He says that the president has killed his predecessor, emperor Haileselassie, by *suffocating with a pillow*. This *description* of the president is deliberately intended for giving a negative mental picture of the country by telling the bad deeds of its president, which Van-Dijk (2006) calls it the technique of *victimization*.

After describing the president in the above ways, the professor continues his negative portrayal of the country by categorizing it to socialist ideology advocate nations. By indicating this, what Professor David's intention is to show the *wrongly supposed ideology* the country is promoting. This was also the strategic way of the professor to polarize Ethiopia as *Them* and Israel *Us*. The polarization of *Us* is used to categorize Israel to the Western world of the Capitalist ideology advocacy. This polarization is better understood in the professor's following statements. At the end of his statement, he states that avows that because the relationship with USSR stopped, President Mengistu has wanted to negotiate with the United States through Israel. In this statement, we find three major topics that Professor David wanted to indicate.

He asserts that the USSR had become unwilling to aid him in terms of military support. By mentioning this, his intention is to indicate how the president had become wither because he was betrayed by the USSR which he was relayed. This might also have another indication that the disloyalty of Socialist countries based on the negative attitude most of the world has on Socialism. Secondly, he says that the president had wanted to use Israel as a way of negotiating with the United States which shows a *national self-glorification* technique used to positively portray Israel as if the country is advocate of the 'right' ideology, which is better indicated in the third analysis point of view. On a third standpoint, he declares that he wanted to negotiate with the United States, which shows Professor David's indication that Colonel Mengistu had shown initiation to join the Capitalist ideology advocacy because he was *too desperate* as a result of being betrayed by the Socialist Soviet Union.

The other notion used to portray Ethiopia in this movie is *corruption*. The portrayal is done through presenting the Ethiopian officials as corrupted ones. The description is affirmed by both the narrator and the interviewees. To discuss this notion of portrayal, first, the selected statements from the narrator and the interviewees is presented as follows:

### Extract 5

**Lord Alliance:** I sat in there. So, the guns is aiming at us through the chair tan. President – “Give me arm, you can have the Jews.” I said to him “Mr. President, you must accept that there aren’t going to be any arm. But we can make your life easier financially.” He didn’t say no to it. We started talking and negotiating. And we got us agreement.

**Narrator:** A personal payment to Mengistu is agreed. And he orders to his government to set a lower price for the Jews.

**Professor David:** When Mengistu fled, the country was in chaos. Meanwhile, Uri Lubrani was still talking what’s remained of the government in the hope of striking a deal. He finally had made a ‘take it, or leave it’ offer.

**Narrator:** Uri’s clothing offer is to pay the ministers what it would cost to transport each Ethiopian Jew to Israel. This is as high as he can go.

As introduced in the movie, Lord David Alliance is a British industrialist who helped the Israeli government and Mossad to operate the mission both in Sudan and Ethiopia, financially and logistically. After Colonel Mengistu agreed to negotiate the terms of the exchange for the Ethiopian Jews, it was Lord Alliance whom the Israeli government sent to negotiate with the President on those terms. To describe how *dictator* the president is, he starts his statement by claiming that guns were held against them in the conference room. After giving this mental illustration of how the tense the conference room is, what Van Dijk (2006) calls it *illustration*, he continues elaborating the terms Colonel Mengistu set. He claims that the terms the President set were demands of military aid, which is intentionally used by Lord Alliance to show his attitude of the president’s despotism. Otherwise, other than the intention to show the despotism, describing the tense situation of the room has no apparent relevance to stating the terms set by Colonel Mengistu.

This negative portrayal continues as Lord Alliance states that he [the president] will not be given any military aid, but personal payment- *bribery*. As Lord Alliance describes, the Colonel did not refuse to take the bribe, which is intended to indicate that he [the Colonel] was ready to take if it was offered. He, then, says that they kept negotiating and reached an agreement. In this statement of Lord Alliance’s, what is tried to show to the viewers is that the president, who is the top of the government, was ready to take *bribe*, which portrays *absence of good governance among government officials*.

The negative representation of Lord Alliance is also repeated by the narrator as she says the Israeli government delegates and the president had reached an agreement of a personal payment to the president. This also could be seen from a point of view *national self-glorification*, i.e. they could be bragging about being able to change the mind a Socialist leader and afford a payment for who was in need of military support. As another statement continues by the military historian Professor David, it is claimed that

President Mengistu had left for Liberia because he is losing the fight and the ‘rebels’ are approaching the capital city, Addis Ababa. The professor describes the result of this situation as “*chaos*”. He used this description of the situation which negatively portrays the country because he wanted to strengthen the next claim he states about the *outstanding decision* Uri Lubrani made, which is *he gave risky but effective offer* to the remaining government officials who was still in charge of their positions by the discursive choice of “*a ‘take it, or leave it’ offer*”.

This *positive national-glorification* is made to portray the Israeli ambassador as an extraordinary and successful missionary. The portrayal of the Ethiopian government officials as corrupted is not limited only by referring Colonel Mengistu, as discussed above. As the narrator asserts, other officials were also involved in the bribe. She says that Lubrani was struggling ‘*to pay the ministers what it would cost*’. In her statement, she does not specifically point out which ministers were agreed to be paid to. Rather she generalizes them as “*the ministers*”. According to

Van-Dijk’s (2006) claim, instead of providing concrete stories, discourse makers tend to generalize to portray out-groups’ negative characteristics. In the context of this extract, the generalized characteristics is the Ethiopian ministers, as whole.

### Extract 6

**Narrator:** After the euphoria of the rescue, in Israel, life isn’t easy for the Ethiopian Jews. Racism, an unfamiliar society, and an educational gap make it struggle for them to adopt.

Another subject of Ethiopia’s negative portrayal is found at the end of the documentary in the narrator’s statement. As evident in the extract above, following their ‘rescue’ from Ethiopia and joined the Israeli people, the Ethiopian Jews are facing lots of problems in terms of integrating with the society. The problems they are encountering, according to the narrator, are racism, cultural difference, and educational gap. In this analysis, the two phrases, – ‘*an unfamiliar society*’ and ‘*an educational gap*’, have been chosen to pinpoint the ideological implications of the moviemakers.

To begin with the first phrase, ‘*an unfamiliar society*’, the expression is a euphemized manifestation used to portray Ethiopia negatively through positively portray Israel. In a testimony given by an Ethiopian Jew ‘rescue’, Mahrata Baruch-Ron, she said that:

### Extract 7

**Baruch-Ron:** I think the fact that we came from such a different culture, a different part of the world, makes it not easy to learn the new way of life to be integrated one of the modern societies in the world.

In Baruch-Ron's statement we see that the Israelis are described as "*one of the modern societies in the world*". This description is made by her by comparing the Israelis with that of the society where she grew up in, which is the Ethiopians. This **comparison** is made by Baruch-Ron intended to weigh against the Israelis and the Ethiopians. Albeit the fact that Ethiopia and Israel are quite beyond comparison in the universal definition of '*modernization*', however, we can see this claim of Baruch-Ron's from two viewpoints. The first one is that she is just trying to forward her idea of the challenges the Ethiopian Jew society in Israel faces only by stating the fact that they are unable to easily adapt the much civilized life style. From a second standpoint, it is also concluded that she is favoring for and commending the Israelis out of seeking entrustment from them.

It is likely to connect the narrator's statement with that of Baruch-Ron's. The above taken extract of the narrator's statement is found in the movie right after Baruch-Ron's testimony. Thus, there is a possibility that the narrator's statement is constructed based on Baruch-Ron's **description** of the Israeli's which is used by her [the narrator] as contrast between the Israelis and Ethiopians. In this sense, the expression '*an unfamiliar society*' is utilized by the narrator to elevate the Israeli society over the intent of **national self-glorification**, which as Van Dijk (2006) claims it as it is intended to give positive references to or praise for one's own country. This **national self-glorification** is also made, through the technique of **comparison**, to aver Ethiopia negatively, i.e. by comparing the Israeli and Ethiopian **level of modernization**, the narrator's intention is to state the fact that Israel is more modernized than Ethiopia. This negative portrayal strategy is achieved through euphemizing the **description** of Ethiopians as **primitive** with a less bothering language.

The other phrase also, '*an educational gap*', is used to assert the negative portrayal of Ethiopia. In this other **national self-glorification** technique, the moviemakers' aim is, by explaining Israelis as well educated, to explain Ethiopians as **less educated/literate** or totally **uneducated/illiterate**. This **description** of Ethiopia could also be claimed as dependent on the use of the previous phrase, '*an unfamiliar society*', which is revealed in the above analysis as a technique used to describe Ethiopia as **primitive**, i.e. since Ethiopians are **primitive**, as the moviemakers described the country in a euphemized way, then, there is a fact of **not having a modern educational system**. Accordingly, based on these two analyses of the phrases used in the movie, it is possible to conclude that the aim of the narrator's statement is to present the 'rescued' Ethiopian Jews as previously disadvantaged, while they were in Ethiopia, but now they are in a better country where their lives is able to be changed for better.

**Summary of the Analysis of *Saving the Forgotten Jews Movie***

<b>Terms and Expressions Used in the Movie</b>	<b>Discursive Strategies Used</b>	<b>Presumed Effects/Connotations</b>	<b>Emerging Themes</b>
"...famine..."	Victimization, Vagueness	Famine	Famine
"...civil war..."	Victimization, Vagueness	Civil war	Civil war
"...religious"	Victimization	Ethnic conflicts	Disintegration
"...out-weep <u>dictators</u> ..."	National self-glorification	Undemocratic, Dictatorship	Dictatorship
"...and <u>overcome</u> a <u>civil war</u> ..."	National self-glorification	Civil war	Civil war
"...there was <u>revolution</u> in Ethiopia, and <u>Civil war</u> ..."	Polarization, Victimization	Revolution, Civil war	Civil war
"Having escaped <u>civil war</u> in their homeland the Jews"	Polarization, Victimization	Civil war; Disintegration	Civil war, Disintegration
"Ethiopia's dictator..."	Description	Undemocratic, Cruel	Dictatorship
" <u>The Bucher</u> of Addis Ababa"	Description	Killer, Merciless, Ruthless	Dictatorship
"...he came to power in a <u>military coup</u> ..."	Victimization	Civil war, Coup	Civil war
"...he, <u>personally</u> <u>suffocated</u> the former <u>Emperor</u> ..."	Description, Victimization	Killer, Merciless, Ruthless	Dictatorship
"...military aid from <u>the Soviet Union</u> ..."	Categorization	Socialism-Wrong ideology	Dictatorship
"...I sat in there. So, <u>the</u> <u>guns</u> are aiming at us"	Description	Dictator	Dictatorship
"...we can make your life easier financially..."	Illustration	Corrupted	Corruption
"...to pay the ministers what it would cost..."	Generalization	Corrupted	Corruption
"...an unfamiliar society..."	Euphemism, Description, National self-	Primitive	Backwardness
"...an educational gap..."	National self-Glorification, Description, Euphemization	Less educated or Totally uneducated	Illiteracy

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The main objective of this study was to critically analyze the portrayal of Ethiopia in the *Saving the Forgotten Jews (2015)* movie. In so doing, seven *themes* were identified. After that, extracts were taken from the movie and critically analyzed based on Van-Dijk's (2006) socio-cognitive approach to CDA. The analysis therefore depicted the negative representations of Ethiopia through the use of the expressions: *famine, civil war, disintegration, dictatorship, corruption, backwardness, and illiteracy*.

The discourses such as, *victimization, vagueness, national self-glorification, polarization, actor description, categorization, illustration, generalization, and euphemization* are identified as major discursive strategies used in the movie. From the discursive strategies, one can understand that Ethiopia is ideologically portrayed as the country with *a land of famine, civil war, ethnic conflict and revolution*; by illustrating its citizens as: *backward/primitive, less educated or totally uneducated, disintegrated, killed each other, merciless, and ruthless*; by stating socialism as: *a wrong ideology* and by presenting the leader as: advocate of socialist ideology characterized as undemocratic, *dictator, and corrupted leader*.

The findings of the analyses also revealed that the main reasons for all the negative depictions of Ethiopia were found to be repeated famines, specially the 1984 G.C Ethiopian famine, and the ethnic conflicts that the country encountered in different times. The other reason which moviemakers' negative portrayal of Ethiopia is the political instability of the country where many of ethnic based rebels fought against each other which resulted in poor economic status. Based on the analysis, the following recommendations are made: a) policymakers and media practitioners to work on the positive images of Ethiopia so as to change the western movie writers' negative perceptions to Ethiopia b) researchers to cover the nonlinguistic aspects of movies and to analyze movies taken from different parts of the world in addition to the Western ones.

## REFERENCES

Amiran, M. R. (2012, September 5). A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Images of Iranians in Western Movies. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, (Special Issue on General Linguistics). Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271027356>.

Hamelink, C. J. (1997). *New Information and Communication Technologies, Social Development*. Geneva: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.

Miller, B. (2007). *Does Hollywood Have a Negative Impact on the World?* Retrieved from <http://www.helium.com/items/432855-does-hollywood-have-a-negative-impact-on-the-world>.

Van- Dijk, T. A. (2015). Critical Discourse Studies: A Socio-cognitive Approach. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer, *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (3rd ed., pp. 63-85). London: SAGE. Retrieved from <http://www.discourses.org/download/articles>.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Ideology and Discourse Analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 11(2), 115-140.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology. A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: SAGE.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse and Society*, 4(2), 249-283.