The Manipulative Tendency of Racist Ideology in American Politics

Taher Ben Khalifa
University of Sfax
Faculty of Letters and Humanities
Department of English
Sfax, Tunisia

Abstract

The present paper uses a multi-disciplinary CDA framework ranging from argumentation theories, discourse representation theories and pragmatics elaborated in Van Dijk (2000) focusing mainly on representation, humanitarianism, evidentiality and implication to explain how racist ideologies are explored in political discourse to manipulate the addresses and justify elite policies. Exploring how these discursive strategies are used to legitimize power, domination, inequality and injustice is carried through the critical analysis of the Republican Jeb Bush's live aired interview on CNN (November the 15th 2015) and the Democrat Barack Obama's press conference speech delivered in Antalya, Turkey (November the 16th 2015). The results of the analysis proved that: a) the polarization of Us vs. Them and the strategies of positive self-representation and negative other-representation are used to serve for the anti-racist arguments, b) the humanitarianism strategies are used to humanize Us and de-humanize Them and evidentiality, which is based on the use of different sorts of proofs that are close to the audiences' minds, are employed to justify the American migration policies and war strategies, and c) implication is employed to demystify such racist ideologies that do not fit with the speakers' arguments. Hence, the manipulative nature of these discursive strategies is justified.

Key Words: Manipulation, racist ideology, representation, argumentation and pragmatics.

Introduction

The critical study of racism in discourse proved to be central in the realm of CDA where scholars like (Van Dijk, 2002 and Wodak and Reisigl, 1999) focused on the analysis of the different discursive features used to convey racist ideologies. Issues of ideology and power are also of major interest in the CDA practitioners' research projects (Van Dijk, 1989a and 1995, Fairclough, 1989 and Wodak, 1989). Manipulation, as a sort of domination and power abuse based on mind control (Van Dijk, 2006), is explored to show how discourse structure at different levels – the syntactic, the semantic, the pragmatic, the logical and viz. – serves to maintain social order and deceive the public to make of them contained by the main stream ruling ideology (Saussure and Schulz, 2005).

Moreover, political discourse, in addition to media discourse and parliamentary debates, represents one of the major targets of CDA. When it comes to political discourse, concepts of manipulation and argumentation are fundamental in that politicians need coherent and well structured logical statements to succeed to convince their audiences and build a kind of agreement that is required for the establishment of hegemony and containment. For instance, Fairclough and Fairclough (2012) used an amalgamation of CDA and argumentation theories in the critical study of political language. The importance of this combination lies in extending CDA's analytical framework to become adequate for the treatment of such political affairs like decision-making.

As far as discourse is concerned, representation proves to be central in the critical study of agents' discursive practices (Fairclough, 2003 and Chilton, 2004) due to its importance for the investigation and comprehension of the power relations existing among the participants taking part in a given communication that takes place in given circumstances. The critical study of discourse in the realm of CDA gives the notion of context greater importance (Van Dijk, 2004 and 2008 and Fairclough and Fairclough, 2012) because of its necessity for the establishment of a holistic comprehension of the piece of language under critique.

For instance, aiming to conserve hegemony and reach persuasion speakers/writers may imply meanings which means that part of the message that is constructed by the produced discourse becomes implicit. To decode these implicit messages, discourse analysts resort to contextual data. This makes of pragmatics theories essential for the critical investigation of the manipulative strategies of discourse in general and political discourse in particular. Indeed, racist ideologies whatever they are sexist, ethnic, or religious are forbidden at the legislative level to preserve human rights and equality. However, they are there and conveyed in an implicit way so that for us to infer these racist messages we need pragmatics together with our mental knowledge of the world.

The interconnectedness of these theories represents the background of the present paper I undertake to answer the following research questions.

1. How representation is used to serve the speakers' denial of being racists?
2. How humanitarianism and evidentiality serve for the justification of the suggested policies?
3. How does implication serve for the mystification of the speakers' racist ideology of religious segregation?

These problematics will be dismantled through the critical investigation of the texts' linguistic structures focusing on phrase, clause and sentence structures to reveal the way racist ideologies are structured to justify the suggested policies and manipulate the public opinion. In addition, this linguistic analysis will be explored to show how political arguments are structured and infer the implicit attitudes the arguments did not convey explicitly.

Literature review

This section aims to review the theoretical concepts upon which this paper is built to reach a detailed critique of the topic through answering the formulated questions and discuss the main findings of the linguistic analysis of the corpus.

1. Racism as ideology

Linguistically speaking, the term racism is a noun referring to the state of being racist. Being a racist person means having such beliefs, attitudes and opinions according to which he/she differentiates him/herself from others like being superior, different and viz. These racist beliefs, in fact, are structured in the form of social practices, mental models, and ideological systems. This complex phenomenon – racism – manifests itself discursively (Wodak and Reisigl, 1999) which means that discourse, as a means of social communication, enables its users to structure their ideological practices in different ways under the rules of human language. As far as language is concerned, this article seeks to find how linguistic principles and rules are violated by the political participants to hide racist ideologies and justify their political policies at the expense of human values and rights that they pretend to defend. Van Dijk (2000) defines racism as ``a social system of inequality``. This kind of inequality and unfair treatment of others on the basis of existing cognitive systems of racist ideology is immoral, unacceptable and non-human which makes of it a hidden character the speakers and writers try to mask through different strategies such as the denial of being racist and the adoption of anti-racist strategies of discourse. However, these strategies and others that will be discussed later on in the findings section are not innocent. These are used to imply meaning in such an ironical way where rhetoric and logic play fundamental roles in shaping the anti-racist argument. In politics, for instance, arguments needs to be homogeneous and deny all sorts of segregation, inequality, power abuse, and viz. to persuade as much of the public as required, however mental stereotypes and prejudices are there and cannot be removed from people`s minds. These are expressed through discourse at different levels where the critique of these discursive structures is required to demystify the manipulative tendency of such text and talk. In brief, racist ideologies are structured in text and talk at different levels of discourse structures. However, for the sake of producing an in-depth critique of their manipulative tendencies at the level of the selected texts, I restricted my focus to the strategies I determined in the method section.

2. Representation

Discourse, as a social, cognitive, and discursive practice, is used to talk about participants, actions, events, and experiences. This property is known under the concept of representation that is proved to be one of the fundamental functions of discourse (Fairclough, 2003, Chilton, 2004 and Fairclough and Fairclough, 2012) in addition to others like argumentation. In the CDA movement, for instance, scholars proved to be interested in how representation functions in discourse in general and racist discourse in particular (Van Dijk, 1989b). Indeed, different works in CDA focused on the critical study of positive self-representation and negative other-representation. Van Dijk (1993) argues that these are two complementary strategies used to deal with participants as social groups rather than individuals (Van Dijk, 2009).

This kind of polarization is summarized by Oktar (2001) in the so called the ideological square that is composed of the following four moves: a) emphasizing positive information about us, b) emphasizing negative information about them, c) de-emphasizing negative information about us, and de-emphasizing positive information about them (p. 319).With reference to Van Dijk (2009) these socially shared representations that people use to talk about themselves and others need to be related to discourse structure. This makes of discourse structure at the heart of the critique of social behaviors like racism, gender and etc. that are discursively conveyed. Being interested in the critical investigation of these ideological sorts of representation, the present research paper seeks to find how the strategy of positive self-representation and negative other-representation is explored to serve the main objectives of the developed political arguments manifested in the justification of American policies like war policies and immigration policies.

3. Argumentation

Politics is about deliberation, decision-making, and policy justification. This makes of argumentation, as a social practice, one of the fundamental functions of political discourse. Indeed, when it comes to justification participants resort to different discursive strategies like evidentiality, humanitarianism and etc. to defend and justify their choices. In fact, there exist plenty of other discursive strategies of argumentative justification; however, I cited only these ones to make of my study more focused, and goal oriented. Moreover, I am thinking to follow the same topic and deal with more strategies in future researches. Van Dijk (1989b) defines the theory of argumentation on the basis of the following properties: a) multi-disciplinary (ranging from different disciplines; logic, philosophy, grammar, cognition, social-cognition, social culture and viz.), b) sub-theory of broader theory of discourse (properties of argumentation are inherited from that of discourse), c) sub-theory of discourse theory (argumentation must describe the structures and strategies that discourse need to be argumentative), d) pragmatic basis (argument often has an assertive nature the local speech acts of which are either direct or indirect), and f) interdisciplinary (argumentation functions within interdisciplinary perspective where priority is given to its cognitive foundations) (pp. 245-246). This kind of definition proves that argumentation analysis requires the interface of different theories of discourse comprehension where argument logical structure and discursive structure are under scrutiny to reflect social structures and mental models of social beliefs, attitudes, and ideologies. For more precision, I am going to reformulate a brief definition of both strategies – evidentiality and humanitarianism – I cited before to facilitate their use in the analysis section (see Van Dijk, 2000). A) Evidentiality is about objectivity, reliability and credibility and it is used as a communicative strategy to make arguments more plausible through providing evidences and proofs. In this paper, examples are also explored as evidences. B) Humanitarianism refers to the defence of human rights and the critique of the violation of these rights. Here, this communicative strategy is used to show how both Bush and Obama used human rights to manipulate the public and justify that the American policies of war are not against Islam, but against terrorism.

4. Implication

Pragmatics is interested on the way context contributes to the establishment of meaning in discourse and it encompasses other theories of discourse and language studies like speech act theory and conversation implicature. In fact, words in text and talk do have, more than the explicit semantic meaning, an implicit meaning that is not conveyed explicitly. However, meaning is implied through discourse linguistic structures at different levels like lexicalization and syntax. As far as manipulation is concerned, the examination of implication in the texts under focus is central for the comprehension of policy justification in the political arguments developed by both Bush and Obama. Thus, the study of these implied meanings serves to reveal the mental structures monitoring the manipulative linguistic strategies used to serve the racist ideologies of these logical statements. Van Dijk (2000) argues that because of contextual reasons speakers are not going to say all what they think and believe (p. 219). This means that people are going to select only what fits with their speaking situations and logical objectives, yet other knowledge is there and might be inferred from the speakers' linguistic choices. Being selective may not reflect the truth of what is going on in such real social context, which means that speakers are going to describe the situations and events on the way that serves their self interests such as power, domination, justification and so on and so forth. This personal representation of the existing social context reflects the manipulative tendency of the produced language. Thus, the demystification of these manipulative discourse strategies needs not only our linguistic knowledge of discourse structure, but also our knowledge of the world (Van Dijk, 2014).

To sum up, the reviewed key concepts are explored to reveal how racist ideologies are employed in Bush's interview and Obama's speech to serve for the manipulation of the public and the justification of the American policies through the denial of being racist.

Methodology

Corpus description

The corpus under focus consists of two texts: a press conference speech delivered by President Barack Obama in the 16th of November 2015 in Antalya, Turkey, and an interview with governor Jeb Bush aired on CNN in the 15th of November 2015. The first text is written by Ram Key who entitled it "Obama: Shameful, Un-American to Close Our Hearts to Syrian Refugees". This extract is retrieved from http://www.breitbart.com/video/2015/11/16/obama-shameful-un-american-to-close-our-hearts-to-syrian-refugees/. The second text has unidentified author published under the title "Interview with U.S. Deputy National Security Adviser Ben Rhodes; Interview with South Carolina Senator Lindsey Graham; Interview with Former Florida Governor Jeb Bush; Terror in Paris. Aired 9-10:00am ET". The whole manscript encompasses the texts of the three interviews named in the title; however, only Jeb Bush's interview will be extracted for analysis. This interview manuscript is retrieved from http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/1511/15/sotu.01.html. The following tables summarize the necessary information related to political participants and corpus description to facilitate their use in the analysis section.

	Obama	Jeb Bush
Political position	US president	Governor
Political party	Democrat	Republican
Time in office	Two terms (2008 – 2016)	Governor of Florida (1999-2007)
Other information	African American Leaving presidency	Son and brother of former US presidents Candidate for presidency

Table one: Necessary information about the two political participants

	Text 1	Text 2
Time	The 15 of November 2015	16th of November 2015
Place	Antalya Turkey	US
Event	Paris attacks / refugee issue	Paris attacks / refugee issue
Delivery	Press conference (20 G summit)	Live aired interview

Table two: Necessary information about the extracts under focus

Analytical framework

The corpus described above will be analyzed on the basis of Van Dijk (2000) framework designed for the analysis of the structure of racist ideology. Using this theoretical approach, my analysis of the two extracts will be done through the scrutiny of these texts clause by clause focusing on the following strategies: representation (polarization), evidentiality, humanitarianism and implication to reach a detailed critique of the deceptive nature of the developed political arguments used to legalize such racist ideologies and practices. Examples of these strategies will be gathered, analyzed and discussed to show how they work in discourse linguistic structure to serve mental structures like stereotypes, prejudices and self supremacy. As well these mental structures in connection to the linguistic ones are explored to (re)shape social structures at the level of the real socio-political context. Putting into consideration the context of articulation of both extracts (terror attacks, refugee issues, policy making and viz.), these strategies will be discussed in relation to the way the political agents describe the situation to serve their personal objectives. In brief, the critical study of the manipulative tendencies of the above mentioned strategies will be multi-disciplinary in nature due the complexity of the topic under focus. For this reason, the theoretical groundings reviewed in the literature review section serve to prepare for the critical investigation of the topic from different theoretical angles in that manipulation, as a discursive practice, may happen at different levels of discourse structure.

Findings and discussion

In this section of the paper, I am going to focus on the analysis of the two selected texts through the examination of some examples of ideological manipulation on the basis of the strategies I determined in the method section; representation (polarization), humanitarianism, evidentiality, and implication.

I. Representation

Here, representation is analyzed in both texts **(T1)** and **(T2)** (note that T1 stands for Bush's interview and T2 stands for Obama's speech) separately and then results are discussed together to formulate synthesizes.

<u>1. We</u>

At this level of analysis, I noticed that the pronoun we has more than one reference: inclusive we and exclusive we (Levinson, 1989). And that the inclusive "we" has more than one reference displayed as follows:

(T1) Bush's interview
- Inclusive we:
  - US + France: the French…our longest and strongest and most loyal ally
  - US + Europe: our European allies,
  - US + Arab allies: our Arab allies,
  - The world: our allies
- Exclusive we:
  - Americans: our borders, our southern borders, our country, the United States, our hearts,

(T2) Obama' speech
- Inclusive we:
  - US + Europe: …whether are European or American, the values that we are defending…., the values we are fighting against…
  - Christians: we have the same obligation as Christians,
  - The world: each of us, do our part,
- Exclusive we:
  - Americans: not American, not who we are, United States …we are…

The critical investigation of both texts **(T1 and T2)** proved that the inclusive we is used to extend the sphere of reference to encompass friends, allies and groups of the same religious faith. For instance, the sphere of references in **(T1)** extends to contain other spheres of references. It consists of: a) US + France, b) US + Europe, c) US + Arab allies, and d) the world allies. In the same way, the inclusive we in **(T2)** is used to broaden the sphere of reference to cover; a) US + Europe, b) Christians, and c) the world allies. This kind of representation is used to extend the notion of belonging and the network of ties to share the exclusive we (Americans) in both **(T1)** and **(T2)** its values, policies, civilization, solidarity, humanity, their fight against extremism and terror, and viz. Moreover, the exclusive we is said to be the leader of the large groups referred to by the inclusive we. Thus, the inclusive we refers to all those who share the Americans' (the exclusive we) fight against the others (they) that are represented by them as terrorist, savage and etc.

This positive self-representation suggests that the in-group nations are represented in **(T1)** and **(T2)** as follows:
In **(T1),** the in-group nations are described as; responsible (our first and foremost responsibility), sympathetic (our hearts go out to the people of Paris), having solidarity (We need to show complete solidarity with them), threatened (this is a threat against western civilization), reasonable (having strategy, listen, think, discuss, create), leaders (…we need to lead…), collaborative (…building a coalition), civilized and fight for civilization (this is fight for western civilization), smart (those are…those are smart moves) and viz. While Bush emphasizes the positive information about Us, he de-emphasizes several negative information such as; denying the fact of being dictator (I would listen to the military commanders), denying the fact of being religious extremists (this is not a question of religion…), and denying the fight against Islam as a religion (this is a political ideology that have co-opted with religion).

In brief, Bush emphasized the positive information about Us and de-emphasized the negative information about Us like the fact of being religious extremists. However, his de-emphasis of negative information about Us showed a kind of contradiction with his direct appeal for "Religious Test" manifested in welcoming only Christian refugees in US and not Muslims.

This kind of contradiction justifies the manipulative tendency of Bush's language and reveals that Bush used discursive strategies on the way that best serves his political argument to justify his political claims.

In **(T2)** the in-group nations are depicted as; courageous (in Europe,….a very courageous stance…), moral (it is our moral obligation), human (… as follow human beings), helpful (…to help people who are in such venerable situations), believe in common humanity (…signal of their belief in a common humanity), right (…the right impulse), better (…our better impulse), having values (…the values we defend), fighting against values like discrimination (the values that we're fighting against ISIS for, are precisely that we don't discriminate against people because of their faith), successful (…we want to be successful defeating...), having obligation (…we have the same obligation as Christians), representing diversity (we are a nation of many peoples of different faiths), respectful (…we show compassion to everybody) and etc. While emphasizing the positive information about Us, president Obama de-emphasized several negative information about Us like; denying the fact of being religious discriminators (…that's shameful. That's not American. That's not who we are. We don't have religious tests to our compassion), denying the fact of being in war against Islam (…this is not a war on Islam), denying the fact of being terrorists (We don't kill people because they're different than us), and viz. To sum up, Obama's emphasis of the positive information about Us and his de-emphasis of the negative information about Us proved to be goal-oriented. It aims to highlight the image of US politics in the G20 Summit and change the public's negative opinions about the US foreign policies during the previous decades, in the George W. Bush's administration. Thus, Obama's discursive strategy of positive self-representation proved to be manipulative in that he attacked other American leaders' policies to show that US politics is not based on racist ideologies like religious discrimination and stereotypes. This kind of justification becomes stronger when Obama proves that what his formers did is the right thing to do after criticizing them and giving the right cause that pushes them to react in that way. This cause manifests itself in the common good of the humanity, which makes of it a good reason.

2. They

The positive self-representation strategy the speakers – Bush and Obama – developed respectively in **(T1)** and **(T2)** emerges in polarization with the negative other-representation strategy. However, what makes difference is that Them (the others) are absent and they are described by the Us (the speakers). This means that while Them are passive participants who have no access to public debates, Us are active participants addressing huge public. This negative other-representation is analyzed as follows:

In **(T1)**, Them are categorized into the following sub-groups; Syrian refugees, Assad Regime, Islamist terrorists, ISIS, Al Qaeda, Iraqi military, Kurdish forces, Sunni tribal, Iran and Russia. After identifying the categorized groups, I will be interested in explaining how they are represented by Governor Bush. This will be done through examining the depiction of each group separately and then giving the whole depiction of the other, Them. The Syrian refugees are represented as the main cause behind the infiltration of terrorists into France, Europe and America (…suicide bomber, apparently embedded himself among a group of Syrian refugees in order to get into Europe). Assad Regime is described as brutal, (…the brutal Assad Regime), killer (…executed or imprisoned either by Assad…). Islamist terrorists are depicted by the verbs embed and smuggle (…embedded himself….,…smuggled into Paris). ISIS is qualified as a threat (We have to look at ISIS as the leading threat of an international terror network). Al Qaeda represents Islamic terrorism (I know what Islamic terrorism is. ….we are fighting with ISIS, al Qaeda, all of the other groups). Iraqi military, Kurdish forces and Sunni tribal are represented as the means the "we" should use to defeat ISIS and Islamist terrorists (We need to embed with the Iraqi military and provide direct support for the Kurdish forces and reengage with the Sunni tribal leaders). Finally, Iran and Russia are characterized as the supporters of violence and brutality (…Iran's and Russia's support of the brutal Assad regime).

In brief, Governor Bush's negative other-representation can be summarized in the following six points: a) **Source of brutality** (Assad Regime), b) **Supporter of brutality** (Iran and Russia), c) **Founder of Islamic terrorism as a political ideology** (Al Qaeda and ISIS), d) **Cause of terrorist attacks in Europe** (Syrian refugees), e) **Actor of terrorism** (Islamist terrorists), and f) **Means to defeat these terrorist groups** (Iraqi military, Kurdish forces and Sunni tribal). These six points form Bush's logical understanding of the cycle of terrorism and his cognitive strategies to defeat these terrorist ideologies that are working against western civilization as he considered them. In fact, this strategy of negative other-representation is used to justify Bush's migration and war policies.

In **(T2)**, them are categorized into the following sub-groups: Syrian refugees, ISIS, and the Muslim community. Having identified the sub-groups constituting the out-group (Them), my next task will be devoted to the explanation of how President Obama represents them through examining the depiction of each of the sub-groups and reformulate the negative other-representation of them. The Syrian refugees are depicted as victims of terrorism (The people who are fleeing Syria are the most harmed by terrorism). The Muslim community is described as the follower who is obliged to follow what the we called universal values and fight for to defeat any kind of extremist ideology (…In the same way that the Muslim community has an obligation not to in any way excuse anti-Western or anti-Christian sentiment, we have the same obligation as Christians...). Finally, the ISIS is described as the source of evil and religious discrimination that should be defeated (…we're fighting against ISIS for, are precisely that we don't discriminate against people because of their faith ... we want to be successful defeating ISIS).

To recapitulate, Obama's negative other-representation can be summarized in the following points; a) **Terrorist** (ISIS), b) **Supporter of this dark ideology** (Muslim community), and c) **Victims** (Syrian refugees). This kind of representation proves the manipulative role of Obama's discursive strategies to justify the American war policy against Islamic terrorism and show that the "We" has a human role to defend peoples who are harmed, terrorized and killed in their land by their people who support that kind of dark ideology. Let me now say that my analysis of both positive self-representation and negative other-representation revealed that these two strategies of representation are used by Bush and Obama to highlight the image of American politics through the denial of being racists and accusing the others to be extremists and supporters of religious discrimination. In both **(T1)** and **(T2)**, the in-group people are represented as humanitarian nations who defend human values and fight against stereotypes, opinions, beliefs and ideologies that promote discrimination and violence. However, the out-group people are represented as devil incarnation on Earth harming all the humanity and even their homeland people. This, in fact, seems to be manipulative especially when Bush who called for "Religious Test" presents himself as the defender of human values and when Obama presents George W. Bush, who committed crimes against civilians in Iraq and Afghanistan, as the leader who defends human values.

II. Humanitarianism

This section consists to reveal how humanitarianism, as an argumentative strategy, serves to mask the speakers' racist ideologies of religion through exploring the different ways it is manifested in the texts under focus, **T1** and **T2**.

In **(T1)**, humanitarianism manifests in the following ways: a) **Showing understanding of the situation** (the best way to deal with the refugee crisis is to create safe zones inside of Syria…), b) **Critique of those who violate human rights** (Syrian regime, ISIS, Al Qaeda, Islamist terrorists, Iran and Russia), c) **defense of human rights** (…destroy ISIS, take out Assad Regime and ISIS), d) **Reformulation of norms to treat refugees** (creating safe zone…, screening and take limited number, …focus...refugees for Christians), e) **Making appeal to our moral responsibility** (…it is our fight, we should act…), f) **denouncing human rights abuse** (…brutal Assad Regime, … ISIS as the leading threat of an international terror network), and g) **Explaining anti-racist opinions** (And that's what we are fighting with ISIS, al Qaeda, all of the other groups).

In brief, the ways in which humanitarianism manifests in Bush's interview proved his support of human rights, values, and peace. They proved also the leadership of US in the defense of the common humanity as values. However, his direct proclamation to welcome only Christian refugees in US reflects such a very extremist and racist way of thinking on the part of a candidate to the US presidency. In fact, this affirmation reflects the inner ideology of political racism that the speaker tries to hide through representing the "We" as the defender of human rights and civilization and representing the "They" as the abusers of human rights and the symptom of threat. Yet, what he tries to hide is proclaimed in such a moment in which emotions ruled over reason. At this moment the true emotions are revealed and the hidden beliefs, thoughts and ideologies become naked. Thus, discourse strategies play a manipulative role in hiding the participant's inner thoughts and opinions.

In **(T2)**, humanitarianism manifests in the following ways: a) **Showing sympathy** (…most harmed by terrorism …victims of such violence), b) **Making appeal to our moral responsibility** (…it is our moral obligation … protect people who are venerable), c) **Making reformulation of norms to treat refugees** (we have to, each of us, do our part. And the United States has to step up and do its part), d) **Defense of human rights** (… the values that we are defending..., the values that we're fighting against...), e) **Critique of those who violates human rights** (… a consequence of civil war),

f) **Praising those who welcomed refugees** (…people like Chancellor Merkel have taken a very courageous stance...), and g) **Explaining anti-racist opinion** (…that is not America, that is not who we are … we don't have religious tests to our compassion).

To sum up, the ways humanitarianism manifests in Obama's speech proved the interests of the US in defending human rights and fight the political ideology of discrimination, segregation, and power abuse. These ways benefit from the negative other-representation and the positive self-representation to highlight the image of the US and its allies, we, to persuade the public that what they stand for are universal values that all humans should defend to establish peace and defend the vulnerable people everywhere. However, the fact of equating the issue of racism while dealing with the refugee issue should not go silent. In fact, Obama resorts to that to justify his former George W. Bush's policy in war against terrorism and deny the gloomy picture of the American politics Jeb Bush has drawn with his proclamation to welcome only Christian refugees and not Muslims one day before Obama delivered this speech in Atlanta, Turkey. Thus, humanitarianism, as a strategy of argumentation, proved to be manipulative and serves for the justification of what the participant wants to legitimize and deny as not part of who we are. Now, let me say that humanitarianism and the different ways it manifests in **(T1)** and **(T2)** is explored by the speakers to humanize the in-group and de-humanize the out-group people. This kind of polarization proves to be manipulative with the direct proclamation of Governor Bush to welcome only Christian refugees. As well in Obama's speech this strategy has a strong manipulative tendency to legitimize what Obama wants it to be legitimate and deny what cannot serve for the well-being of the US foreign relations. Thus, discourse strategies like humanitarianism are at the heart of mind control, power abuse and domination, especially when it comes to policy justification.

III. Evidentiality

In this part of the paper, I will be interested in the critical examination of the evidences and proofs the participants used to make of their arguments more plausible for the sake of attracting their addresses' attention and maintain control over them.

In **(T1)**, Bush used several evidences to justify his claims concerning his policies on refugee issues and US war on terrorism. First, he highlighted the danger that migrants might bring into Europe and US providing a real proof taken from what happened in France (…Islamist Terrorists smuggled into Paris among the refugees. Second, to justify his policy on how to screen refugees he referred to US previous policies (…we do that all the time…). Third, Bush justifies the need for US leadership through providing cause-consequence evidence (The United States has pulled back. And when we pull back, voids are filled. And they're filled now by Islamic terrorism that threatens our country). Fourth, to emphasize the brutality and harshness of the Islamist terrorists and the victimhood of the French people, he resorted to enumeration (…This is the second time they have had an atrocious act of terror in their country…). Fifth, to emphasize the threat and the harm of Islamic terrorism, Bush resorted to the nomination of the terrorist groups they fought (…what we are fighting with ISIS, al Qaeda, all of the other groups. And that's what our focus should be on.). Finally, he justified his claim on war on terrorism through providing a proof from his brother's fight for national security (… And I don't think anybody would question that my brother was in that fight, that he viewed it as a national security fight and he led).

To conclude, Bush used different types of evidences to make his argument more plausible to defend the strategies and policies he proclaimed as well to emphasize the victimhood of the "we" and the criminality of the "they". According to the critical analysis I carried in the above paragraph, these are categorized as follows: a) contemporary news, b) old policies, c) cause-effect, d) enumeration, e) Nomination, and f) previous experiences. In fact, these proofs are close to the mind of the addresses which makes of them more reliable to persuade the public opinions and maintain control over them.

In **(T2)**, Obama employed several evidences to support the argument he developed and delivered on refugee issues and terrorism in Antalya, Turkey. First, to emphasis world sympathy towards the refugees and call for all parts to assume their responsibility, he referred to the example of Turkey, Jordan, Lebanon and Europe (In Europe, I think people like Chancellor Merkel have taken a very courageous stance in saying it is our moral obligation... / Turkey with 2 1/2 million refugees and the people of Jordan and Lebanon ... is a signal of their belief in a common humanity). Second, when he defended his denial of being religious discriminators as "we", he resorted to evidences taken from Pope France's speech (When Pope Francis came to visit the United States ... he didn't just speak about Christians who were being persecuted. ... He said protect people who are vulnerable).

Third, to emphasize America's war on terrorism and de-emphasize its war on Islam, he referred to former President George W. Bush's speeches (Bush ... he was adamant and clear about the fact that this is not a war on Islam). Finally, while emphasizing the fact of showing compassion to all humans regardless of their race, faith and beliefs, Obama resorted to the American social reality (…we are a nation of many peoples of different faiths, which means that we show compassion to everybody).

To recapitulate, the evidences Obama used to defend his claims are of different types. These are categorized under the following labels: a) Real facts, b) Religious proofs, c) Textual indices, and d) Cultural proofs. In addition to the fact of being close the addressees' minds, the diversity of the provided evidences serves for the empowerment of Obama's political argument. This kind of logical power makes of discursive strategies at the heart of the struggle of power raised between the "we" and "They", between evil and good, as it is described by Obama and his predecessor George W. Bush.

Briefly, few remarks can be reformulated from the analysis of the evidences speakers used in both texts, **(T1)** and **(T2)**. Both Bush and Obama used proofs of diverse types and sources. These proofs are concrete and close to the mind of the addresses because they represent some kind of shared knowledge that is globally known by the public. In fact, this reflects the great importance they gave to evidences to justify their claims and their points of view concerning refugee issues and world terrorism. Moreover, evidentiality is explored to emphasize what speakers want to legitimize and de-emphasize what they want of it to be illegal or unjust.

IV. Implication

This section is devoted to show how implicitness serves for the speakers' representation strategies and the mystification of such racist political ideologies. Hence, it is interested in revealing the way implication strategies serve for the logical function of the developed argument, which is that of policy justification.

In **(T1)**, Bush resorted to implicitness several times to achieve some communicative and logical goals. These are inferred as follows: first, when Governor Bush says "…the best way to deal with the refugee crisis is to create safe zones inside of Syria", he may imply that *we (American and Europe) are not going to welcome refugees who were the cause of such terrorist acts in our countries*. Second, by saying "This is a threat against Western civilization", Bush implies that *the civilized Westerners (We) are now threatened by the savage and uncivilized non-Westerners (They)*. Third, I can infer from Bush's "This is made more complicated by the Iranian deal and Iran's and Russia's support of the brutal Assad regime" that *Iran and Russia are among the supporters of terrorism in the world*. Fourth, Bush's "We need to embed with the Iraqi military and provide direct support for the Kurdish forces and reengage with the Sunni tribal leaders" can be inferred as *we need to lead and have the others (Them) divided into two groups – ally and enemy – to make of the ally group fight the enemy under our support*. Finally, Bush's explicit statement "It is Islamic terrorism" can be inferred as *this is the terrorism of Islamic religious faith against non-Islamic faiths*. The analysis of these examples showed that implication is frequently used in Bush's interview.

In brief, Bush used implication to mystify such racist political ideologies that I summarized in these five points respective to the analyzed examples: a) Refusing Syrian refugees, b) Justifying war between cultures, c) Accusing Iran and Russia as supporters of terrorism, d) Making in-group war among Them, and e) justifying war between religions. The classification of these implications is done on the basis of their themes/topics. However, at the theoretical level, these are monitored by face-keeping **(c),** cultural norms and properties **(b, e)**, and politeness **(a, d)** (see Van Dijk, 2000). Indeed, these implication strategies are employed to serve for the de-emphasis of the negative details about the in-group people and the persuasion of the public about the need for the adoption of Bush's immigration policy and strategy of war against ISIS and Islamist terrorists. Hence, implication serves for the plausibility of the political argument Bush developed in his interview to justify the American politics.

In **(T2)**, Obama used implication for different reasons only the analysis of the inferred meanings of the following example is adequate to determine. First, by saying "I know that it is putting enormous strains on the resources of the people of Europe", Obama implies that *we (westerners) have done all our efforts to support vulnerable people and now our sources do not allow us to welcome mor*e *refugees*. Second, Obama's explicit statements "That's not American. That's not who we are" can be inferred as *that is who they are. That is they who discriminate people because of their faith*. Third, I can infer from Obama's "I was very proud after 9/11 when he was adamant and clear about the fact that this is not a war on Islam" that *it is a war of faith between Islamist and non-Islamist groups and whether you follow the American policy to be among Us or not and you are part of Them*. Fourth,

when Obama says that "…If we want to be successful defeating ISIS, that's a good place to start, by not promoting that kind of ideology, that kind of attitude", he may imply that *it is good to defeat terrorism in its homeland through controlling people's (They) extremist thoughts and ideologies.* Finally, by saying "we don't feed that kind of notion that somehow Christians and Muslims are at war", Obama may imply that *They (out-group) are feeding some kind of extremist religious ideologies that engage Muslims and Christians in a war of religious faith.* The analysis of these examples proved that implication is frequently used in Obama's press conference speech.

To sum up, Obama's speech (November, 16th 2015) conveys an explicit denial of the "Religious Test" suggested by Governor Bush in his interview with CNN (November, 15th 2015). However, the study of implication revealed that Obama resorted to implicitness to mystify such racist political ideologies that I summarized in the following five points respective to the analyzed examples: a) Hiding the denial of welcoming more refugees, b) Denying the fact of being religious discriminators, c) Implying out-group accusation, d) Conveying an out-group cleansing (among Them), and e) Implying the justification of war between religions. I carried this classification on the basis of the implied themes/topics. Yet, at the theoretical level these implications are monitored by the following norms and conditions of interaction: face-keeping **(c)**, cultural norms and properties **(d and e)**, and politeness **(a and b)** (see Van Dijk, 2000). In fact, the critical analysis of these examples showed that implication is used in Obama's speech to de-emphasize negative details about the in-group (We) which serves for the emphasis of the positive ones. In addition, the implied meanings proved their roles in hiding ideological biases that do not serve the well functioning of the Obamite argument. Therefore, implication is proved to be ideologically monitored to serve for the justification of US and European migration policies and US leadership on war against terrorism.

Now, let me say few wards about the use of implication in both **(T1)** and **(T2)**. Here, Bush and Obama used implication in the way that serves for both representation and argumentation. When it comes to representation implicitness works precisely to de-emphasize the negative details about the in-group and emphasize the negative details about the out-group. Yet, at the level of communicative argumentation it consists in the production of a homogenous logical statement that is adequate to persuade the addressees who will not be interested in the examination of what is inferred. Instead, what is explicit is the meaning that will be received and communicated by the audience. In fact, the critical analysis of the above examples showed that implicitness is governed by some theoretical assumptions like politeness, face-keeping and cultural norms. Hence, the manipulative nature of the implication strategies the speakers used to serve for mind control, domination and power abuse.

Conclusion

The critical analysis of both Bush's interview **(T1)** and Obama's speech **(T2)** revealed that representation, humanitarianism, evidentiality and implication serve for the manipulative tendency of these two political talks. In fact, the polarization of Us vs. Them and the strategy of positive self-representation and negative other-representation fit with the main objectives of the talks which are that of creating a bright image of the in-group and a dark image of the out-group in the mind of the audience to succeed to persuade them about the speakers' political strategies and policies. Moreover, humanitarianism is explored to humanize the in-group and de-humanize the out-group where evidentiality is central for the justification of the humanized deeds of the (We) and the de-humanized acts of the (They) through providing evidences and proofs that my analysis proved of them to be close to the addresses' mind and range from different sources such as politics, religion, and viz. As well implication is proved to be central for the mystification of such racist ideology to serve for the emphasis of an anti-racist talk.

In his live broadcasted interview, Bush resorted to the production of an anti-racist talk as a strategy to serve for the manipulation of his audiences. However, his racist ideologies are unveiled to the public at the moment in which his feelings of sympathy towards French people reigned over his cognitive strategies of hiding these racist practices to declare supporting and welcoming only Christian refugees. Obama who is delivering a speech in a different context did not express explicitly such racist ideologies. Instead, he resorted to the critique of what Governor Bush declared to emphasize his anti-racist stance and the humanitarian mission the in-group are carrying. Though Obama explicitly express anti-racist attitudes and opinions, he implied such racist ideologies manifested in his implicit denial of welcoming more refugees in US and Europe and his indirect accusation of the others (Them) as terrorists.

Thus, anti-racist strategies of discourse proved to be dominant at the explicit level; however, what is inferred suggested that racist attitudes, beliefs, and practices are there. Briefly, the critical investigation of the manipulative tendency of racist ideologies in both Bush's and Obama's political talks proved to be multi-disciplinary in nature where representation, argumentation and pragmatics are involved in the demystification of what the speakers tried to mystify for the sake of deceiving and controlling their audiences.

This means that the analyzed discursive strategies represent the main source of power the speakers used to justify the American migration policies and war strategies. As far as multi-disciplinarity is concerned, the analysis of these two extracts benefited from our knowledge of the way American leaders used terrorism for the justification of their policies, especially with reference to George W. Bush's justification of war against the Iraqi regime in 2003.

References

Chilton, P. (2004). *Analyzing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. New York: Longman Inc.

Fairclough, N. (2003). Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, I. & Fairclough, N. (2012). *Political Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students*. London and New York: Routledge.

Levinson S. C. (1989). Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oktar, L. (2001). ``The Ideological Organization of Representational Processes in the Presentation of Us and Them``. Discourse and Society, 12(3), 313-346.

Saussure, L. & Schulz, P. (Eds.). (2005). *Manipulation and Ideology in the Twentieth century*. Retrieved from: http: // www. books.google.com/books?isbn=9027227071

Van Dijk, T. A. (1989a). "Structures of Discourse and Structures of Power". In Anderson, J.A. (Ed.). *Communication Yearbook 12, pp. 18-59*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1989b). ``Race, Riots and the Press: An Analysis of Editorials in The British Press about the 1985 Disorders``. *Gazette*, 43, 229-253.

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

Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). "Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis". In Schäffner, C. & Wenden, A. (Eds.). *Language and Peace, pp. 17-33. Aldershot: Dartmouth Publishing.*

Van Dijk, T. A. (2000). "The Reality of Racism". In Van Oostendorp, H. & Susan Goldman (Eds.), The Construction of Mental Representations during Reading, (pp. 123-148). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2002). "Discourse and Racism". In Goldberg, D. & Solomos, J. (Eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Racial and Ethnic Studies* (pp. 145-159). Oxford: Blackwell.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2004). *Politics, Ideology and Discourse*. Retrieved from http://www.discourse-in-society.org/teun.html.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and Manipulation. *Discourse and Society*. London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi Sage Publications, 17 (2), 359-383.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Critical Discourse Analysis and Nominalization: Problem or Pseudo-problem? Discourse and Society*, 19 (6), 821-828.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2009). Critical discourse Analysis: A sociocognitive Approach. In Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 62-86). London: Sage.

Van Dijk, T.A. (2014). *Discourse and Knowledge: A Socio-cognitive Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wodak, R. (1989). *Language, Power and Ideology.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Wodak R. & Reisigl, M. (1999). "Discourse and Racism: European Perspectives". *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 28, 175-199