# The Denial of Racism and Policy Justification in the American politics

**Taher Ben Khalifa**
Department of English
Faculty of Letters and Humanities
University of Sfax
Sfax, Tunisia
taherbenkhlifa@yahoo.fr

*Abstract*
*This paper deals with the critical study of the way the denial of racism works in political discourse to serve for the justification of public policies. To study this issue two texts are selected for analysis. These are the republican Jeb Bush's interview on CNN in November the 15th 2016 and the democrat Barack Obama's press conference speech in the G-20 summit in November the 16th 2016 in Antalya, Turkey. The analysis of these two texts is carried within the framework of a multidisciplinary theoretical approach ranging from semantics, syntax, pragmatics, argumentation theories, rhetoric, and context. This multi-dimensional approach finds its ground within the CDA framework of discourse and language study. The methodology used for the analysis of the selected texts consists of two phases. The first phase is based on the collection of data via the scrutiny of the texts phrase by phrase, clause by clause, sentence by sentence, and even paragraph by paragraph tracing the discursive strategies of actor description, authority, burden, consensus, empathy, fallacies, lexicalization, normative expressions, reasonableness, populism, and victimization determined in Van Dijk (2000). The second phase is devoted to the establishment of relations between the employed strategies to determine how they serve for the denial of racism, the justification of the speakers' policies, and the extent to which they can reflect political continuity. The results showed that the denial of racism at various levels of discourse structure is justified and public policies are determined and justified through both the denial of racism and the political manipulation of the war on terror. Thus, the results of the analysis highlighted the relation between the concepts of policy (migration), denial of racism, and terrorism. These parameters form a triangulation we need to understand how terrorism is used in connection with the denial of racism to justify public policies.*

*Keywords: denial of racism, migration, terrorism, policy justification, political continuity, ideologies, discourse structure*

## Introduction

Racist ideologies exist in the dark side of the thinking of any communicative agent. These are usually expressed in an implicit way through discourse structure at various levels like; syntax, semantics, pragmatics, argumentation, phonology, morphology, semiotics, and so on. My research in this paper focuses on the discursive structures both speakers, Bush and Obama, used to deny the fact of being racist, as American citizens and politicians,  and highlight the fact of being tolerant, responsible, and have universal values to defend.

In the present paper, the denial of racism is considered as a discursive strategy agents, especially politicians, use to justify their past policies, present decisions, and/or future plans for action. In fact, policy justification entails that speakers are aware about social, cultural, and political differences. In other words, they are aware about the characteristics of the context of speaking. This kind of awareness represents a strong point that communicative

agents explore to hide all these differences and try to create a hegemonic public atmosphere, where they appear more tolerant, respect differences, and allow diversity. For instance, Van Dijk (1993a) highlights that racism can be summarized in the following strategies; positive self-representation, negative other-representation, denying racism, apparent sympathy, fairness, top-down transfer and justification. These strategies among others reflect the way racist ideologies of hate, discrimination, marginalization, segregation and etc. are discursively expressed in text and talk.

Researchers interested in the critical study of racism and racist practices in discourse and language use focused in different discourse types; everyday conversation (Van Dijk, 1984, 1987a), textbooks (Van Dijk, 1987b), news in the press (Van Dijk, 1991), and politics (Van Dijk, 1993a). Stories are also dealt with focusing on how story telling carries social beliefs, stereotypes, ethnic prejudices, and cross-cultural conflicts (Van Dijk, 1993b). In fact, racism is not restricted to the realm of politics and it can be traced in all sorts of human communicative practices. However, when it comes to political discourse and the media it becomes much more dangerous since media and politics are at the center of the interests of a huge number of public. Moreover, racism once practiced at the level of politics and media it becomes advertised and legalized. For this reason, it needs to be revealed, analyzed, criticized, and condemned publically to reduce this illegal practice, especially in an era that is characterized by the wide spread of feelings of hate and discrimination.

Indeed, racism is not legally allowed and once such racist practices are proved, they can bring their practitioners to courts and legal punishments. These practices are also rejected by human societies and described as uncivilized and barbaric practices. Having this kind of legal and social knowledge in the mind, speakers try to hide what they have as stereotypes, prejudices, and racist ideologies. Moreover, they may resort also to the denial of these practices emphasizing the fact of being anti-racist and pretending to defend social and cultural diversity. The denial of these practices become more prominent especially when speakers are seeking to justify their policies and action plans and convince a large population of different socio-cultural back-grounds that their plans are the most appropriate among the existing alternatives.

The present paper is not interested in the mere detection and analysis of racist discursive strategies in the speeches of both Bush and Obama nor the mere detection and analysis of the strategies of denial. However, it seeks to make connection between the way racist practices are denied in these two speeches and the political policies, decisions, and future action plans the speakers aim to justify and make them hugely supported by public and political opinions. The critical connection I will try to establish in this project needs more than our knowledge of discourse grammar; like racist discursive strategies and strategies of denying racism. However, it needs also our knowledge of the world (Van Dijk, 2014); like our knowledge of the American politics, decision-making, and the history of policy justification, especially in the near history of the US manifested in the Bush administration and its justification of war in different places of the world.

The way strategies of positive self-representation, negative other-representation, polarization (Us vs. Them), argumentation, implication, and evidentiality are used in the speeches of both Bush and Obama to justify the US political policies was explored in my previous paper (Ben Khalifa, 2016). Whereas, the present paper will trace the manifestation of racist ideologies through the study of the following discursive strategies stated in (Van Dijk, 2000); actor description, authority, burden, consensus, empathy, fallacies, lexicalization, normative expressions, reasonableness, populism, and victimization. These strategies will be dealt with

within the framework of a multidisciplinary theoretical approach ranging from semantics, syntax, argumentation, speech act theories, rhetoric, world shared knowledge and etc.
The critical investigation of these discursive strategies within this multi-dimensional framework of analysis aims to answer three main research questions. These are the following:

1. How the denial of racism is used to justify Jeb Bush`s anti-migration policy?
2. To what extent does the denial of racism justify Barack Obama`s war policies?
3. To what extent do the strategies of defense and attack serve to reflect the political continuity among the successive US presidential administrations?

To answer these problematics, I will focus on the critical investigation of what the speakers used as discursive strategies to deny the fact of being racists focusing mainly on the examination of phrase, clause, and sentence structures. In addition, to understand how the speakers' denial of racism justifies their public policies, I will focus on the determination of how racism is denied and the detection of the policies they want to justify either implicitly or explicitly. Then, the obtained results will be discussed with reference to our knowledge about policy justification in the US politics. Finally, the conclusions of the discussion of the triangular relation between the denial of racism, policy justification, and shared knowledge will be explored to highlight how American politicians monitor facts to serve the American interests and Supremacy.

**Literature Review**
This section seeks to review the key concepts required for the critical investigation of the topic under focus. It aims at reviewing the literature related to the issues of political denial of racism and policy justification as well as the theoretical concepts to be used for the analysis of the texts under study.

**1. The denial of racism**
The discursive denial of racism was one of the major topics that proved to be at the center of the interests of many researchers' writings during the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century (Van Dijk, 1992, Petrova, 2000, Szuchewycz, 2000, Augoustinos and Every, 2007 and Nelson, 2013). Being interested in the study of racism as a social practice of exercising power, power abuse, and domination over less powerful groups of people, these researchers attempted to highlight that the denial of racism is also a discursive practice of segregation, discrimination, inequality, and domination. In other words, the discursive denial of these illegal social practices does not mean that the speaking agents do not have racist ideologies; however, this form of denial is a strategy of highlighting the image of the self and/or the in-group members. In fact, this sort of denial is not innocent, yet it is employed for the sake of achieving personal goals and preserving self-interests and allies' interests.

According to the oxford dictionary (2007), the term denial has three meanings: first, it denotes a statement that says that something is not true or does not exist. Second, it refers to the refusal to allow somebody to have something they have a right to expect. Third, it is associated with the refusal to accept that something unpleasant or painful is true. These three definitions of the noun "denial" cover three different realms of negation: a) the negation of what is already said; b) the negation of the right to own; and c) the negation of the truth of unpleasant things and deeds. These three realms of negation entail being put into consideration while seeking to determine the communicative agents' goals lying behind their discursive denial of such sayings and deeds. Knowing about these types of denial is required to unlock the participants' intensions behind any proclaimed denial of racism and what are the goals they seek to achieve.

In fact, the notion of denial in the study of racist practices in discourse and language use is problematic and closely connected to the notion of justification. According to (Petrova, 2000), "the problematic of denial seeks the answer in the direction of justifications and rationalization of the racist status quo" (p. 3). Thus, the critical study of the denial of racism needs putting into consideration in addition to the three definitions stated in the above paragraph, the two discursive functions the participants seeks to achieve: first, we need to determine the policies the speakers want to justify by denying the fact of being racist. Second, we need to make clear the way speakers use the discursive denial of racism to justify racist practices of social inequality and domination. In brief, the denial of racism becomes a double edged sward that we need to fight through exposing its danger to our readers and the human communities in general.

Some researchers like (Van Dijk, 1992 and Nelson, 2013) consider the denial of racism as one of the main features/properties of modern racism. In other words, what the participants try to deny as racist practices and ideologies at the surface level of discourse structure to positively represent themselves and the in-group members, is justified to be an implicit way of rejecting and discriminating the out-group individuals. Here, we notice a big contradiction between what is expressed at the macro-level of discourse structure and what is inferred at the deep-level of our analysis of the participants' speeches. The internal opposition between what is said and what is implied highlights the manipulative tendency of the discursive denial of racism that the speakers resort to while delivering speeches in front of their public. Indeed, the coexistence of these two opposite functions within the same speech is a good indicator for the existence of several discursive goals the speaker seeks to achieve among which are persuasion and policy justification. Thus, the analysis of participants' discursive denial of racist practices and ideologies entails paying attention to these participants' intensions and the goals lying behind their refusal of these social practices that are usually recognized by the addressed public. Here, our analysis of denial needs the investigation of our knowledge of how racist ideologies and practices work in the context of the study we are instead of carrying (Szuchewycz, 2000).

The denial of racism functions at various levels of discourse structure; like semantics, syntax, style, rhetoric, implication, argumentation and etc. that are required for the construction of the in-group positive representation through the denial of any racist sayings, deeds and even the existence of racist thinking among the in-group members. Nelson et al. (2011) affirms that the denial of racism operates through a number of different discourses and tropes. Indeed, previous literature on the study of the denial of racism; like (Augoustinos, and every, 2007, Augoustinos et al., 1999, Van Dijk, 1992 and Wetherell and Potter, 1992) demonstrated how text and talk are organized to deny racism in various contexts. Van Dijk (1992) summarized the denial of racism in four types: a) act-denial (I did not do/say that at all); b) control-denial (I did not do/say on purpose, it was an accident); c) intension-denial (I did not mean that, you got me wrong); and d) goal-denial (I don't do/say that in order to …) (p. 92). Nelson (2013) recapitulated the denial of racism in the following four points: a) temporal deflection (minorities today experience less racism than in the past); b) spacial deflection (racism is worse in other countries, including those where immigrants come from); c) deflection from the mainstream (racism is not an overwhelming problem, just with a small cohort of individuals); and d) absence discourse (outright dismissal that there is racism) (p. 93). These works on the denial of racism focused on how participants' denials are expressed through text and talk, which is also part of my analysis in this article.

The literature on the denial of racism showed that denial occurs at different levels; the individual, the institutional and the political (Van Dijk, 1992 and Nelson, 2013). In the

present paper, I will focus on the study of the denial of racism at the political level through the critical analysis of the speeches of both Jeb Bush and Barack Obama. Here, the denial of racism is affirmed by individuals who represent, in fact, political institutions of different ideological orientations: republicans and democrats. Moreover, the present paper will not focus just on the critical study of the denial of racism; however, it will overcome that to delve into the critical study of the logical connection between the denial of racism in the speeches under focus and the policies the two speakers sought to justify.

The denial of racism is also one of the strategies of positive self-representation. In fact, drawing a positive image of the self on the receivers' minds is of crucial significance for the persuasiveness of the arguments the speakers will produce. When it comes to politics, values of tolerance, human rights, anti-racism, justice, and social equality are the dominant international values speakers might adopt to affect the receivers' emotions rather than minds. The resort to this sort of influence finds its strength in the discursive strategy of the denial of racism. Indeed, this strategy functions through changing the norms from the state of a social reality of racism, prejudices, stereotypes, and discrimination people live every day in their societies to the state of the discursive world of tolerance and social equality. Values of human rights, equality, justice, and tolerance are dominant and universal. However, racist practices such as domination and discrimination are rejected by the human societies and the laws of national states and international organizations. So, for speakers to have strong impacts on their public they need to stick to the dominant values and deny having what their communities rejects as values despite having them in their thinking and every day practices.

Now, let me say that the critical study of the denial of racism – in the light of the existing contradiction between the social reality and the discursive reality – entails carrying the analysis of discourse on the basis of the three following parameters. First, we need to determine how racism is being denied discursively. Second, we are required to determine the policies, the decisions, and the action plans the agents seek to justify. Finally, we need to explore our knowledge of the world to discuss the relation between what is said and what the speakers want to justify by saying it. These data will be reviewed under the following titles aiming to establish a multi-dimensional framework that is adequate for the critical study of the topic under focus.

## 2. Policy justification

To understand how policies are justified in the realm of political discourse we need to have concise and precise definitions of both terms – the noun "policy" and the noun "justification" – constituting the noun phrase "policy justification". On the one hand, the term policy refers to: first, a plan of action agreed or chosen by a political party. Second, a principle that we believe to influence how we behave or a way in which we usually behave. Third, a written statement we use as a contract of insurance (Oxford, 2007). On the other hand, the term justification refers to the fact of producing a logical reason or finding a fact, a circumstance, or an explanation to justify why something exists or is done (ibid.). In brief, the combination of these two nouns in one noun phrase refers to the human cognitive activity of making public policies and the whole cognitive process of thinking about how to justify these policies.

The surface analysis of the syntactic structure of the phrase "policy justification" made clear the logical connection between "policy production" and "policy justification". In other words, our critical analysis of how policies are justified is closely connected to and entails our critique of how policies are produced and shaped at different levels of discourse and language structure. As far as policy-making is concerned, a practical reasoning framework (Fairclough I. and Fairclough N., 2010, 2011a and 2011b) is required for the dismantling of how the denial of racism is employed by both Barack Obama and Jeb Bush to justify their foreign

policies. While being engaged in the process of policy-making, communicative agents respond to the practical questions "what we should do?" (Fairclough I. and Fairclough N., 2012) in response to what is going on in the circumstances leading to the production of these political decisions. In the case of my study in the present paper, the question "what we should do?" should be explored in connection with the logical question "how to justify our policies?" to find the logical connection between the denial of racism and the policies both speakers sought to justify. Thus, the practical question "what we should do?" can be fragmented into two complementary practical questions: first, "what we should do to solve the ongoing crisis?" linked to the process of policy-making. Second, "what we should do to convince our public?" related to how policies are justified. Finally, these two questions are crucial to understand how the denial of racism works in text and talk to justify the US foreign policies.

In this paper, the answer to these two practical questions – "what we should do to solve the ongoing crisis?" and "what we should do to convince our public?" – will be formulated via: first, the determination of how racist practices are denied at the level of the discursive structure of both speakers' speeches. Second, the determination of the policies, decisions, and future plans for action the speakers sought to justify while they are addressing their public. However, establishing a logical connection between both answers entails being aware about our knowledge of how the denial of racism serves for the positive representation of the in-group people and how dominant and elite groups use denial to justify their policies. In addition, the understanding of the rational connection between the denial of racism and policy justification becomes more obvious with the revelation and the critique of the different sorts of interests lying behind any act of policy justification. Thus, the critical analysis of how the denial of racism is structured in political discourse to justify war, migration and other public policies should be treated within the framework of a multidisciplinary approach to cover the different dimensions of the topic under focus.

In fact, the cognitive activity of justifying one's policy works through the production of persuasive arguments that are adequate to convince the target public that what the speakers are arguing for is the best among the various plans for action. At this level, the production of such a convincing argument entails the production of coherent statements the coherence of which depends on the different choices the speakers make while addressing their public; like semantic choices, syntactic structures, style and etc. Rhetoric is also important in the critical study of the produced arguments. With reference to (Fairclough I. and Fairclough N., 2012) framework of argument evaluation, an argument can be rhetorically persuasive while it is not rationally and dialectically persuasive. A good example of this is Bush's triumph to use rhetoric and persuade the American public and part of the world to invade Iraq in 2003. He succeeded to prove rhetorically that the Iraqi President Saddam Hussein and his Regime represent a threat to world peace because of their ownership of bombs of mass destruction and their support of terrorism. The Americans and some of the world nations were deceived by Bush's rhetoric while the employed arguments are proved to be rationally non persuasive. Thus, the persuasiveness of such an argument depends on the ability of language users to produce coherent statements that can affect and shape the public opinion.

In addition to discourse linguistics, the communicative agents' power to convince the target public depends on some non-discursive practices. First, it depends on the identity of the speaking agent and the power he has over the public he is addressing. Here, the term identity does not refer to the speaker's family name, yet to his social categorization such social class (poor vs. reach), his belonging to power groups (dominant vs. minority), or his social position (political position, occupation, and institutional membership). Second, it is affected by the context of speaking and the relationship between the addressee and the addressed public. The

situation in which the communicative practices of language take place are crucial in that it affects the speaker's choices of what to deliver and what not to articulate because it impacts the persuasiveness of their speeches. At this level, a pragmatic reading of discourse is required to infer what the speakers try to imply through language strata to reach an in-depth critique of what he affirmed explicitly. In addition, the relation between the speaker and his public like intellectual belongingness (same group of thoughts vs. different group of thoughts) and interests (shared vs. conflicting) has its power in affecting the speaker's discursive choices. Indeed, while speakers and especially politicians are speaking they need to converse self and shared interest. Third, it depends also on the agents' access to public discourse (Van Dijk, 1993c) and the media. The more communicative agents have the occasion to speak publicly the more they can exercise their power on the real social ground and succeed to shape public opinions. In brief, these factors need to be taken into consideration while dealing with how policies are being justified in text and talk.

To sum up, the critical study of how foreign policies are being justified in political discourse requires using a multidisciplinary theoretical framework. This need for an interdisciplinary research methodology in this kind of study finds its explanation in the nature and the specificity of political language (Beard, 2000) that "varies according to one's position and purpose" (Chilton, 2004). Moreover, political justification becomes highly manipulative with the speaker's emphasis on the notion of the public good (Cohen 1989 and Sunstein, 199). Here, the articulation of the common good empowers the speaker's denial of having racist ideologies and practices and rises the rate of the persuasiveness of his speech since it makes the public stimulated by feelings of belongingness and unity. To unlock the illusive unity the communicative agents establish at the discursive level and its distance from real social life it is crucial to find logical connections between what speakers want to achieve or justify and how differences are reduced for the sake of social hegemony.

## 3. The US foreign policy justification
The successive US presidential administrations usually highlight the notion of common good and world peace while seeking to justify foreign policies of democratization, war, invasion, migration, and etc. However, the notion of self-interests related mainly to economic benefits and geopolitical interests is implicitly defended. The notion of allies' interests is always there, especially when it comes to the Middle-East region. For instance, the US has proved to defend Israel's interest, as one of its loyal allies in the region, under the umbrella of the peace of the Middle-East region as an explicit goal. Yet, the American economic and geopolitical interests are there, these are not referred to explicitly. So, it is up to language and discourse analysts to determine the national interests lying behind any US trial to justify its foreign policies.

Seeking to justify the US and its allies' military intervention in Iraq, Bush emphasized the divinity and the nobility of the mission his administration leads. In contrast, he created a gloomy picture of the other through the demonization of Saddam Hussein and his regime. In fact, he described them as the devil incarnation on earth. Bush's polarization of "Us" (good, innocent, freedom fighter) and "them" (Evil, guilt, terrorist) in addition to the exploitation of such events like terrorist attacks represent complex mental models he used to manipulate and reshape public opinions (Van Dijk, 2006). Moreover, Bush goes far away to divide the world community into two sub-communities saying "you are either with us, or against us". This implies that those who do not agree on what the Bush presidential administration called the "war on terror" and the invasion of Iraq are terrorists. Indeed, Bush's positive self-representation and the demonization of the other served for the rhetorical justification of his political plans despite the non-reasonableness of his arguments, especially when it is proved that no bombs of mass destruction were found in Iraq. Thus, Bush's denial of being invaders

and his emphasis on the human common good served to shape the public opinion and made him succeed to defeat his enemy.

The notion of the common good is emphasized; however, the American national interests and the geopolitical policies remained in the unsaid part of Bush's speeches. To defend America's economic and political interests, elites of the American foreign policy based their action plans on the explicit appeal and the defense of universal human values. Under the umbrella of these values, the US foreign policy-makers manipulate and (re)-shape both international and national public opinion trying to convince their public and the world to interfere for the sake of the human good. However, they interfere because the US interests are attacked (Mercille, 2008). Here, the political ideologies of geo-economic and geopolitical interests are mystified, yet these are the real motivators for the US interventions in world affairs. The geo-economic and the geopolitical interests guiding the main stream opinions of the US foreign policy-makers are referred to as the two logics: geo-economic logic and geo-political logic (see Harvey, 2003 and 2006 and Arrighi, 1994 and 2005). These two sorts of logic entail that any critical analysis of the US foreign policies should answer the following two logical questions "what are the economic interests?" and "what are the political interests?" elites seeks to achieve. Thus, the answers to these two questions make clear the connection between what the speakers try to mystify or deny and the policies they seek to achieve.

Moreover, Obama's administration justified the intervention of the US and its allies in Libya in 2011 to remove the Gaddafi regime by highlighting their human responsibility to secure the civilians and restore peace, order, and protect the human rights. However, the notions of geo-economic and geopolitical interests are there. These are mystified for the sake of highlighting the nobility and the humanitarian side of their intervention. Critics and writers interested in this issue like (Fermor, 2013) made clear the important role imperialistic ideologies of self-interests played in pushing the US foreign policy-makers to persuade the public that what they are doing is to secure the civilians. The richness of Libya in oil reserves and its geographical location in the north of Africa represent the main reasons behind the intervention of America and its allies. In addition, Gaddafi's long time standing anti-American policy is also another important factor to intervene in Libya to protect the American geo-economic and geopolitical interests in the North of Africa. In fact, these ideologies of self-interest are not explicitly affirmed, yet they represent the major causes of intervention. Here, the example of Libya represents another instance where the American interests are mystified to highlight the humanitarian mission of the NATO in Libya. Thus, the American ideologies of self- interests are there. These are defended under the cover of the United Nations' international values of human rights, freedom, and democratization.

To sum up, this brief discussion shows that the American geo-economic and geopolitical interests are not explicitly referred to; however, these are defended with reference to what the international community agrees on as universal values. These interests and the political ideologies defending them are mystified for the sake of persuading the public that America's role is to serve the spread of the human values of liberty and freedom. The critical analysis of the mystified ideologies shows that the stretch of the American interests across the world depends on America's ability to justify that humanitarian values are attacked to interfere and serve its self-interests. Thus, what the American decision-makers plan for as future actions is justified through the binary strategy of implicitness and explicitness. They put the emphasis on the defense of the international humanitarian values neglecting their imperialist values and their ideologies of dominance, exploitation, and geo-economic and geopolitical interests. So,

to what extent does the strategy of implicitness and explicitness serve for the justification of the American foreign policy?

Denial is another form of mystification and deception where the speaker's negative attitudes and ideologies are explicitly stated and negated. The negation of these ideologies; like racist ideologies and ideologies of geo-economic and geopolitical interests, is also meant to justify what the speaker makes as past decisions, present policies, or future plan for actions are the best among the existing choices. In this paper, I will focus on how the negation of the explicitly stated racist ideologies serves for the justification of both Barack Obama's and Jeb Bush's public policies. It will seek to analyze the discursive strategies the speakers employed in their denial of such racist practices and ideologies, highlight the policies the speakers sought to justify and explain the extent to which the strategies of defense and attack can be explored to justify the political continuity among the US Presidential administrations. The critical investigation of these axes at the level of the speeches of both Bush and Obama will be carried within the framework of a multidisciplinary approach.

## Analytical concepts

Here, I will focus on providing brief definitions of the theoretical concepts to be used for the critical examination of the corpus under focus. These concepts are discussed and employed in Van Dijk (2000)'s *the reality of racism*.

**Actor description:** refers to the ways participants are described in a given discourse. These participants can be described in different ways; like their identities, their occupations, their actions and etc. In this paper, actor description will be employed in the sense of how the two speakers resort to the description of the Syrian refugees as victims of war to deny their racist ideologies and highlight their anti-racist ones. In fact, actor description belongs to the ideological strategy of positive self-representation and negative other-representation; however, in this critical study of the denial of racism it functions in the opposite way to demystify the traces of the superiority of the self I focused on in my last paper (Ben Khalifa, 2016).

**Authority:** this theoretical concept is used to denote the different sources of authorities the speakers may resort to seeking to make of their arguments more persuasive. For instance, speakers refer to experts, scholars, religious institutions (Church), the media, or international organization like the UN, and etc to make of their communicative arguments more plausible. In the present study, authority will be explored to highlight the different sources of power the two speakers referred to while trying to deny the fact of having racist policies in the US and show how these are used to serve for the justification of the speakers' public policies.

**Burden:** refers to the different reasons that the speakers use to make of their arguments more persuasive. These are taken for granted premises employed to make of the conclusion acceptable by the addressed public. In this paper, I will focus on how the notion of burden woks on both speakers' talks to deny the fact of being and having racist ideologies or practices and how it is used to justify their public policies of migration and war on terror.

**Consensus:** is used to denote that the different parties in a state government or opposition should defend notional interests and make of all decisions and legislations non-partisan, prevailing over party politics and division. In this paper, this political strategy will be explored to show how the two speakers use different strategies to deny racism, highlight the national threat and lead towards the justification of unique US migration and war policies.

**Empathy:** is used to denote the different ways speakers express their sympathy with the hard conditions in which immigrants live. The way participants express their feelings of sympathy is deeply affected by their political strategies and their ideologies concerning the issue under debate. In my critical study of the denial of discourse in this paper, I will focus on how the speakers express their feelings of sympathy to deny the fact of being racist and justify their migration policies. This strategy will be explored to highlight the impact of the emotional argument in deceiving the addressed public.

**Fallacy:** the critical study of this strategy refers to the determination of the logical relations among the different premises of the argument as well as the relations between the speakers and the recipients. Here, I will focus on how faulty reasons are used by the speakers to deny the fact of being racist and persuade the public that what they propose as policies serves the common good of the humanity.

**Lexicalization:** refers to the different lexical and semantic choices the speakers made to make of their arguments sound and able to persuade the speakers. In fact, Semantic choices are not innocent, yet these are determined by the speakers' thoughts, ideologies, and beliefs as well as the context of speaking. In the present research, lexicalization will be explored to show how speakers select their items to express their anti-racist thinking and how they manipulate their choices in the way that can affect the addresses' feelings and emotions. Thus, the boundaries between reason and emotions will be dressed to see how the addressed public are sought to be manipulated through the resort to impacting their feelings.

**Norm expressions:** these are expressions the speakers use to express what they should or should not do while reacting to a given issue like migration. In this research project, I will focus on how the two speakers use norm expressions to deny having racist and anti-migration ideologies to convince their public that they are not racist, but they have the right to stop migration when it threats their peace. So, speakers resort to think about what they should do to highlight the difficulty of the situation and prove that their choices are the result of a long thinking process and these are the best among the existing plans for action.

**Populism**: this political strategy refers to the speakers' thinking and argumentation that the public community is abused by the minority privileged elites. It is always combined with the topos of financial burden and is known as a form of argumentation fallacy. In this case study, populism will be explored to highlight how it is employed by both speakers Bush and Obama to deny the fact of having racist and anti-migration ideologies. Also, it will be explored to reveal how it works to justify the speakers' public policies.

**Reasonableness:** denotes the state of being reasonable. In fact, any argument the speaker produce is central for different sorts of evaluation among which reason to see whether the developed argument is rationally persuasive or not. Thus, an argument have two different status either it is rationally persuasive (rational) or rationally non-persuasive (un-rational / biased). Here, Reasonableness will be studied in connection with fallacy to show how the boundaries between rationale and fallacy are crossed to manipulate and reshape the public opinion.

**Victimization:** this discursive strategy works together with polarization and dramatization to highlight the threat the immigrants caused on the native citizens. In racist discourse, victimization is usually employed to highlight the negative representation of the out-group (them) and the positive representation of the in-group (us). However, in this case study I will

focus on how the victimization of the self and the other serves for the denial of racism and the justification of the speakers' public policies. Here, victimization acquires another dimension which is the victimization of the other, but it is not caused by us as a part of this polarity (us vs. them). Yet, it is caused by a third party that should assume its responsibility.

**Number game:** this strategy is frequently used in argumentation to highlight credibility and emphasize objectivity. In fact, numbers and statistics are employed for the sake of reaching a high degree of persuasiveness. In case of migration, for instance, speakers tend to use numbers and give percentages to highlight the dramatization of the situation and the economic burden of the new circumstances to make of their anti-migration policies justifiable. Here, this number game strategy will be explored in connection with that of burden to trace the way both speakers uses numbers and statistics in their discursive denial of racism as well as in their attempt to justify public policies.

Now, let me say that the discursive strategies introduced in the above paragraphs will be traced, collected and analyzed to show how both Barack Obama and Jeb Bush expressed their discursive denial of racism to justify their political policies. Together with the discursive strategies of denial elaborated in (Van Dijk, 1992 and Nelson, 2013) these strategies will be analyzed to test the political continuity among the successive US presidential administration. Thus, the present study will be interested on the demonstration of how American leaders deny racist practices and ideologies and how they emphasize the American moral responsibility to serve the common good of the humanity while seeking to justify such public policies.

**Methodology**
The present paper comes as continuation to my previous paper (Ben Khalifa, 2016) in which I dealt with the way racist ideologies are mystified and manipulated by Jeb Bush and Barack Obama to persuade their public that migration causes a threat to the US to convince them that new policies should be adopted. The same corpus will be visited again to study the way the denial of racism is employed by the speakers to deceive and re-shape the public opinion. The corpus of the present paper, thus, consists of two texts: a press conference speech delivered by President Barack Obama in the 16th of November 2015 in Antalya, Turkey. This speech is retrieved from: http://www.breitbart.com/video/2015/11/16/obama-shameful-un-american-to-close-our-hearts-to-syrian-refugees/. And an interview with Governor Jeb Bush aired on CNN in the 15th of November 2015 one day before Obama's press conference in Turkey. This interview is retrieved from: http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/1511/15/sotu.01.html. Here, the denial of racism will be explored and discussed in triangulation with policy justification and our shared knowledge of how American leaders are used to justify public policies. Thus, the texts of the corpus will be analyzed and results will be discussed in the light of the above reviewed literature in the denial of racism, policy justification, the US foreign policy justification and the analytical concepts (Van Dijk, 2000) elaborated for the study of the reality of racism.

The corpus under study will be analyzed through the scrutiny of its texts phrase by phrase, clause by clause, sentence by sentence, or even paragraph by paragraph (see Van Dijk, 2000) focusing mainly on the following discursive strategies: actor description, authority, burden, consensus, empathy, fallacies, lexicalization, norm expressions, populism, reasonableness, victimization, and number game. These strategies are employed in (Van Dijk, 2000) to highlight the manifestations of racist ideologies in racist discourses. However, in this paper I will explore them in the critical study of the manifestation of the denial of racism (anti-racist discourse) according to the modifications I made at the level of the definition of each of them in the above section. Once these strategies are collected and analyzed and once the speakers'

policies are determined and analyzed, I will move to the establishment of the logical relations between what the speakers deny as racist ideologies and practices and what they seek to justify as policies. The discussion of the main findings and the logical relations among them in the light of our knowledge of how policies are produced and justified in American politics will be explored for the analysis and discussion of the political continuity among the US presidential policies.

In brief, the methodology of the present paper consists of two phases: one simple and the other complex. While the easy task seeks to determine the discursive manifestations of the denial of racism and trace the public policies the speakers seek to justify, the difficult task culminates in the establishment of the rational connection between how policies are being produced and justified. The critical examination of the logical connection between how policies are generated and put into practice will be crucial to discuss with previous knowledge on the nature of the US politics to show how the common good prevail in the American foreign policy. That is to say, the determination of how the duality of the mystification of self and allies' interests and the emphasis of international values of freedom, democracy, and human rights is employed to serve the American geoeconomic and geopolitical interests.

**Findings and discussion**
This section of the paper is devoted to the analysis and discussion of the data collected from the two texts constituting the corpus under focus.

**I. The denial of racism**
Here, the way racist ideologies and practices are discursively denied by the two speakers will be examined in each text T1 and T2 (note that T1 stands for Bush's interview and T2 stands for Obama's speech) separately. Then, the results will be discussed to write a brief conclusion on how the denial of racism can be structured in text and talk.

**(T1) Bush's interview**
Governor Jeb Bush, who declared from the early beginning a racist migration policy that is based on religious differences (Muslim vs. Christian) by saying "… I think we should -- we should focus our efforts as it relates to refugees for the Christians …", resorted to the denial of racism at various levels of his discourse. Though these ideologies of religious discrimination have been affirmed and aired publically through the antenna of the CNN radio station, he denied the fact of having racist ideologies against Islam and negated the fact of being in war against it later on. This sort of denial is traced through: first, the use of rhetorical question: while being asked by the radio presenter "is Islam peace, Governor?", Jeb Bush respond with a similar question "You know what?" waiting for no response. He employed this rhetorical question as a communicative strategy of 'face keeping' through evading the straight answer to the question. He continued his discursive evasion by saying "I know what -- I know what Islamic terrorism is" without expressing his thoughts about how he defines Islamic terrorism as a politician. The way he answered the question is highly manipulative in that his resort to vagueness represents another strategy of face keeping since the non-direct replays save their agents from facing harsh critiques. Then, he skipped the question to speak about his views on how to defeat such terrorist groups like ISSI, Al-Qaida, and others. Second, the resort to the direct negation: he employed the negative form to deny the fact of being in a war of religion saying that "this is not a question of religion. This is a -- this is a political ideology that have co-opted with religion". The negation of the existence of any religious dimension in the fight against terrorism and the troubled explanation (justification) he offered for this negative statement reflect his desire to highlight his personal image before his allies from the

Muslim community after having tarnished it by his racist declaration of welcoming only Christian Syrian refugees. Briefly, Bush resorted to rhetorical question, linguistic vagueness, evasion, skipping, and negation as strategies of face keeping seeking to highlight his image as a candidate to the coming US Presidential elections after what he has affirmed as a racist declaration the moment his emotions reined over his thoughts (mind).

Moreover, the oscillation between the declaration of racist ideologies/practices and their denial continues along Bush's interview. These are traced in the critical study of the following discursive strategies. Indeed, the study of the way actors are described in his speech shows that: first, the asylum seekers are said to be in a real political crisis "… the refugee crisis …", in which they tend to risk their lives through entering foreign countries in insecure ways "… so that people don't risk their lives and you don't have what will be a national security challenge …". These harmed people are in need for no-fly zones "… to create no-fly zone" and these are in need for safe heavens "… create safe heavens …" to save themselves from the harshness of the military deeds of the Assad regime. Second, the Assad regime is described as the main source of brutality "… the brutal Assad regime…" that has led to this refugee crisis. This brutal regime is supported by outside forces like Iran and Russia to make the situation more complicated "this is made more complex by the Iranian deal and Iran's and Russia's support of the brutal Assad regime". Bush's description of actors implies that the Syrians are living in a self-made made problem so they should solve it inside of their borders without bringing danger to our nations (westerners and Americans). This implication becomes more obvious with his emphasis on his empathy towards the Christian refugees. While all refugees are described in the state of being victims, Christian refugees are described to be the most affected by the ongoing war according to Bush's description of them. Thus, Bush's emphasis on the victimization of the Christian refugees is another discursive strategy to deny the fact of being racist and having such racist ideologies and practices implying that the others (Syrians) are the racists and we need to save our nations (Christians) from their extremist practices. This is a way to say that we are not racist or religious extremists, yet they are implying that this reality is the logical reason that pushes us to take the right actions.

The mystification of racist ideologies could also be traced in Bush's exposure of the security burden "this is a -- this is a warning for our country that this threat is not going to go away" to highlight that welcoming more refugees becomes challenging for the US national security since terrorists are used to infiltrate among them. Here, the exposure of the security challenge is another strategy of denying racism the speaker used to highlight that we could not welcome more refugees not because that we are racists; however, because of the proved threats these refugees carried to the hosting countries. By saying this Bush might imply that we (Americans and Westerners) opened our doors largely to welcome harmed and victim people, yet they rewarded us with such discriminatory and terrorist practices that threatened our societies what led us to act and review our refugee policies. Thus, the analysis of the implication of Bush's exposure of the security challenge reveals that it is a wise political strategy he relied on to deny the fact of behaving in such racist ways when it comes to the refugee crisis. In harmony with the strategy of highlighting the security burden, Bush's use of fallacies – illustrated by the following statement "… the best way to deal with the refugee crisis is to create safe zones inside Syria – serves for the mystification of his racist ideologies seeking to highlight the important role the US plays in serving the common good across the world. In fact, using this fallacy, Bush might imply that for the security of our nations from their terrorist threats we need to solve the crisis inside the Syrian boundaries. This fallacy is a rhetorical device Bush used to convince his receivers that it is better to solve the crisis inside Syria through showing them that even if security challenges prevent the US from taking more refugees; the US is

always there and will not retrieve to defend when it comes to world freedom and peace. So, both the security burden and the fallacy of the US's full preoccupation to solve the crisis inside Syria are two discursive strategies Bush used to deny racist practices and manipulate his public that what he plans for is the right way to act.

Bush's denial of having such racist ideologies/practices conveyed through his emphasis on the security burden and his employment of fallacy to manipulate the public and reshape their opinion is empowered by his resort to reasonableness that is illustrated by the following statement "… creating a strategy means that we -- we create a no-fly zone, create safe heavens …". Here, Bush' call for rationalization is another discursive strategy that he used to deny any kind of racist practices and emphasize the need to behave according to what the human logic dictates for the resolution of the crisis. With reference to Bush's emotional declaration at the beginning of this interview, we can say that his overlap between emotion and cognition is highly manipulative to persuade his follow Americans, Westerns, and Arab allies that the US has no racist ideologies against refugees; however, once it is faced with extremist and racist practices it should take the adequate measures to save its nations. In addition, Bush's call for the rationalization of the way to respond to the ongoing refugee crisis gets its strength with his reference to experts and power sources like the commanders "a strategy requires listening to the commanders …". Here, Bush's reference to the sources of authority is another strategy to deny the fact of having such racist ideologies because when the commanders are those who plan for how to act in this situation Bush's policies to act become national policies to defend. That is to say Bush's is resort to authority is meant to show that this is an American affair to defend the US and western values and not a discriminatory practice on the part of the person of Governor Bush. In fact, his resort to authority extends in scope to reach the allies; like Arab allies, European allies and etc. In brief, Bush employed both reasonableness and authority to highlight that what he suggested as refugee policy should be a notional policy to protect the US and the western nations and deny the fact that what he planned for is the result of personal racism as it is revealed by his religious test-policy.

In addition, Bush resorted to the use of norm expressions manifested in the following statement "… I think we need to do thorough screening and take a limited number" to highlight that the US has nothing against the refugees; however, it has the right to screen the refugees and take the number that fits with its security and economic challenges. By this statement Bush denied any discrimination against refugees and highlighted that the American capacity to welcome new immigrants depends on its ability to provide the necessary security measures. Thus, Bush and the Americans in general have no racist stereotypes and prejudices against the coming refugees; however, what matters is the security burden, especially when it was proved that terrorists smuggled through the waves of immigrants and committed terrorist attacks in Paris. To make of his restriction policy – to take a limited number of refugees – widely supported by the American public, he employed the discursive strategy of consensus illustrated by the following statements "… American leadership is desperately needed there" and "… we need to be all in on it". The scrutiny of these two statements shows that the denial of racism can be traced in the following two implications. In the first statement, Bush implies that the US has no discriminatory policies; however, it has the moral duty to lead when the world values of peace and freedom are attacked. In the second statement, he implies that these are not Jeb Bush's or America's policies, yet these are international policies that all nations should defend to live in peace and protect their states from the harshness of such extremists. That is to say, Bush used consensus to negate personal racism and highlight the universality of the US principles in the war on terror. Thus, Bush used norm expressions and consensus to deny the interface of any racist discrimination in what he called for as migration policy emphasizing that what determines these policies are the security challenges.

Now, let me say that Jeb Bush made use of several discursive strategies to deny the impact of any racist ideologies on what he proposed as a migration policy regarding the issue of Syrian refugees. In fact, Bush's declaration to allow only the Christian refugees into the US can be read as a racist migration policy at the surface level of analysis. However, at the deep level of analysis it is proved to be the result of the discriminatory practices of the Syrian regime and Jihadist groups towards the Christian minorities in Syria. In other words, Bush implies that the Christians are given the priority not because of their religious belonging, but because they are the most harmed by the harshness of war as a minority. The victimization of the refugees and the emphasis on the Christian ones is shaped by Bush's ideological use of lexicalization to raise the public sympathy towards the Christians' suffering in Syria. Moreover, Bush used discursive strategies like security burden, fallacies and reasonableness to emphasize that the US has no racist prejudices against the coming refugees; however, its capacity to welcome them is monitored by its security challenges. To make of this migration policy supported by the public he resorted to the use of authority, norm expressions and consensus. Also, for the sake of keeping his face safe from the critiques of his receivers he resorted to discursive vagueness and evasion. Thus, Bush's discursive strategies served for his denial of racism.

**(T2) Obama's speech**
President Obama initiated his press conference with a couple of sentences that emphasizes that the issue of the Syrian refugees has never left the American and the European political debates. First, by saying "one of the places that you're seeing this debate plays itself out is on the refugee issues", Obama highlights that the issue of migration is one of the crucial topics that is at the top of both American and European political agenda. Second, Obama's affirmation "both in Europe and in, I gather, it started popping up while I was gone back in the United States" implies that both the Americans and the Europeans are working hard on how to solve the crisis of the Syrian refugees. The use of the embedded sentence "I gather" should not move silent because it is not inserted in that position at random; however, it is employed to serve a well-determined communicative function which is that of emphasis and stress. Thus, the critical investigation of this couple of sentences shows that Obama resorted to emphasis to highlight both the Americans' and the Europeans' full preoccupation with what is going on in Syrian and especially the refugee crisis.

Obama's emphasis on the American and European preoccupation with the refugee crisis finds its justification on the way he described the refugees. Here, Obama resorted to the strategy of actor description to construct the image of the miserable situation in which the refugees are living to show to his public that he and his administration are aware about these difficult circumstances where a huge number of refugees live. According to Obama's description, the refuges are: a) harmed by terror (the people who are fleeing Syria are the most harmed by terrorism); b) the result of a civil war (they are the most vulnerable as a consequence of civil war and strife); c) of different ages (they are parents. They are children. They are orphans); d) victims of violence (… the victims of such violence); and e) live in vulnerable situation (… help people who are in such vulnerable situations). In fact, the adjectives (harmed, vulnerable), the nouns (victims, orphans, children), and the verbs (fleeing, live) that Obama used to describe the refugees are telling to create a kind of empathy on the part of the public and catch their attention towards the harshness of the conditions in which the refugees are living. In other words, lexicalization played an important role in the victimization of the refugees because of their current situation of living. This situation is characterized by both civil war and terrorism visualized through the lexical choices Obama made to describe it (civil war, strife, violence and terrorism). To give more emphasis to the victimhood of the refugees, Obama stressed that it is not their fault or choice to be refugees through saying that they are the consequence of a civil war "…a consequence of civil war and strife …". Thus, Obama's

use of actor description, lexicalization and victimization served to highlight the full engagement of the Americans on how to work with friends and allies to save the refugees from such harsh conditions. That is to say these discursive strategies enabled Obama to highlight the picture of the American politics after being tarnished by Bush's "religious test" policy.

To deny the fact of having such racist policies to welcome refugees on the basis of their ethnicities or beliefs and emphasize the US's endeavor to help those people who live in vulnerable situations, Obama made use of authority, consensus, and norm expression. First, he used consensus "… I was glad to see that this was affirmed again and again by the G-20 – that we should not close our hearts to these victims of such violence …" to praise the team work of the G-20 states and their belief for a common humanity to help those who are in vulnerable situations. In fact, emphasizing the understanding of the G-20 and its agreement not to close their hearts to these war victims is an indirect call for the other nations of the human community to step ahead and assume their human responsibility to share the burden with the states that are most affected by refugees. Here, Obama might imply that Americans and Europeans cannot welcome all the refugees and other states should do their part to help the victims. Second, he employed norm expression "… And so we have to, each of us, do our part. And the United States has to step up and do its part" to emphasize the importance of cooperation in such difficult situations inorder not to make some countries more affected by the huge numbers of migrants while others are not interested. By this call for burden sharing, Obama might imply that America and Europe are not able to welcome more refugees and it's the responsibility of other states to open their doors and welcome part of the refugees. Third, he resorted to the use of authority illustrated by his reference to Pope Francis "when Pope Francis … he didn't just speak about Christians who are persecuted … he said protect people who are vulnerable" to deny Bush's declaration of having 'religious test' to screen migrants according to their religion. Indeed, Obama referred to the church to justify the American willingness to support all vulnerable people across the world and deny the fact of having racist ideology of discrimination and prejudice against Muslims. To sum up, Obama used consensus, norm expressions, and authority to deny any American or Christian racist prejudice to welcome refugees, to emphasize that America and Europe are not able to welcome more people, and call the other states to step up and assume their responsibility. That is to say, other states should follow the western (American and European) model of assuming human responsibility and sharing the burden of the vulnerable.

Moreover, Obama employed both strategies of burden and number game to highlight the bigger burden people of Europe, Turkey, Jordon, and Lebanon are carrying. On the one hand, he used burden "… I know that it is putting enormous strains on the sources of the people of Europe" to show that despite the security challenges the European nations stepped up and assumed their responsibility to help refugees, yet with the huge strains they face they will not be able to welcome more people. In other, words Obama highlighted the effects of the huge number of refugees on the European sources to say that they will not welcome more people not because they are racist but because of the economic burden they have. On the other hand, Obama made use of number game "… Turkey with 2 ½ million refugees" to highlight the enormous challenge this G-20 member state will face in case that more refugees will get in. Here, the employed number is politically manipulated to praise the efforts of Turkey, as the hosting country of the G-20 Summit. This number game strategy is also another form of indirect call for the other world states to step up and take their parts so that they soften the tension of the burden and the security challenges on the part of these hosting countries. Thus, both number game and burden strategies served for the denial of racism on the basis of religious beliefs. Also, they serve for the formulation and the transmission of the Obamite

political call for the world nations to cooperate and share the burden that have affected the hosting countries' sources.

Indeed, the denial of having racist migration policies in America becomes more prominent with Obama's use of both strategies of populism and reasonableness. First, he employed populism illustrated by the following statement "…When some of those folks themselves come from families who benefited from protection when they were fleeing political persecution that's shameful" to emphasize that America is the land of diversity and it is used to protect vulnerable and persecuted nations. In fact, this communicative style is used to show to the public that the nations who dwelled the US when they fled persecution in their native states will not practice segregation once they are in peace because they know what is meant by persecution. Here, Obama resorted to this socio-cultural fallacy to emphasis that the US is the land of diversity and deny having such racist policies that he described using lexical terms; like the adjective 'shameful'. Second, he resorted to reasonableness "…I think it is very important for us right now, particularly those who are in leadership, particularly those who have a platform and can be heard, not to fall into that trap, not to feed that dark impulse inside of us" to highlight that he, his administration, and the Americans in general are against this dark way of thinking and they always call for diversity. In other words, calling for 'religious test' in the screening of refugees is not American and it's the other's (out-group) tradition to terrorize people because they are different from them. Here, Obama might imply that though the Americans and the Europeans were harmed by the smuggling extremists who feed this dark way of thinking, they will not close their hearts to the victims of war. To sum up, both populism and reasonableness served for the denial of any racist thinking and policies on the part of the Americans and the emphasis of the western values of diversity, tolerance, hospitality, and etc.

To sum up, the critical analysis of the discursive strategies Obama employed in his press conference speech served for the emphasis of America's stick to international values of diversity, responsibility, tolerance and etc. as well as for the denial of having racist policies. For instance, the lexical choices Obama made in the description of the refugees (actors) served to raise public empathy and highlight the victimhood of these vulnerable people. Also, his use of number game and burden served to emphasize that America will not receive more refugees not because it has racist migration policies, but because of some economic and security challenges. This, in fact, signals the existence of an indirect call on the part of Obama for the rest of the world states to step up and share the burden with the most affected countries. That is to say, even if Obama's speeches seems to be an attack to Jeb Bush's racist policy at the surface level of analysis, it is proved to justify the same policy of restricting the number of the refugees coming to the US at the deep level of analysis. Thus, Obama's denial strategies are highly manipulative and what makes of his speech more deceptive is his repetitive use of negation "this is not American … that is not who we are … we don't have religious tests to our compassion". The surface reading of these negative statements makes us understand that Obama's administration is against Bush's restriction of the number of refugees and it will welcome and save more persecuted people. However, this is not the case because the analysis of the above stated strategies showed that the Obama administration oriented its call to the world community to help sheltering and saving these asylum seekers. So, does this means that the US initiates the political propaganda of saving refugees and let other countries to do the mission?

## II. Policy justification

In this section, I will focus on the determination of the logical structures of the plans both Bush and Obama designed for the justification of their public policies. Here, we notice both

speakers linked the issue of refugees with that of terrorism what makes the logical connection between the justification of migration policy and war on terror policy worth exploring.

**(T1) Bush's interview**
The critical study of Bush's interview revealed that he employed a well-structured cognitive schema to defend his policy. This schema can be summarized in the following nine strategies:

**1. Claiming the policy:** Governor Bush stated his talk about migration by presenting his view on how to deal with the refugees. First, he claimed that the US should go through a screening process and take a limited number. Second, he declared that the best plan to act is to create safe zones inside of Syria to save the refugees from the brutality of the regime and the fighting groups. Third, he highlighted the victimhood of the Christians, as a minority ethnic group in Syria, to declare welcoming just Christian refugees and not others. While being asked by the radio presenter about how screeners will tell which refugee is Christian and which is not, he responded that it is easy and that they used to do that before and all the time "we do that all the time". To put more emphasis on the utility of this screening process, he gave the required time "It takes almost a year for a refugee to be processed into the United States. Finally, the policy Bush claimed highlights the impact of the racist ideologies of religious discrimination in shaping one's political decisions and claiming for actions.

**2. Highlighting the goodness of the self:** While being asked about his opinion on how to deal with the refugee issue giving the smuggling of terrorist attacks, Bush responded with a strong emphasis on the notions of threat, caution, and protection to show that the goodness of the Americans and Europeans to keep their borders open to refugees becomes a big threat. Then, he emphasized the victimhood of the French nations to highlight that the French who showed hospitality to welcome the refugees are facing a potential threat. Here, Bush might imply that we (American and European) should learn from what happened in France and solve the refugee crisis inside Syria. So, Bush's claim to create safe zones inside Syria is justified.

**3. Highlighting the danger of the other:** Bush highlighted from the early beginning that the coming refugees represent a threat to the US and the European states since terrorists are proved to smuggle among them and commit terrorist attacks. To emphasis the potential danger of the immigrants, he: a) claimed taking a limited number; b) called for extreme caution; c) called for border protection; d) called for the empowerment of counterintelligence capabilities; e) warned his country; f) warned the western civilization; and g) called for the US leadership to fight the threat. Thus, Bush's strategy to highlight the danger fits with his migration policy to justify the need for safe zones inside of Syria instead of welcoming more refugees to the US and Europe.

**4. Highlighting the challenges:** While trying to justify his policy of creating safe zones inside Syria to end the refugee crisis, Bush emphasized the security challenges the US and the European states are facing with the smuggling of the terrorists among the refugees. He explained that welcoming more refuge without having the national security challenge will be risky. Here, the way Bush presented the security challenge benefits from his description of the danger of the other to justify his claim that creating safe zones inside Syria is the best way to deal with the refugee crisis.

**5. Making connection between migration and terrorism:** Before speaking about how to deal with the refugee crisis, Bush declared the US responsibility to lead in Iraq and Syria to eradicate the ISSI. This implies that migration is the means through which terrorism is transmitted from Syria and Iraq into the US and the European states. In fact, this is justified by the concrete example of the Paris attacks that is very close to the audiences' minds. Since migration becomes a way to terrorists to smuggle into Europe and the US and a source to

threat the national security there, creating safe zones inside Syria is justified to be the "best way" to deal with the refugee crisis according to Bush. Thus, solving the refugee crisis inside Syria and defeating terrorist groups in their land is better than welcoming refugees and being threatened in our home lands as Europeans and Americans.

**6. Attacking the other's policies:** Bush attacked Obama for having no strategy concerning how to defeat the ISSI "The president has admitted he does not have a strategy as it relates to ISIS" and Hillary Clinton for saying that it is not our fight to destroy the ISSI "Hillary Clinton last night said that it's not -- it's not our fight". Bush attacked the Obama administration to highlight his political wisdom as a future president to the US. In fact, having a strategy is one of the steps of success while planning to act in a given situation. Here, Bush emphasized the need to have a strategy "I would first have a strategy" as the important step to defeat terrorism and solve the refugee crisis. Then, he equated creating a strategy with his claim to create no-fly zone and safe heavens in Syria "… creating a strategy means that we -- we create a no-fly zone, create safe heavens". Thus, Bush attacked Obama's administration to justify that his claim for creating a "no-fly zone" is the best way to solve the refugee crisis and avoid the smuggling of terrorists in the US and Europe.

**7. Determining allies and enemies:** Bush started his war on terror by naming allies and enemies. On the one hand, he classified the enemies into three categories. First, he designated the ISSI as the first and foremost enemy the US should lead to eradicate the ISSI from the surface of the earth in order to stop the infiltration of terrorist groups into western countries. Second, he classified the Assad regime as a brutal regime that should be taken out to solve the crisis in Syria and prevent the arrival of immigrants to the US and Europe. Third, he designated Russia and Iran as the supporters of violence and brutality. On the other hand, he classified the allies into three groups. First, he emphasized the need to have the support of the European allies. Second, he called the Arab allies and friends to support one fighting force of the Syrian Free Army to rebuild up. Third, he highlighted the need to embed other fighting groups like the Iraqi military, the Kurdish forces, and the Sunni tribal leaders to help eradicate the ISSI. In brief, Bush's determination of allies and enemies played a very significant role in the justification of his plan to create a no-fly zone and solve the refugee crisis inside Syria instead of welcoming more refugees and being threatened in our homeland.

**8. Praising previous policies:** While being asked about his view towards his brother's strategy of war on terror, Bush responded by showing that what he did is what the Americans need to do again "… that is what we need to do again". Here, Governor Bush expressed his appreciation of his brother's fight for national security saying that "… he viewed it as a national security fight and he led". Moreover, Bush's top admiration of what his brother did culminates in this quote "… I don't think anybody would question that my brother was in that fight". This quote implies that not only Jeb Bush appreciated the former president G. W. Bush, but the Americans should admire it also since it is a fight for the US national security. Thus, Bush's admiration of his brother's policy on the war on terror is politically manipulated to justify his policies on migration and war on terror.

**9. Framing the war on terror:** By determining the source of threat, the means through which terrorists reached Paris, the enemies, and the allies, Bush provided to his audiences a clear map on how to defeat the terrorists in their homeland and prevent the arrival of the immigrants by offering them safe shelters. In fact, Bush's schema made it possible to resolve the crisis in Syria since there is a clear map on how to defeat terror, get rid of the regime's brutality, and restore peace in this war-torn country. In brief, the logical framing Bush offered to make clear how to defeat terror is rhetorically manipulated to convince his public that a no-fly zone is the best way to deal with the Syrian refugee crisis.

To sum up, the nine strategies Bush resorted to in order to justify his "no-fly zone" policy to resolve the refugee crisis in Syria showed that terrorism is politically manipulated to deny the

impact of such racist ideologies on what he declared as public policy. In fact, the connection he made between migration and terrorism makes of the security burden one of the major challenges the US and European states fear to welcome more refugees.

**(T2) Obama's speech**
The analysis of Obama's speech showed that he used a well-defined cognitive schema to defend his public policies. This schema is summarized in the following nine strategies:

**1. Highlighting the US's preoccupation:** President Obama started his speech by highlighting that the question of the Syrian refugees is central for the American political debates to show to the public he is addressing that the US is up-to-date with what is going on in Syria.

**2. Highlighting the need of the refugees:** Obama focused on the description of the miserable conditions the refugees are living in to highlight their need for humanitarian help. In fact, Obama's victimization of the refugees is a strategy that can serve two political functions: reflecting the speaker's empathy and creating empathy on the part of the audience. While the first is meant to emphasize the Obamite administration's preoccupation with the refugee crisis, the second is used to call for burden sharing.

**3. Praising the welcoming states:** Obama expressed his emotions of appreciation and praising to different persons, states, and organization. First, he expressed his emotions of eagerness and congratulation to the important affirmation of the G-20 not to close their hearts to these victims "… I am glad to see that this was affirmed again by the G-20 – that we do not close our hearts to these victims of such violence". Second, he praised people from Europe – naming Chancellor Merkel – for their courageous stance to assume their moral responsibility "In Europe, I think people like Chancellor Merkel have taken a very courageous stance in saying it is our moral obligation as fellow human beings to help people who are in such vulnerable situations". Third, he expressed his emotions of praise to states like Turkey for welcoming 2 ½ million refugees as well as Jordon and Lebanon for admitting refuges. Finally, Obama's feelings of praise culminated in his emphasis on these people's strong belief in a common humanity to keep their borders open to the victims of war.

**4. Highlighting the burden:** Obama's expression of praise for the welcoming people and countries is associated with his emphasis on the burden they are carrying regarding the huge number of the coming immigrants. First, he highlighted the economic burden this huge number of refugees is putting on the European nations. Second, he declared that states like Turkey, Jordon, and Lebanon are the most burdened nations. In fact, Obama's emphasis on the burden the huge number of refugees put on the welcoming states is an indirect call for the remaining states and nations of the glob to take a courageous stance and assume their moral obligations towards such vulnerable people.

**5. Calling for the sharing of the burden:** After praising the welcoming states and highlighting the burden they are carrying because of the huge number of the immigrants they admitted, Obama called for all the nations to step up and assume their moral obligation. This direct call is, in fact, politically manipulated to highlight that other states should open their borders and help the victims because the US, the European, and the Syrian neighbor countries are suffering the burden. That is to say, it is the right moment to share the burden.

**6. Attacking the other's policy:** While calling for the sharing of the burden, President Obama attacked the migration policy of "religious test" Governor Bush declared in his interview on CNN one day before the G-20 Summit. In fact, Obama's refusal of Bush's declaration is expressed in the form of: a) surprise: Obama initiated his refusal by expressing his feelings of surprise towards what he heard from a political leader who has platforms, followers and can be heard widely; b) negating this racist declaration to be American "that's not American"; c) denying the fact of being racists "that is not who we are"; and d) denying the fact of having religious tests in the American political traditions "we don't have religious

tests to our compassion". Thus, Obama's attack to Bush's declaration is politically manipulated to highlight the image of the US politics in the G-20 summit. That is to say, this attack is not meant to change the US migration policy, yet to deny having racist ideologies.

**7. Making connection between migration and terrorism:** Obama started his connection between migration and terror with reference to the former President George W Bush's war on terror to highlight that America is on war against terrorism and not in a war of religions. Then, he moved to speak about the ISSI to show that they are fighting it because they refuse the extremist ideologies it defends "… the values that we are fighting against ISSI for are precisely that we don't discriminate against people because of their faith". Here, Obama tries to highlight that it is not the we (American and European) who have religious discrimination, but it's the other, they (non-westerners). Also, he denied the fact of treating people badly because they are different from them "… we don't kill people because they are different than us" to make prominent the American values of difference, tolerance, and solidarity. Finally, he made clear the difference between the in-group (westerners) and the out-group (ISSI and other terrorist groups) "… that is what separates us from them" to justify that the US has no religious discrimination "… we don't feed that kind of notion that somehow Christians and Muslims are at war". Thus, the connection between migration and terrorism Obama made in his speech served to highlight that America has no religious discrimination concerning the refugees; however, welcoming more refugees depends on the security challenges.

**8. Praising previous policies on the war on terror:** While making connection between migration and the war on terror, Obama showed a great inspiration towards the former US President George W Bush's policy. The way he praised George Bush's policy is structured as follows: first, he highlighted his disagreement towards Bush's policy "I had a lot of disagreement with George W Bush on policy …" to show that he do not allow religious discrimination. Second, he expressed his proudness to what George W Bush did after hearing him affirming clearly that it is not a war on Islam "… but I was very proud after 9/11 when he was adamant clear about the fact that this is a war on Islam" to highlight that the Americans have no racist prejudices in their political traditions. Third, he expressed his full admiration of this example "… it was the right one. It is the right impulse" to highlight that he and the American leaders are in a fight against terrorism and not against Islam. Fourth, he called the Americans to follow this example "… they should follow this example". In brief, Obama's reference to George Bush's policy was meant to convince his public that the Americans do not have religious discrimination in their compassion.

**9. Framing the war on terror:** After making connection between migration and terrorism and praising George Bush's policy on the war on terror, Obama moved to the framing of how to fight terror and defeat the ISSI. He declared that the war on terror should start from the place of speaking. Then, he gave his description of the strategy on how to do that on the real social context. The political strategy he described consists of the following steps. First, he addressed his public not to promote such extremist ideologies "… by not promoting that kind of ideology, that kind of attitude". Here, the advice is addressed to the humanity in general. Second, he called the Muslim community not to excuse anti-Western and anti-Christian sentiments "… the Muslim community has an obligation not to in any way excuse anti-Western and anti-Christian sentiment". Third, he called the Christians to have the same obligation not to promote extremist ideologies "we have the same Obligation as Christians". Finally, he reminded his public that the US has not religious tests in its political traditions and that Americans show compassion to everybody regardless of the differences. To sum up, Obama's framing of terror moved from the collective responsibility to the ethnic responsibility to the US responsibility as a part of the Christian community to emphasize his denial of having religious test in the American compassion.

Now, let me say that Obama is resort to terrorism served to deny the fact of having religious tests and extremist ideologies in the American political compassions. The connection between migration and terrorism is proved to be politically manipulated to highlight that the US doesn't close its borders on the faces of the victims of war; however, the security burden is the challenging matter. The economic burden is also addressed to call all the nations of the Glob to step up and assume their human responsibility. Briefly, Obama didn't say it explicitly that the US could not welcome more refugees like Bush did. However, the different steps he followed for the justification of his policy revealed the implicit meaning that the US could not admit more refugees and that all the world nations should share the burden.

### III. Political continuity

The critical study of the way racist ideologies are denied and how public policies are being justified in the texts of both Jeb Bush's interview and Barack Obama's speech showed that the issue of political continuity among the successive US presidential administrations can be traced in five points. These are: the attack-defense policy, the denial of racism, the justification of migration policy, the justification of war policy, and the praising of the previous policies.

**1. The attack-defence policy:** The strategy of attacking the counterpart's policies played a very significant role in structuring the justification of the speakers' claims for action. For instance, Jeb Bush attacked the Obamite administration for not having a strategy to fight the ISSI to highlight his political intelligence to think about a strategy before acting. Also, his emphasis on the cooperation with the commanders of the state is rhetorically manipulated to show the effectiveness of his political strategy on how to defeat terrorism. Moreover, Obama attacked the candidate to the coming presidential elections Governor Bush's claim of welcoming only Christian migrants to deny the fact of having 'religious tests' in the American political compassion. Obama showed also a kind of disagreement with the former president George Bush to highlight that the US has no prejudices against the others because of their religions and that whatever is the presidential administration the US do not promote and feed the dark ideologies of being in a war of religions. In fact, both Bush and Obama resorted to the attack strategy to defend the US at different level; like politics, national security, international relations, inter-cultural relations, and etc. In brief, the political continuity between Bush's and Obama's political views culminates in their defense of the former President George W Bush's policy on the war on Terror.

**2. The denial of Racism:** Though Bush claimed the 'religious test' policy explicitly, he resorted to the security burden to show that the US could not welcome more refugees because they represent a challenge to the American national security since terrorists are used to smuggle among refugees. Also, he resorted to the victimization of the Christian minority in Syria to justify that he decided to welcome Christians not because he defends religious discrimination, but because these are the most harmed and segregated against by the majority Muslims. In other words, the other (Syrians) has shown a kind of discrimination towards our follow Christians and we (Americans) should interfere to rescue them. Here, the denial of racism is a discursive strategy Bush manipulated to justify his policy not to welcome more refugees to the US by solving the crisis inside of Syria. In the same way, Obama resorted to the denial of racism to highlight the US's full preoccupation with the Syrian refugee crisis. In fact, he emphasized the victimhood of the coming refugees to reflect personal empathy and create sympathy on the audiences to share the burden and help the hosting countries to secure the affected people. He denied the fact of having religious tests in the American political traditions to stress the fact that Americans show compassion to all people regardless of their differences. However, his emphasis on the security burden, his call for burden sharing and his connection between terrorism and migration helped decoding the central message of his

speech manifested in the inability of the US to welcome more refugees and the need of other nations to step up and assume their human responsibility. To sum up, both Bush and Obama used the denial of racism to defend the same migration policy resumed in the reduction of the number of refugees to the US. In reality, the use of the denial of racism to defend the same policy despite the differences expressed at the surface level of discourse structure (attack) is a good proof for the political continuity among the US administrations.

**3. The justification of migration policies:** The critical study of the denial of racism and policy justification in the texts of both Bush' interview and Obama's speech proved that they defend the same migration policy 'no more refugees' to the US. Moreover, the resort of both speakers to terrorism to justify public policies is a good justification for the existence of political continuity among policy and decision makers regardless of party differences. Thus, the way policies are publically justified is a good instance for the justification of continuity at the level of the US foreign policy.

**4. The justification of the war on terror:** Though Bush emphasized the existence of difference between his strategy and Obama's strategy on how to defeat the ISSI, the speakers' agreement on George Bush's policy as the 'right impulse' to follow signaled the existence of a unified American political view on how to defeat terror. In fact, Jeb Bush focused on how to build a military strategy through listening to commanders and embedding with allies and friends to remove the ISSI. However, Obama focused on solving the problem from its roots by calling the public not to promote that kind of extremist ideologies and attitudes. He emphasized tolerance and the acceptance of religious differences. Despite the difference on how to defeat terror, the speakers showed a kind of agreement on the need to fight terror across the world. Thus, war justification is another strategy to show political continuity among the US administrators and policy-makers.

**5. Praising previous policies:** Bush's and Obama's praising of former President George W Bush's policy on the war on terror is another proof for the political continuity the speakers' discourse on migration and terrorism highlighted. In fact, the traces of political continuity detected at the level of the above four points culminated at the level of this point, praising previous policies.

To sump, the critical analysis of the two texts of the corpus highlighted the existence of a political continuity among the US successive administrations despite the differences the speakers expressed at the surface level of discourse (attack). In fact, the analysis of these texts showed that the denial of racism, the war on terror, and migration policy form a triangulation that is required for the deep understanding of how the US politicians highlight the common good and mystify the ideologies of self-interest to justify foreign policies. Here, both Bush and Obama mystified the American geo-economic and geopolitical interests in Syria and resorted to the justification of the war on terror and the denial of racism to justify their migration policies. Moreover, Bush declared the US leadership and emphasized the need to embed with friends and allies to support them to defeat the ISSI. In the same way, Obama highlighted the US's preoccupation with the refugee crisis and called the other nations to step up and assume their human obligations. This sort of resemblance on the structure of the logic of both speakers is also another evidence for political continuity. After justifying the notion of political continuity, one might ask the following question: to what extent does an elected president have the power to shape the US foreign policy?

**Conclusion**
The critical study of the texts of Bush's interview and Obama's speech revealed that racist ideologies and practices are expressed and denied at various levels of discourse structure to serve for the justification of the speakers' policies. In fact, the semantic analysis of these texts showed that lexicalization played an important role in structuring the speakers' description of

the actors (Refugees, Assad regime) as well as in shaping their expression of the emotion of empathy. Moreover, the critical study of the way the speakers' lexical choices are affected by the context of speaking (pragmatics) highlighted that they showed difference at the level of their explicitness/implicitness the moment they deliver their migration policies to the public. While Bush is proved to be more explicit by declaring 'welcoming only Christian refugees' and 'creating no-fly zones', Obama is found to be less explicit by defending the same policy of welcoming 'no more refugees to the US' through the call of the other nations to step up and share the responsibility. Though Obama attacked Bush's declarations at the surface level of analysis, he proved to defend the same policy at the deep level of analysis (implication) which is a good proof for the existence of political continuity in the US regardless of party differences.

The results of the study showed that the speakers resorted to the use of reasonableness and fallacies to manipulate their public and convince them that what they are claiming are the best ways to solve the refugee crisis. While Bush called for the creation of 'no-fly zone' to prevent the immigrants from arriving to the American and European borders, Obama highlighted the need of the other states to interfere and help welcoming refugees. They also manipulated the notion of burden to highlight that the US and Europe could not welcome more refugees because of the security and the economic challenges their people are facing with the huge number of refugees crossing their borders. Here, the strategy of burden played an important role in denying racist ideologies/practices and justifying the speakers' policies. In addition, both strategies of norm expressions and authority are also proved to be manipulated to justify the speakers' claims for action, to deny racism, and to persuade the international community to help by sharing the burden carried by the hosting countries.

However, the strategies of number game and populism traced in Obama's speech where not detected at the level of Bush' interview might be due to the degree of explicitness that differentiate Bush's talk from that of Obama. In fact, Obama used these two strategies to highlight the economic burden of migration on the hosting countries and call for the sharing of the burden to imply that the US will not be able to welcome new immigrants, which is not the case of Bush.

The way policies are justified while denying racism is traced through the logical schemas the speakers followed to show that what they are claiming are the right choices to solve the refugee crisis and get rid of the harms of terrorists. In fact, Bush's argument to defend his public policy (migration) is structured in a logical way that reflects his views towards the migration crisis as well as in the way that highlights his sway between explicitness and implicitness in expressing racist ideologies. As I have shown before, this political argument is built upon nine steps that I divided into two categories according to their degree of explicitness. First, the explicit declaration of segregationist ideologies manifested in the claiming of the policy. Second, the denial of racism traced in the strategies of: a) highlighting the goodness of the self; b) highlighting the danger of the other; c) highlighting the challenges; d) making connection between migration and terror; e) attacking the other's policy; f) determining allies and enemies; g) praising previous policies; and h) framing the war on terror. However, Obama's argument to defend his policy (migration) is built upon nine strategies that I divided into two types according to their functions. First, the preparation for the call represented by Obama's: a) emphasis of the US preoccupation with the refugee crisis; b) stress of the need of the refugees; and c) praise of the welcoming countries. Second, the call for the sharing of the burden traced though his: a) emphasis on the burden of the hosting countries; b) direct call for the sharing of the burden; c) attack the other's policy; d) connection between migration and terrorism; e) praise of previous; and f) framing of the war on terror. Here, the logical structure of Obama's argument reflects the degree of implicitness while expressing the US's inability to welcome more refugees. Thus, the way arguments are

structured highlighted that the denial of racism is rhetorically manipulated to justify the speakers' policies.

In brief, the way racism is expressed and denied and the way the speakers' arguments are structured to justify their public policies made clear the political continuity existing among the US administrations regardless of party differences. Continuity, indeed, is traced at the level of the following five points: the attack-defence policy, the denial of racism, the justification of migration policy, the justification of war on terror, and the praising of previous policies. The discussion of these points shows that the denial of racism and terrorism are politically used while seeking for the justification of foreign policies.

## References

Arrighi, G. (1994). The Long Twentieth Century. London: Verso.

Arrighi, G. (2005). "Hegemony Unravelling". *New Left Review*, 32, 23-80.

Augoustinos, M. and Every, D. (2007). "The Language of Race and Prejudice". *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 26(2), 123-141.

Augoustinos, M., Tuffin, K. and Rapley, M. (1999). "Genocide or a Failure to Gel? Racism, History and Nationalism in Australian Talk". Discourse and Society, 10(3), 351-378.

Beard, A. (2000). *The language of Politics.* London: Routledge.

Ben Khalifa, T. (2016). "The Manipulative Tendency of Racist Ideology in American Politics". *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science,* 6(8), 17-27.

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

Cohen, J. (1989). "Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy". In Alan H. & Phillip, P. (Eds.). *The Good Polity* (pp. 17-34). Oxford: Blackwell.

Fairclough, I. & Fairclough, N. (2010). 'Argumentation Theory in CDA: Analysing Practical Reasoning in Political Discourse'. In de Cillia, R., Gruber, H., Krzyzanowski, M. & Menz, F. (Ed.). *Discourse-Politics-Identity* (pp. 59-70). Vienna: Stauffenburg, Verlag.

Fairclough, I. & Fairclough, N. (2011a). 'Practical Reasoning in Political Discourse: The UK Government's Response to the Economic Crisis in the 2008 Pre-Budget Report'. *Discourse and Society*, 22(3), 243-268.

Fairclough, I. & Fairclough, N. (2011b). 'Practical Reasoning in Political Discourse: Moral and Predential Arguments in the Debate over Bankers Bonuses in the British Press'. In Eemeren, F.H., Van Garssen, B., Godden, D. & Mitchell, G. (Eds.). *Proceedings of the Seventh Conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 434-447). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

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

Fermor, C. (2013). "NATO's Decision to Intervene in Libya (2011): Realist Principles or Humanitarian Norms?" *Journal of Politics & International Studies*, 8, 323-361.

Harvey, D. (2003). *The New Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harvey, D. (2006). *Spaces of Global Capitalism: towards a Theory of Uneven Geographical Development*. London: Verso.

Mercille, J. (2008). "The Radical Geopolitics of US Foreign Policy: Geopolitical and Geoeconomic Logics of Power". *Political Geography*, 570-586. Retrieved from:

Nelson, J. K. (2013). "Denial of Racism and its Implications for Local Action". *Discourse and society*, 24(1), 89-109.

Nelson, J. K., Dunn, K. M. and Paradies, Y. (2011). "Australian Racism and Anti-racism: Links to Morbidity and Belonging". In Mansouri, F. & Lobo, M. (Eds.), Migration, Citizenship and Intercultural Relations: Looking through the Lens of Social Inclusion, (pp. 159-176). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (2006). New York: Oxford University Press.

Petrova, D. (2000). "The Denial of Racism". European Roma Rights Center, ERRC.

Retrieved from: http://www.errc.org/article/the-denial-of-racism/1218

Sunstein, C. (1991). "Preferences and politics". *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 20, 3-34.

Szuchewycz, B. (2000). "Re-pressing Racism: The Denial of Racism in the Canadian Press". Canadian Journal of Communication, 25(4).
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.22230/cjc.v25i4.1177

Van Dijk, T. A. (1984). *Prejudice in Discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1987a). *Communicating Racism: Elite Prejudice in Thought and Talk*. Newbury, CA: Sage.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1987b). Schoolvoorbeelden Van Racism: De Reproktie Van Racism in Maatschappijleerboeken (Teztbook Examples of Racism: The Reproduction of Racism in Social Science textbooks). Amsterdam: Socialistsche Uitgeverij Amsterdam.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1991). *Racism and the Press*. London: Routledge.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1992). "Discourse and the Denial of Racism". *Discourse and Society*, 3(1), 87-118.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993a). *Elite Discourse and Racism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993b). "Stories and Racism". In Mumby, D. (Ed.), Narrative and Social Control, (pp. 121-142). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993c). "Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis". *Discourse and Society*. London. Newbury Park and New Delhi: Sage, 4 (2), 249- 283.

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. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, *17*(2), 359–383.

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

Wetherell, M. and Potter, J. (1992). Mapping the Language of Racism: Discourse and the Legitimation of Exploitation. New York: Colombia University Press.