

Manipulation through Presuppositions in the context of International Politics

Dr. Shazia Ayyaz

*Lecturer in Department of English (UGS)
National University of Modern Languages
Islamabad, Pakistan
saayyaz@numl.edu.pk*

Gulzar Ali

*Lecturer in Department of English (GS)
National University of Modern Languages, Peshawar Campus
guali@numl.edu.pk*

Syed Sajjad Ali

*Head of English Department
National University of Modern Languages, Peshawar Campus
ssali@numl.edu.pk*

Dr. Alam Rehman

*Assistant Professor National University of Modern Languages, Peshawar Campus
amrehman@numl.edu.pk*

Abstract

This paper is based on the Critical Discourse Analysis of dominant political discourse. It focusses on the analysis of presupposition as discursive strategies of the dominant group to manipulate the subordinate groups and to suppress their ideologies. The theoretical base of the study is Norman Fairclough's (1992a) concept of presuppositions. He (1992a, 1992b) finds presuppositions a part of intertextuality which exposes the manipulation and ideologies of the social actors in a power structure. The paper concludes that dominant political actors strive to construct and sustain the power relations and hegemony in the world political order. Presuppositions are discursive tools which help them to achieve their power goals. They use presuppositions to manipulate and suppress the ideologies of the other group which help them to legitimize their own ideologies.

Keywords: *Critical Discourse Analysis; presuppositions; ideologies; political discourse; international politics.*

1. Introduction

In the context of international politics, the divisions of groups and blocs are usually based on the political ideologies and interests. Sometimes these binaries are constant while sometimes they are created due to some specific reason or event. Foucault (1976) finds power relations shifting and relevant to the context and position of the discourse users. He believes they are relational and continuously changing in

the netlike situation. The shifting nature of power relations puts the political actors in a position where they constantly struggle to construct and reconstruct the power relations. Dominate political actors strive to sustain their position by oppressing the others while subordinate political actors struggle to construct the power position. Political groups, in the global context, are divided majorly on the grounds of their geographic, strategic and political interests. Sometimes these lines are created by the religious and ethnic associations of the groups. Religious and ethnic demarcation gets stronger when ideologies of a religious group come in a clash with the other and hurt the emotions of one or the other group. One of the reasons for the clash between the religious groups is blasphemy. People from other religious ideologies unwittingly act against the ideologies of the other group which is intolerable for them. This creates a very sensitive situation and the reason of clash between different groups.

1.1 Background

In the recent political history, this clash is seen between the Muslims and the West. This clash is not based on the distinctive religious ideologies. Rather it is the clash between the concept of religion and freedom of the modern man. The West believes in the modern law in every walk of life while Muslims cannot detach themselves from their religion. The disagreement is created when the modern ideology of freedom interferes with religious ideologies of Muslims. This was first seen in the recent history after the publication of the novel *Satanic Verses* (1988) in England; Cartoon Controversy in Denmark and Norway (2005, 2006) and the release of the movie *The Innocence of Muslims*. *Satanic Verses* was considered blasphemous because its content violated the basic concept of Islam. As well, Danish and Norwegian newspapers published the humiliating cartoons of the Prophet of Islam which caused hurt to the Muslims.

In 2012 the release of the movie trailer *The Innocence of Muslims* again injures the emotions of the Muslims throughout the world. They protested against the West when their demands for banning the video and sentence for the makers were not accepted. In order to tackle with the situation, a meeting of the UN general assembly was convened to discuss this issue. Being from the dominant discourse, President Obama's speech represents the point of view of the West. He talks as a dominant and hegemonic political actor in the world politics. His point of view on this matter is important to understand the ideologies of the dominant group and their struggle to maintain the power and hegemony while suppressing the ideologies of the subordinate group i.e. the Muslims.

1.2 Presuppositions

The concept of presupposition belongs to pragmatics and is defined as the assumptions made by the language user and are accepted by the language receiver without challenge (Brown & Yule, 1989). In Critical Discourse Analysis, presupposition is a way of language use where certain ideas are taken for granted (Huckin, 1997) in order to take a position in the structure of power relations. It is "explicit assumption about the real world" (Fromkin and Rodman 1983, p. 189). "It is a frequently referred linguistic/pragmatic property of language use which might be systematically employed to serve ideological and/or political purposes in news

discourse” (Bekalu, 2006, pp. 151, 169). Fairclough (1992a) defines presuppositions as a tool for examining the power relations and hegemony.

1.2.1. Presuppositions and Critical Discourse Analysis

In the theory of Critical Discourse Analysis, presuppositions are important because they are attached to the assumptions of the discourse users. The assumptions are based on the ideas and beliefs of the social actors. The identities of the political actors are constructed and reconstructed on the grounds of the ideologies they follow. Their association with the groups they belong to is also suggested by the ideologies. Political groups come into existence as a distinct from the other groups because their ideologies are different. They work to establish their ideologies in the political institution. The clash between the ideological nature of the political groups creates the binary of the power relations where the powerful groups dominate the powerless groups. Of course, the power is ideological which is exerted through the discourse of the dominant political actors. The relations of power are not stable so the groups strive to achieve their power goals i.e. construct and sustain the power relations. The struggle makes the political actors to use discursive strategies to emphasize on their positive actions and to press on other groups’ negative actions. Presuppositions used by the political actors help to unveil the manipulations of the dominant political actors to suppress the ideologies of the subordinates.

2. Literature Review

Fairclough (1992a, 1992b) finds presuppositions an element of intertextuality (manifest intertextuality). Presuppositions for him are the assumptions of the speakers which they believe their audience already know about. The intertextual nature of presuppositions lies in the assumptions that are attached to them. These assumptions refer the reader to another text or discourse which is brought in by the writer/speaker through presuppositions. For example, the phrase “The French revolution” presupposes that France has gone/is going through a revolution and it is known to the audience. The presupposition belongs to the discourse of French revolution and can be re-contextualized in any other discourse to give a specific meaning i.e. when used in the context of Arab Spring it can help the speaker to justify the toppling of the leaders. Presuppositions become manipulative when the presupposed idea is not agreed or known by their consumers as well as they are imposing the point of view of the speaker (De Saussure, Schulz, 2005). Fairclough (1992a) has declared presuppositions as propositions (judgments) that can be manipulative and ideological. The manipulative nature of presuppositions helps in constructing and sustaining of power relations and hegemony i.e. dominant social actors manipulate the ideologies of the subordinate social actors with the help of presuppositions.

Political actors hide the agenda they promote behind the ideologies presented in the presuppositions and many a times the ideologies are not in the interest of the common people. The manipulation of ideologies can be exposed through the analysis of the presuppositions and the assumptions hidden behind them. Wadi and Ahmed (2015) examine the use of presuppositions for exploitation of the ideologies. They studied western media discourse vs Palestinian media discourse to expose the manipulation. Youssefi et al, (2013) investigate the discourse about US sanctions on

Iran in the western media and found presuppositions as a source of manipulation. Presuppositions are discussed in comparison with dissociation to find out the structures of the ideologies as explicit in the structures of discourse and relationship between them.

3. Research Methodology

The study follows the concept of presuppositions as an element of manifest intertextuality and hegemony suggested by Fairclough (1992a). He mixes the theory of intertextuality and hegemony to find out the interplay of power and hegemony through the intertexts present in a text. His concept approves that every text that is brought into another text has a role in constructing and sustaining the power relations through discourse. He suggests the combination of hegemony theory with intertextuality because he thinks it can help to “list the possibilities and limitations for intertextual processes and the processes of constructing and restructuring orders of discourse as processes of hegemonic struggle in the sphere of discourse, which has effect upon as well as affected by hegemonic struggle in the wider sense” (Fairclough, 1992a, p. 103). The concept of hegemony in the present study is based on the definition given by Fairclough (1992a) “Hegemony is a focus of constant struggle around points of greatest instability between classes and blocs, to construct or sustain or fracture alliances and relations of domination/subordination, which takes economic; political and ideological forms” (p. 92).

The point of instability for the present study is the divide between the concept of freedom of expression and blasphemy/religious freedom. The study has attempted to find out how dominant political leaders as exposed in the use of presuppositions construct and sustain alliances and relation of domination by manipulating the ideologies of the subordinate groups.

4. Data Analysis

4.1 Context

The analysis is based on the presuppositions present in the speech of President Obama. He represents the dominant group i.e. America/ the West which supports the freedom of expression. The speech was delivered at the UN General Assembly meeting in September 2012 where political representatives from around the world were present including the representatives of the subordinate group.

Obama brings in various discourses in his speech to achieve his power goals. His speech is based on the account of an American ambassador Chris Stevens who died in Benghazi, Libya, Arab Spring /political policies and problems of the Muslim world and the direct account of the issue of blasphemy. The analysis is aimed at discovering his strategies to manipulate the subordinate ideologies.

4.2 Analysis

“...he came to. throughout his life.”

Obama’s statement shows that Stevens had special feelings for Muslims and particularly the Muslims of the countries he served (The Middle East and North America). He is manipulating the fact that Stevens was a diplomat and he was appointed by the American government in those countries. Instead, the assumptions declare that Stevens dedicated himself to the cause because he was in love with the

countries and the peoples. Obama further adds that Stevens had intentions to love and respect the people of the country where he has been working as a diplomat throughout his life. The fact is, Stevens could have stayed in any country until the government allowed him to stay and the way he behaved with the people has been in accordance with the foreign policy of the US. We know that diplomats are instructed to behave and keep good relationship with the country and its common people that are based not only on the foreign policy of the country but also the interest that shape the relationship between the two countries. Therefore, as an ambassador, Stevens' actions were also controlled by his country.

The manipulative nature of the presupposition makes it ideological and helps Obama to declare Stevens a friend of Muslims and through the image of Stevens, he declares America as friends of Muslims. He also lets down the reaction of the Muslims to the release of the video by declaring Stevens and America their friends and well-wishers. This effect is achieved by merging the voice of Stevens with the voice of America. In this example, he implies America's ideology through the identity of the American ambassador. However, in the next lines, he identifies Stevens directly as a representative of America and discusses his achievements as American.

The assumptions taken out from the above presuppositions of Obama expose the manipulation like Stevens came to love and respect the people. However, it is known that diplomats go to other countries for political and diplomatic reasons and not for their emotional attachment to the people. The word "came" is ambiguous and Obama utters it while standing in New York, not in any country in the Middle East or North Africa. This makes the word to be understood in different senses like he went to the Middle East and North Africa because to love people of these countries; he was born to love the people of the Middle East and North Africa; he joined US embassy to love the people of the Middle East and North Africa and he went to the high officials of American diplomacy and volunteered himself for appointment in Libya because he loved the people of the Middle East and North Africa. All such possibilities are in contrast with the reality that he was appointed by the government of America as an ambassador of Libya and other countries of the Middle East or North Africa on the same or the other posts and this does not have any connection with the personal feelings, emotions or love of Stevens. The manipulating presupposition here tries to establish the ideology that Stevens/America is working highly in favor of the people of Libya and other Muslim countries (see Fairclough, 1992a, p.120).

...we must reaffirmno place among our United Nations.

Obama portrays Stevens as a role model for the whole world (highly positive representation) and assumes that the world has two choices to be followed for future and they are Chris Stevens and his killers. Stevens is associated with a peaceful and prosperous future contrasted with "violence" associated with the killers of Stevens. He avoids specifying the killers here, nor he commented on the event of the death of Stevens. The contrast of Chris Stevens with the killer and the picture of the future presented in front of the eyes of the audience is an attempt to win their consent and establish Stevens as one of the best persons in the world. He, many times in his speech, has taken Stevens as a metaphor for America here as well; he tries to level the grounds for constructing a positive image of America in contrast with its opponents

and they are “killers”. Determining the future is a complex term here and relative as well. In his speech, Obama supported the future where people through revolutions and protests (peaceful) change the governments established by the dictators. Secondly, a future determined by Chris Stevens is also not clear and it seems that Obama has exaggerated his character and metaphorically used him as a symbol for America. This argument concludes that Obama is getting dominant and wants to impose his views of democracy to the nations of the world. In the last part of his speech, he affirms that he would help people against the dictatorship of their current leaders. Obama aspires to include the voices of all the member nations with his voice that can be an attempt to impose his ideology or at least win their consent about the issue by moulding their opinion in favour of America.

...we face a choice betweenwe hold in common.

The presupposition holds that the world must make a choice between two things, i.e. “forces” and “hopes” and keeps both unspecified. The article “the” before the words marks them specific linguistically as well as discursively that is explicit from the way they are used by Obama. The word “force” is not negative but the context and the contrast make it negative. Obama has not marked it with any negative marker; he has rather put it in an environment where its sense has become negative. The contrast of force with “hope” has done it for him. The word “hope” can hardly be taken as negative and here it represents the positive picture of the future of the world.

The discourse behind this statement takes the reader towards the extremists and peace-lovers. Extremists are represented by the word “force” that suggests their negative force which is used by them to create violence and to disrupt the peace of the world. Peace-lovers according to Obama are in favor of people’s government, freedom of expression (of his definition that does not condemn blasphemy) and stand against extremism. Obama’s definition of freedom of expression and extremism could be challenged by some especially the Muslims who cannot afford the idea of freedom of expression that allows individuals to disrespect their religious personalities and beliefs. Another important aspect of the presupposition is that Obama has assumed his aspirations and ideals for the future as the ideals of the world “we hold in common”. In this way, he has identified the ideologies of the people worldwide in terms of his ideologies and this is the point where the presupposition is manipulative. It shows the emphasis of dominant discourse on the ideologies they promote over the ideologies and discourses of the subordinate.

We were the side of the people.

The “Tunisian protest” referred to the revolution in Tunisia that is the start of the Arab Spring. Obama is referring to the protests held in January 2011 and therefore, President Ben Ali had to leave the government and go into exile. Obama supports the protesters who came out against the government. The main point of Tunisian people was a demand for job opportunities and it was triggered by the death of a street vendor who was restricted by the government to sell fruit on the streets without permission. The presupposition is existential in nature and it helps Obama to draw a negative picture of the leadership in Tunisia and oppression of the common people. He manipulates the situation and takes a position with the common people as their only supporter in the miserable time. In this manner, he is successful to create a

divide between Us and Them between the leadership as them and common people and himself as us. He achieves a power position to dominate the leadership as it is cruel, and the people are innocent and peace-loving. He is with the people because he also shares the qualities of being innocent and peace loving.

...we had the ability ... than a tyrant.

Obama refers to the actions of America in Libya against the government of Gadhafi. He uses the presuppositions to take a power position that he can justify all his actions. The assumption that Gadhafi was committing “slaughter” of the innocent people in Libya is very harsh and helps Obama to depict the identity of Gadhafi as the most detestable person on earth who should be given as severe a punishment as possible. The detestable identity of Gadhafi justifies the intervention of Obama in his country to bring him to justice i.e. to deprive him of the government of his country. The next presupposition belongs to the people who were being killed and destroyed by Gadhafi and for whom everyone present in the meeting has sympathy after adopting the ideologies set by Obama. So, if the people of Libya have “aspirations” everyone is ready to support them due to the sympathies they win. Obama uses these sympathies and takes a position along with the people to “topple the tyrant” and save them miseries. This is how the presuppositions present in the text help him to justify his actions even those which are above the international law (i.e. intervening in the internal matter of a country) and he achieves dominance and ability to control the opposition.

.. we again ... are not unique to one culture.

Obama’s reference to the regime of Bashar al-Assad guided the audience towards the situation in Syria. The United States believes that Syria is having a civil war, but Syrian government declares the situation as terrorism by some rebellions against the government. Obama in a categorical way expresses his disfavour for the president of Syria through depicting the picture of the common people as oppressed and dominated by the government in an illegal way. The reference to the common people is not clear and they might be the people referred to as rebels and terrorists by the Syrian government but for Obama they are innocents. Obama urges that Syrians are suffering because their ruler is a dictator. The presupposition “the regime of Bashar al-Assad” accepts the existence of Bashar’s rule in Syria and Obama wants it not to exist. He is unable to justify his point in a convincing manner and has only one reason to demolish the Syrian government i.e. “suffering of Syrian people”. The ‘individualization’ (Leeuwen, 1996, p.48) of Bashar al-Assad exposes that Obama might have some personal issue with him as he could not identify the sufferings of the Syrians. He is also unable to explain “the new dawn” for Syrian people and only reveals in the next presupposition that the Syrians are enjoying freedom and self-determination. However, still, the presupposition presented here are not very strong as in the previous statement. Obama is successful in portraying though less intensive but negative picture of Bashar al-Assad who is oppressing his people, therefore, he should not be supported by the member nations.

Around the globe...their future.

Obama tries to win the opinion of the people sitting in the assembly by drawing a picture of the world where people are protesting their governments and

leaders for their “dignity” and “right”. The word “dignity” takes the audience back to Tunisia where a street vender’s dignity was hurt by the government officials and he burnt himself. The word “right” could be associated with the protesters’ demand that is mostly related to job opportunities and economic opportunities. Obama presupposes the facts related to the crisis in the Arab world and tries to establish those protesters as innocent people who should be helped and given whatever they demand. Obama stresses in this presupposition the right of the people to determine their future according to the context of this speech, it means reacting and protesting the present governments to form a new government where they could get their influence and share in the government. This exposes the ideology of Obama that leadership in the Arab Muslim countries is corrupt, so it should be changed either by force (Libya) or protests (Yemen) as well as people of these countries are good and innocent, so their aspirations are also good. Therefore, America is right in helping them to topple their leaders and give power in their hands. It can also imply that Obama wants people of his own choice as rulers in the Arab countries.

As President disagree with.

The statement is given in the context of the discussion of the controversial video where Obama was trying to defend the right of the people to express whatever they feel. He condemns the action of creation and publication of the video openly but in contrast to this condemnation, he declares it an instance of the freedom of expression of the people who created the video. In addition to the contradiction of his statement, he included himself in the discourse to clarify his point which weakens his position the most. The discussion started from the slander of the Prophet of Islam (SAWW) and moulded by him towards the freedom of expression. He argues that he himself is disrespected by the people and he respects their opinion. There is no comparison between him and the Prophet of the Muslims (SAWW). The false and inappropriate comparison has made him lose points. Later he brings in the American nation to discussion for defending his argument that America is in favour of freedom of expression of the people around the globe if the opinion of people is against America. This statement cannot be called as a true statement and it expresses the attempts of President Obama to protect his ideology of freedom of expression and used it as a weapon against the discourse that was generated around the world against American reaction on the release of the video.

We empower the worst of us if that’s how we respond.

The statement refers to the reaction of the Muslim world on the release of the controversial video. Here, “worst of us” is used for the protesters or future protesters on any of such incident while “that’s how” indicates towards the events in the Muslim World in the reaction to the video in which many people were killed and buildings were damaged. Obama in the background of these events tries to establish his opinion that the reaction was wrong and unjustified. He uses “us” that shows he is struggling to achieve power by defending his ideology. It is also an attempt to win the consent of the Muslim world using the strategy of inclusion. The word “empower” is crucial here and it has multi-faceted meanings. Obama might have used it to speak about the past events like protests and violence or the future events of the same kind. The ambiguity here is he wants to warn the world (the Muslim world) to be prepared for the things

like this to happen (release of video) or he is trying to prove that whatever happened in the reaction of the video was not acceptable for America. The word empowerment is used for the people who reacted, and this time Obama used “us” for them. This notion goes against his severe reaction to the protests on the video in the other statements of the speech. Now if not directly, he indirectly declares that the protesters are the participants of the same group to which Obama belongs. By doing it, he is not only mixing his own identity with the protesters but also changing their identity from “them” to “us”.

More broadly, ...is moving towards democracy.

Obama here associates the protests with the tension between the Arab World and the West instead of declaring it a reaction against an event. This statement discloses that he believes whatever happened in the name of protests in the Arab world was a demonstration of the conflict between the two worlds. He, in this way, translates the things according to his own will and interests ignoring the facts which he already accepted in the speech i.e. the reaction was against the video. The intertextual reference of the statement here not only links to the anti-Islamic video protest but other conflicts, unrest and fights as well which were going on in the Arab world during 2012. Some Arab countries at that time were facing the crisis and violent protests which were a consequence of the conflict between different groups within those countries while others were suffering from the consequences of war. These were the causes of the conflicts among different groups within the Arab countries in addition to the conflict between them and America and the West after the release of the video. Obama expresses his interest in addressing the tensions and declares this process as a step towards democracy. Here an indirect hint leads towards the Arab Spring that is a symbol of the protests of the people in Arab countries against their governments. The hint helps Obama to establish his ideology that the governments in the Arab countries are based on dictatorship and they should be toppled. The American government is in favour of the anti-government protests in the Arab World and it aids the people who are involved in such protests (like strikes in Libya in favour of civil war 2011) by naming it a democratic movement in the world that would make the world a better place to live. He assumes that the tension has taken a positive move because it is going towards democracy. He manipulates the facts here to establish his ideology by giving his own meaning to different aspects involved in the crisis of the Arab world.

I do believe that ... violence and extremism.

The Obama’s statement here is very forceful that makes the assumptions that are present in the statement forceful as well. He assumes that it is the duty of the world leaders around the globe to speak against violence and extremism. The assumption seems true if taken as a general statement but when considered in the context of the issue of blasphemy, it is false. First, the concept of violence and extremism is relevant, and every leader of the world thinks about that in a different way. However, some of the leaders can have the same opinion but not all. As the discussion in the speech is mostly related to the division of the Arab world and the West so the explanation of these terms from their point of view will clarify the matter in a proper manner. American invasion and intrusion in the Arab countries are termed

as an aid to the people who are in favor of democracy as defined by Obama but for these countries, it is violence and terrorism. On the other hand, anti-American protests or actions by the other parties are seen as extremism and violence by America but for the other groups, it is just a reaction against American intrusion. Secondly, the leaders sitting in the assembly are divided into these two opinions, therefore, all the leaders are not in a position to accept whatever is said. Obama intentionally ignores the situation and directly addresses all the leaders for a cause that is the cause of America that's why it is the cause for everyone present in the assembly. Obama here is getting manipulative and it helps him to sustain his position in the power structure of the world politics where he is attempting to impose his ideological beliefs on the rest of the world by speaking about it as the common ideology of the world.

Let us remember ... by a suicide bomber in Kabul.

American president here addresses the non-Muslim leaders directly and Muslims indirectly. The extremism discussed in the speech is mostly related to the Muslim world and some of the Muslim groups are responsible for violence mainly against America (i.e. Stevens) or other Muslims (protesters against the government in the Muslim countries). However, here he talks from the other perspective that can be taken as pro-Muslim perspective. Obama's statement comprises of the sympathies for the Muslims who suffered. However, these sympathies might be used to clarify his position in the war against extremism. He quotes one example of the victimization of the American diplomat (Chris Stevens and his colleagues) and three instances from the Muslim countries where people were killed in violent attacks. The purpose of this is to convince the Muslim countries of the world (not just Arab or North African Muslim countries) and to make his argument strong that can be more convincing for the Muslims to fight against extremism. However, the history of the events mentioned for making his point does not match with his statement as it has different roots and reasons. The attack on Benghazi was an instance of revenge from America by the people who were attacked by the American army in Libya (2011 military invasion). The killing of a Turkish police officer was the result of the clash between the Turkish government and the leftist rebels who have been against Turkey for more than two decades. The car bomb in Sana'a was an attack on the defence minister of Yemen by Al-Qaeda because of the death of their leader in the east of Yemen a day before. Lastly, the attack on the children in Kabul was probably going to be an attack on the compound of the allied forces but children unknowingly stopped the suicide bomber and, in a panic, he blew himself up. Obama tried to associate the attack in Benghazi with the anti-video protests in his speech. Here the attack on American compound is associated with attacks in different Muslim countries on the same day but in fact, every event has a different history and the ideology behind the killing is also different.

The impulse towards ...tribes and clans.

Obama assumes as well as warns the world leader about the impulses of some people who want to cause harm to the western world. The impulses here referred to the ideologies of anti-American Muslim groups around the world who are fighting against or resisting the Americans in one or the other way. Most of them are from Muslim countries like Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya and Syria. They have ideological and political differences with America and every group has its own reason. Obama makes

his point that these are the forces which want to create violence to get their political benefits and most of the time they do not want anything but violence and intolerance. In the Muslim world, the most critical issue is the clash between the Muslims of different sects and tribes. According to Obama the people who make others fight on the difference of sect or tribe are the same who are spreading hatred against America. He warns the Muslim world to take serious actions against the anti-American forces because this action can stop the other inter-Muslim conflicts in the Muslim world. In this manner, he identifies the opponents of America with the opponents of the Muslim solidarity. He makes his point to convince the Muslim world to be on the side of America to overcome the instances of violence that prevails all around the Muslim world and he does it by manipulation of the fact about the opponents of America and other extremist factors dominant in many parts of the Muslim world.

It is time to leave ...of division behind.

The statement links back to the thought of Obama about the violence and calls for violence, that is, violent and extremist forces are spreading hatred against America to achieve their political goals. The politics of division refers to the statement he gave in the speech about the politicians of some (Muslim) countries project the hatred of America against the masses to divert their attention from the other issues like the economy, unemployment, health and education. It is politics of division because it divides the people of the world into two groups like East and West. The phrases “the call of violence” and “the politics of violence” help Obama to manipulate the presupposition that there are some forces in the world which create violence, so America has the right to stop them likewise. Obama implies that some people (Muslims) are involved in this type of politics so they (audience) need to stop favouring or strengthening such forces. Moreover, the word “behind” is hinting at something hopeful that can lead a person (a negative person may be) towards a positive move where nothing related to (negative) past is there. Obama also gives the message through his words to the opponents to finish the conflicts and to move forward as one instead of going on as divided groups. The power of Obama on the violent forces makes him talk like this and takes a position as a “right” person and a member of a “right and “just” group that is America/the West.

5. Findings

The research finds presuppositions as a great tool to expose the ideologies of the political actors. They help to reveal the hidden clues that lead to the construction and sustention of the political power relations. The re-contextualization of the presuppositions supports the dominant political actors to construct and sustain the power relations. Presuppositions in the dominant discourse emphasize “them” as destructive and corrupt and “us” as constructive and honest. They work as a tool to highlight certain assumptions in the political discourse and make it possible for the dominant political actors to marginalize the established ideologies of the subordinate group.

6. Conclusion

Power relation in the political set up is constructed and reconstructed and this process is revealed in the division between us and them and individualization, marginalization, emphasizing and deemphasizing, intensifying and de-intensifying of

certain ideologies and assumptions. In the present study, the binary of power relations was set on the division of freedom of expression and religious freedom/blasphemy. The dominant group is in favor of the freedom of expression which suppressed the religious freedom of the subordinate group and marginalized their religious emotions and ideologies and emphasized and intensified the negative aspects of their concept of religious ideologies and declared them misfit in the modern world of technology. The dominant group de-intensified and deemphasized the emotional attachment of the subordinate group with the religious concept and debased them by making analogies between the freedom of expression and blasphemy to mitigate the significance of the Muslim ideologies. The dominant group divides the other group into the protesters against the video and the friends of America. The protesters are portrayed as destructive, cruel and violent and are dissociated from the Muslim world to win the consent of the Muslim world and to make them realize that the protests in the context of the video are irrational. This is an example of exclusion and inclusion at the same time. The protesters are excluded from the Muslim world and, at the same time, the Muslim world is included into the dominant group just to win their consent. The suppression of the Muslim ideologies revealed the presence of the power relations between both the groups. The release of the video is a point of instability for power relations and hegemony that was overcome by the dominant with the help of discursive strategies and the power relations were recreated in the context of global political order.

References

- Alexander, S.T., & McCargo, D. (2016). War of words: IsanRedshiftactivists and discourses of Thai democracy. *South East Asia Research*, 24 (2). pp. 222-241.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1989). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1992a) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity
- Fairclough, N. (1992b) Intertextuality in critical discourse analysis. *Linguistics and Education*, 4, 269-293
- Foucault, M. (1976). Two lectures. In C. Gordon, (Ed. & Trans.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977* (pp. 78-108). New York: Pantheon.
- Fromkin, V., & Rodman, R. (1983). *An introduction to language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Huckin, T.N. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. Miller (Ed.), *Functional approaches to written text* (pp. 78-92). Washington
- Rushdie, S. (1989). *The satanic verses*. New York, N.Y: Viking Penguin Inc.
- Saussure, L., & Schulz, P. (2005). *Manipulation and ideologies in the twentieth century: Discourse, language, mind*. Philadelphia: J. Benjamins Pub. Co.
- Van Leeuwen, T. (1996). The representation of social actors. In C. R. Caldas-Coulthard and M. Coulthard (Eds.). *Texts and practices: Reading in critical discourse analysis* (pp. 32-70). London: Routledge
- Wadi, S. I., & Ahmed, A.A. (2015). Use of presupposition for manipulation in media two Western vs Palestinian mediae International Herald Tribune newspaper

and al Jazeera online to find out the manipulation. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)* Volume 3, Issue 7, PP 16-26.

Youssefi, K. et al. (2013). Ideological or International Move? A Critical Discourse Analysis toward the Representation of Iran Sanctions in Western Printed Media. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 4, No. 6, pp. 1343-1350.

Speech of President Barak Obama.

Retrieved on February 23, 2012, from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2012/09/25/remarks-president-un-general-assembly>