



IRAQI  
Academic Scientific Journals



العراقية  
المجلات الأكاديمية العلمية

ISSN: 2663-9033 (Online) | ISSN: 2616-6224 (Print)

**Journal of Language Studies**

Contents available at: <https://jls.tu.edu.iq/index.php/JLS>



## A Critical Discourse Analysis of Racism in Selected Statements by Winston Churchill

Ameen Abdulrahman Dhiya'\*

Department of English/College of Arts/University of Mosul

[ameen88@uomosul.edu.iq](mailto:ameen88@uomosul.edu.iq)

Received: 1/ 5/ 2025, Accepted:16 /6 /2025, Online Published: 30/9/2025

### Abstract

This study examines racism in Winston Churchill's<sup>(1)</sup> selected statements through Critical Discourse Analysis, specifically using Reisigl and Wodak's (2001) Discourse-Historical Approach. The analysis, following the qualitative approach, focuses on discursive strategies of self-presentation and othering, revealing how Churchill systematically used positive in-group and negative out-group strategies. His discourse consistently reflects racial hierarchies by portraying colonial powers as superior while denigrating marginalized groups. The research reveals Churchill's use of explicit language without mitigation, demonstrating his clear ideological commitment to racial worldviews. These discursive patterns are examined within their historical context of the colonial era. The findings highlight how political discourse operates as a tool for naturalizing racism through strategic representations of self and other. The study concludes that Churchill's

\* **Corresponding Author:** Ameen Abdulrahman Dhiya', Email: [ameen88@uomosul.edu.iq](mailto:ameen88@uomosul.edu.iq)

**Affiliation:** Mosul University - Iraq

© This is an open access article under the CC by licenses <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>



(1 ) Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill (1874-1965) was a prominent British politician, military officer, and author who held the office of Prime Minister of the United Kingdom on two occasions: first from 1940 to 1945 during World War II, and subsequently from 1951 to 1955. With the exception of a two-year period between 1922 and 1924, he served as a Member of Parliament from 1900 until 1964, representing five different constituencies throughout his career (Jenkins, 2001, p.3). Churchill's intricate political ideology combined economic liberalism with a steadfast conviction in Britain's imperial fate. His racial views, particularly regarding Middle Eastern peoples, Native Americans and Afghan tribesmen, often reflected the unexamined prejudices of his class and era, and would later become subjects of historical scrutiny (Jenkins, 2001, p.782).

discourse is a reflection of embedding racist ideologies in political discourse through binary oppositions that are employed for the positive evaluation of the dominant groups and the negative evaluation of the dominated ones.

**Keywords:** Racism, Critical Discourse Analysis, Winston Churchill

## تحليل خطاب نقدي للعنصرية في تصريحات مختارة لونستون تشرشل

أمين عبد الرحمن ضياء / قسم اللغة الإنكليزية/كلية الآداب/ جامعة الموصل

### المستخلص

تبحث هذه الدراسة مظاهر العنصرية في تصريحات مختارة لونستون تشرشل باستخدام تحليل الخطاب النقدي من خلال تطبيق المقاربة التاريخية للخطاب لرئيسل وفوداك (2001). يركز التحليل على استراتيجيات تمثيل الذات والآخر، ويبين كيف استخدم تشرشل استراتيجيات إيجابية لتمثيل مجموعته الداخلية وسلبية لوصف المجموعات الخارجية. يُظهر خطاب تشرشل تراتبية عرقية بشكل واضح من خلال إعلائه من شأن القوى الاستعمارية وحطه من قدر الجماعات المهمشة. وتكشف الدراسة أن تشرشل استخدم لغة صريحة وغير مخففة، مما يعكس التزامه الأيديولوجي الواضح بوجهات النظر العنصرية. تم تحليل هذه الأنماط الخطابية في سياقها التاريخي خلال العصر الاستعماري، إذ توضح النتائج كيفية استخدام الخطاب السياسي كأداة لجعل العنصرية أمراً طبيعياً من خلال التمثيل الاستراتيجي للذات والآخر. تخلص الدراسة إلى أن خطاب تشرشل يمثل تجسيدا لإدراج الأيديولوجيات العنصرية في الخطاب السياسي من خلال الثنائيات المتضادة التي تُستخدم لإضفاء تقييم إيجابي على الجماعات المهيمنة وآخر سلبي على الجماعات المقهورة. **الكلمات المفتاحية:** العنصرية، تحليل الخطاب النقدي، ونستون تشرشل.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The utilization of language for diverse purposes appears to be influenced by societal conditions. However, these conditions also govern the accessibility and regulation of the communicative resources available to language users. For individuals to engage in communication with others, they are required to employ a specific medium, which is language. So, communication serves as a fundamental objective of language employed by individuals. Yet, it is more striking that language which is related to politics has power

and control (Oliver, 1994, p. 4). Language cannot be understood simply by examining its symbols and codes; it must be looked upon "as a discourse or a series of discourses" (Oliver, 1994, p. 4).

According to Crystal (1995, p. 291), there are several distinct features of political language, which include syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, etc., all of which have a defining stylistic function, which makes it a particular register. While politicians utilize the "verbal impact to control and affect others, written texts, on the other hand, appear to lack all of these characteristics." (Crystal, 1995, p. 291). As a consequence, written texts are compelled to express meaning lexically and syntactically.

Along history, language has played a significant role in politics and control. Politics has percolated almost "every aspect of human thought and activity to a considerable extent", in the sense that politicians, and even politics, have ruled us throughout all our societies-whether by democracy or dictatorship (Newmark, 1986, p. 43).

According to *Britannica* (n. d.), politics constitutes the "activities that relate to influencing the actions and policies of a government or getting and keeping power in a government.", or "the attitudes and behaviors that are used to get or keep power or an advantage within a group, organization, etc.". For Chilton and Schaffner (2002), politics constitutes "a struggle for power between those who seek to assert and maintain their power and those who seek to resist it" (p.5). Politics is a universal human activity which is reflected through the use of (Newmark, 1986, p. 44).

The main function of language, on the one hand, "is to create social and political relationships, and in some circumstances", it can serve as a means of evoking the roles of those involved. On the other hand, language allows us to portray users' ideology, namely that of politicians, so that "the use of language in general and particularly in political discourse" can give insights "about the ideas" and how these ideas have been formed (Beard, 2000, p. 18). So, one can learn "about the ideologies of those who have been creating the texts" of politics by observing the language employed in these texts (Beard, 2000, p. 18).

Political language is intrinsically political, as it reflects different ideologies, viewpoints, struggles, power relations, opposing sides, and interests, among others. Language is exploited in the political field by "politicians, groups with certain orientations, and government to control, convince, and exercise power", among other things (Spolsky, 1998, p. 58).

As such, it can be established that politics and language are inextricably linked. Politics is intrinsically linked to language, and the manner in which language is utilized within a social group significantly influences political activities in a broad sense. Despite the fact that political language serves many different functions, its variety extends to cover a wide scale of human affairs (Van Dijk, 2002, p. 206).

Despite Winston Churchill's celebrated legacy as a wartime leader and statesman, his political discourse reveals racial ideologies that have historically justified colonialism, oppression, and systemic discrimination. Although Churchill's rhetoric has been studied

in leadership and propaganda contexts (Toye, 2007; Smith, 2014; Loughran, 2019), no research -to the researcher's best knowledge- has applied Critical Discourse Analysis, specifically the Discourse Historical Approach, to uncover his racist discursive strategies. This study is an attempt to address this gap in the literature by investigating the following research questions:

1. How does Winston Churchill's political discourse construct and reinforce racist ideologies?
2. What discursive strategies does he employ to justify and legitimize racial hierarchies and colonial domination?

The significance of this study lies in highlighting how political rhetoric naturalizes oppression, questioning Churchill's polished legacy. By linking historical colonial discourse to current power dynamics, it reflects the role of language in sustaining systemic racism.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1 Critical Discourse Analysis**

Critical Discourse analysis (CDA, henceforth) can broadly be defined as an interdisciplinary approach to the study of discourse that views language as a form of social practice. According to Fairclough and Wodak (1997), discourse is viewed within a framework of CDA as a form of social practices, which indicates "a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and the situation(s), institution(s) and social structure(s) which frame it" (p. 258). The discursive action is shaped by them but also shapes them. i. e, discourse is socially constitutive as well as socially conditioned. It enunciates "situations, objects of knowledge, and the social identities of and relationships between people and groups of people." (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997, p. 258). Discursive practices may have major ideological effects, in the sense that "they can produce and reproduce unequal power relations between social classes, women and men, and ethnic/cultural majorities and minorities through how they represent things and position people." (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997, p. 258).

Van Dijk (2015a) postulates that "CDA is a field that is concerned with studying and analyzing written and spoken texts to reveal the discursive sources of power, dominance, inequality and bias (p. 97). It examines how these discursive sources are maintained and reproduced within specific social, political and historical contexts" (Van Dijk, 2015a, p.97). Put differently, CDA "aims to critically investigate social inequality as it is expressed, signaled, constituted, legitimized and so on by language use (or in discourse)." (Wodak, 2001, p. 2).

The main tenets of CDA can be summarized in the following points, as highlighted by Fairclough and Wodak (1997, pp. 271-280):

1. CDA addresses social problems.
2. Power relations are discursive.
3. Discourse constitutes society and culture.

4. Discourse does ideological work.
5. Discourse is historical.
6. The link between text and society is mediated.
7. Discourse analysis is interpretative and explanatory.
8. Discourse is a form of social action.

Van Dijk (2015a, p. 467) refers to the criteria and features that characterize CDA:

- "It focuses primarily on *social problems* and *political issues* rather than the mere study of discourse structures outside their social and political contexts".
- "This critical analysis of social problems is usually *multidisciplinary*".
- "Rather than merely *describe* discourse structures, it tries to *explain* them in terms of properties of social interaction and especially social structure".
- "More specifically, CDA focuses on the ways discourse structures enact, confirm, legitimate, reproduce, or challenge relations of *power abuse (dominance)* in society".

## **2.2 Approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis**

CDA has been differently approached by different scholars. Norman Fairclough (1989) suggested that discourse has three aspects:

1. **Texts** (the objects of linguistic analysis).
2. **Discursive practices** (the production, distribution and consumption of texts).
3. **Social practices** (the power relations, ideologies and hegemonic struggles that discourses reproduce, challenge or restructure).

In comparison to these three aspects, Fairclough (1989, pp. 26-27) identifies three dimensions for CDA:

1. **Description**, which is related to "formal features of a text (punctuation, grammar, vocabulary, types of speech acts and the directness or indirectness of their expressions, and turn-taking)".
2. **Interpretation**, which concerns "the relation between text and interaction where text is seen as a product of a process of production, and as a resource in the process of interpretation".
3. **Explanation**, which is concerned with the relationship between social context and interaction, viewing a discourse as part of processes of social struggle, within a matrix of relations of power.

So, in Fairclough's framework, three types of analyses can be carried out:

- A. **The text analysis** (description).

B. **The discursive analysis** (explanation).

C. **The social analysis** (interpretation).

For his part, Van Dijk (2015b) argues that "the relation between discourse and society is cognitively mediated, since the nature of social structures and discourse structures is different" (p.64). To him, "the only way of relating them to each other is by means of mental representations of language users as individuals and as social members" (Van Dijk, 2015b, p. 64). Accordingly, social structures, social interaction and social situation can only affect talk and text by means of people's interpretations of such social environments. And conversely, discourse can only affect social structures and social interaction by the same cognitive interface of knowledge, mental models, ideologies and attitudes (Van Dijk, 2015b, p. 65).

Van Dijk's socio-cognitive model includes three components, as proposed in (Van Dijk, 2015b, pp. 66-73):

**1.The cognitive component**, which is related to memory, mind, and the cognitive representations and processes included in the comprehension and production of discourse.

**2.The social component**, in which ideologies are not only represented and acquired by individuals, but collectively represented and socially learned by a group of people. So, the social aspects of ideologies may be defined both at the micro and macro levels of society.

**3.The discursal component**, in which specific discourse structures are involved in the (re)production of power and power abuse in society, such as polarization, pronouns, identification, emphasis of positive and negative self-descriptions, activities, values and norms, and interests.

From a different perspective, Reisigl and Wodak (2001) initiated the Discourse Historical Approach (DHA, henceforth) to CDA in which a written or spoken text is analyzed and interpreted through systematic integration of all available background information. From their standpoint, context is of central importance to this approach, which takes into account four dimensions, as proposed in (Reisigl and Wodak, 2001, p. 41):

1. The immediate, language, or text-internal co-text.
2. The intertextual and interdiscursive relationship between utterances, texts, genres, and discourses.
3. The extralinguistic social variables and institutional frames of a specific "context of situation".
4. The broader sociopolitical and historical context, which discursive practices are embedded in and related to.

This approach, described as a tool for analyzing ‘racial’, ‘national’ and ‘ethnic’ issues in discourse, is oriented towards all four dimensions of context in a recursive manner (Reisigl and Wodak, 2001, p. 44).

According to Reisigl and Wodak (2009), the DHA is three-dimensional: after (1) having identified the specific contents or topics of a specific discourse, (2) discursive strategies are investigated. Then (3), linguistic means (as types) and the specific, context-dependent linguistic realizations (as tokens) are examined (p. 93). They further suggest five discursive strategies that are involved in the positive self- and negative other-presentation, achieving "particular psychological, linguistic, social or political aims". The table below, which is adopted from (Reisigl and Wodak, 2009, p.96), shows in detail these strategies, their social objectives, and the linguistic devices through which they are achieved:

Table (1) Strategies of Self- and Other-presentation

| Strategy          | Objectives                                                                                                                             | Devices                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1."Nomination"    | "Discursive construction of social actors, objects/phenomena/ events and processes/ actions"                                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Membership categorization devices, deictics, anthroponyms, etc."</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|                   |                                                                                                                                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Tropes such as metaphor metonymies and synecdoches (pars pro toto, totum pro parte)"</li> <li>• "Verbs and nouns used to denote processes and actions, etc."</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                  |
| 2."Predication"   | "Discursive qualification of social actors, objects, phenomena, events/ processes and actions (more or less positively or negatively)" | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Stereotypical, evaluative attributions of negative or positive traits (e.g. in the form of adjectives, appositions, prepositional phrases, relative clauses, conjunctive clauses, infinitive clauses and participial clauses or groups)"</li> </ul>                                                                      |
|                   |                                                                                                                                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Explicit predicates or predicative nouns/adjectives/pronouns"</li> <li>• "Collocations"</li> <li>• "Explicit comparisons, similes, metaphors and other rhetorical figures (including metonymies, hyperboles, litotes, euphemisms)"</li> <li>• "Allusions, evocations, and presuppositions/implicatures, etc."</li> </ul> |
| 3."Argumentation" | "Justification and questioning of claims of truth and normative rightness."                                                            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Topoi (formal or more content-related)"</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |

|                                                             |                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4. "Perspectivization, framing or discourse representation" | "Positioning speaker's or writer's point of view and expressing involvement or distance."                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Fallacies"</li> <li>• "Deictics"</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|                                                             |                                                                                                                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Direct, indirect or free indirect speech"</li> <li>• "Quotation marks, discourse markers/ particles"</li> <li>• "Metaphors"</li> <li>• "Animating prosody, etc."</li> </ul>                                                                                   |
| 5. "Intensification/ mitigation"                            | "Modifying (intensifying or mitigating) the illocutionary force and thus the epistemic or deontic status of utterances." | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Diminutives or augmentatives"</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|                                                             |                                                                                                                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "(Modal) particles, tag questions, subjunctive, hesitations, vague expressions, etc."</li> <li>• "Hyperboles, litotes"</li> <li>• "Indirect speech acts (e.g. question instead of assertion)"</li> <li>• "Verbs of saying, feeling, thinking, etc."</li> </ul> |
|                                                             |                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|                                                             |                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|                                                             |                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |

The five discursive strategies illustrated in the table above construct positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation, serving ideological and political objectives (Reisigl and Wodak, 2009, p.93). **Nomination** involves labeling social actors, objects, or events through membership categorization (e.g., "illegal immigrants"), metaphors, or synecdoche (e.g., "Brussels" for the EU bureaucracy), shaping how groups are perceived (pp. 94–95). **Predication** assigns evaluative traits (e.g., "criminal," "heroic") through adjectives, metaphors, or collocations, reinforcing stereotypes (p. 96). **Argumentation** involves justifications of claims, using topoi (recurring argumentative patterns, such as the "threat topos") or logical fallacies (e.g., "We must control borders to protect our culture"), legitimizing exclusionary policies (pp. 96–97). **Perspectivization** positions the speaker's stance through deixis ("us" vs. "them"), reported speech, or metaphors in order to align audiences with specific viewpoints (p. 97). Finally, **intensification or mitigation** modifies statements' force, using, for instance, hyperboles ("invasion"), diminutives ("a *tiny* problem"), or hedging, to amplify or downplay urgency (p. 98). According to Wodak (2015), these strategies are not neutral but serve power structures by constructing in-groups and out-groups (p. 47). Some critics argue that a significant advantage of the DHA is that it can effectively expose manipulative discourse, whereas its heavy reliance on contextual analysis may create complications in cross-discourse comparisons (Krzyżanowski, 2010, p. 72).

### **2.3 Racism**

According to the Australian Human Rights Commission (n.d.), *racism* is defined as "the process by which systems and policies, actions and attitudes create inequitable opportunities and outcomes for people based on race". Racism constitutes "more than just prejudice in thought or action. It occurs when this prejudice – whether individual or institutional – is accompanied by the power to discriminate against, oppress or limit the rights of others" (Quoted in Moloney, 2025, p.395).

Anthropologists and biologists define race as a group of individuals who possess specific physical traits inherited biologically (Aydınay and Yıldız, 2021, p. 2). The term 'race' was first employed in the 16th century, originally referring to "ancestry" and "generation." Over the years, its connotation has developed to denote groups sharing similar physical attributes (Aydınay and Yıldız, 2021, p. 2).

So, when an individual's race is the grounds for any form of oppression, the resulting actions are 'racist' in nature. When this oppression or prejudice is widespread and targeted at particular ethnic groups, it is referred to as 'Racism'. This is not to be confused with discrimination, specifically because oppression takes into account power – wherein societies have dominant and subservient groups at least in terms of population and representation (Bowser, 2017, p.572).

Racism can be understood as a manifestation of an oppressive framework rooted in white supremacy, wherein individuals from predominantly 'non-white' communities are regarded as second-class citizens by white individuals. Oppression happens when a group of the population endures prolonged periods of harsh or unjust treatment. As a systemic issue, racism interacts with and reinforces other forms of oppression, including those based on economic status, gender (sexism), or identity; thus, the oppressive framework intensifies and reinforces existing privileges. (DiAngelo, 2016, pp.107-108).

Grosfouel (2016) defines racism "as a hierarchical global term of superiority and inferiority" (p.10). This "global hierarchy term exists among the line of humanity that has been expressed and re-expressed culturally, economically and politically by the institutions of the capitalist/patriarchal western-centric/ Christian-centric modern/colonial world system". He asserts that individuals can be categorized as either above or below the line. Those positioned above the line are entitled to a range of rights, including both human rights and labor rights, whereas those below the line are regarded as sub-human. (Grosfouel, 2016, p. 10).

Furthermore, Grosfouel (2016) postulates that the manifestations of racism can be identified by language, ethnicity, color, culture, and religion (p.10). The superiority in racism has been constructed through history by different groups. The third-world westernized elites, for example, have practiced racism against ethnic/racial groups; the British have reproduced racist practices against Irish in Ireland's colonial history through religious markers (Grosfouel 2016, pp.10-11). Muslim religious identity is "today's most prominent indication of superiority and interiority in Europe and North America", and, consequently, "Muslims have been stereotyped in Europe and North America as terrorists, violent, barbarians, etc" (Grosfouel, 2016, p.11)

According to Van Dijk (1997b), racism and prejudice are seen from the perspective of white people within many forms of public discourse; "therefore, the role of discourse in the production of" these phenomena is distinct (p.32). Furthermore, it is pointed out "that discourse plays a significant role on both micro and macro levels, as well as in cognitive functions and interpersonal interactions" (p.33). As such, discourse may serve as a means of direct discrimination, for example, when white speakers or writers derogate minorities openly. Discourse also reflects "and influences social cognitions such as ethnic prejudice, resulting in "their acquisition, use, and reproduction in daily life" (p.33).

At the macro level, various genres or orders of discourse, such as those of politics and media, can be considered "the overall manifestations of organizations or institutions in the system of ethnic-racial relations and as expressing the shared ideologies of the dominant white group" (Van Dijk, 1997b, p.33). The aforementioned processes of reproduction are strongly influenced by the elite groups within the white dominant group. Not only do they possess preferential access to material social resources, but they also "possess preferential access to, and control over, various forms of public discourse." (p.33). Accordingly, politicians have an important role to play among such leading elites within "a complex process in the definition of the ethnic situation" (p.33).

### **3. METHODOLOGY**

The sample of this study includes four authenticated and historically recorded statements made by Churchill in four different spans of time with four different contexts. These statements are an expression of Churchill's personal viewpoints about the issues involved, as they are either personally told to another British political figure, or presented in a book of his authorship. Information about the context is provided for each statement.

The model adopted for the analysis is the DHA to CDA by Reisigl and Wodak (2001). The reason behind choosing this model particularly is that, through its framework, it, on the one hand, combines racism with politics within a historical dimension. On the other hand, it offers a set of linguistic strategies that can help reveal in detail the ideologies and biases in discourse (See section 3)

### **4. DATA ANALYSIS**

#### **Statement (1)**

*" I do not agree that the dog in a manger has the final right to the manger even though he may have lain there for a very long time. I do not admit that right. I do not admit, for instance, that a great wrong has been done to the Red Indians of America or the black people of Australia. I do not admit that a wrong has been done to these people by the fact that a stronger race, a higher-grade race, a more worldly-wise race has come in and taken their place." (Quoted in Martin, 1991, p.552).*

### **Context:**

The statement, which dates back to 12<sup>th</sup> March, 1937, was made by Winston Churchill, then a member of the British parliament. Through it, he was informing the Palestine Royal Commission (Lord Peel) about his opinion on a future conduction of the 1917 Balfour Declaration.

### **Analysis**

According to the model adopted, the following discursive strategies have been found to be used by Churchill:

1. **Nomination:** The discursive construction of the social actors, here the Arabs of Palestine, is established through the use of the metaphor "the dog in a manger". According to *the Cambridge Dictionary of English Language*, this idiomatic expression means "Someone who keeps something that they do not want in order to prevent someone else from getting it". So, for Churchill, the Arabs of Palestine basically do not need their land because they cannot make use of. And consequently, they do not have the right to prevent others, here the Jews, from taking it, even if they have lived in this land for a long time. The relationship between people and their land, for Churchill, is only constituted by the act of living in it, neglecting all other senses of belonging and patriotism.
2. **Predication:** These strategies are employed to manifest stereotypical evaluative attributions of both negative and positive characteristics through linguistic expressions, whether implicit or explicit. Their objective is to categorize social actors in a manner that is either favorable or unfavorable. Churchill makes explicit comparison between the case of Arabs of Palestine and those of the Red Indians of America and the black people of Australia. He, instead of giving negative evaluative attributions to these groups, labels their invaders and occupiers (the Europeans in general and the British in particular) positively through the use of adjectives "stronger", "higher-graded", and "more worldly-wise". These adjective are all used to modify one word "race", which is an explicit indication of Churchill's White Supremacy ideology. This is supported by the direct reference to the original people through using the adjectives "red" and "black". Churchill further implies that the invaders did wrong actions against the original people ("a *great* wrong"), still these actions, to him, are of no significance.
3. **Argumentation:** Churchill provides an argument through which he justifies the truth of his stance towards the Arabs of Palestine. This argument is made to refer to two other similar historical cases- those of red Indians and black people. The rightfulness of the argument that a 'better race' has the right to control the 'lower race', in Churchill's opinion, can give the moral justification to the Jews to take the land of the Arabs. It is worth noting that Churchill describes the Jews as "the most formidable and the most remarkable race."
4. **Perspectivization and framing:** Churchill's position in this piece of discourse is of total involvement. This is clear through the use of the negative declarative in all the four sentences comprising the discourse. The use of the pronoun "I" in the beginning of each sentence indicates that Churchill firmly believes in the

proposition each sentence conveys, i.e., he does not distance or disassociate himself from the core messages they carry.

### **Statement (2)**

*"The unnatural and increasingly rapid growth of the feeble-minded and insane classes, coupled with a steady restriction among all the thrifty, energetic and superior stocks, constitutes a national and race danger. I feel that the source from which the stream of madness is fed should be cut off and sealed up before another year has passed."* (Quoted in Martin, 1991, p.245).

### **Context**

This extract dates back to December, 1910, and is part of a letter written by Winston Churchill, then a member of the British parliament, to H. H. Asquith (A British politician who served as Prime Minister of the UK from 1908 to 1916). In the above statement, Churchill expressed his opinion about the financial support the British government had been providing to the mentally deficient people in the Kingdom, given that he was a firm believer in improving the British race: "The improvement of the British breed is my aim in life."

### **Analysis**

According to the model adopted, the following discursive strategies have been found to be used by Churchill:

1. **Nomination:** The discursive construction of the social actors, here the mentally deficient people in Britain, is established through the use of the noun "danger". This indicates that this group of people are identified as dangerous not only to the economy of Britain, but also to other classes in the British society. The use of metaphor "stream of madness" in identifying the social actors can also be considered as another way of nomination.
2. **Predication:** Churchill negatively labels the social actors in two ways:
  - A. By using negative attributes such as "feeble-minded", "insane", and the noun "madness".
  - B. By using positive attributes such as "thrifty", "energetic", and "superior" when referring to the other classes which, for Churchill, are economically affected by the British government's support of the social actors.
  - C. Churchill uses evocative words that can unconsciously arouse bad feelings or reactions on the part of the addressee towards the social actors, such as "unnatural", "increasingly rapid", "restriction", "danger", and "stream". This serves as an attempt from Churchill to persuade the Prime Minister about his idea.
3. **Argumentation:** Churchill provides an argument through which he justifies the truth of his stance towards mentally deficient people. This argument is built on the claim that the financial support provided by the government to a class of people

who cannot be effective and productive in the society negatively affects the financial status of the more productive and "superior" classes. The rightfulness of the argument that the 'better race' deserves to have the financial share of 'lower race', in Churchill's opinion, can give the moral justification to the British government to stop supporting the mentally deficient people, while supporting eugenics in which Churchill firmly believed in.

4. **Perspectivization and framing:** The use of temporal deictic expression "before another year has passed" indicates urgency, framing the issue as a dangerous crisis. Furthermore, Churchill's use of the direct assertion in "I feel that the source... should be cut off" reflects his personal commitment to his stance. On the other hand, the prosody in this statement is of alarming nature, which is indicated by the use of "unnatural," "increasingly rapid," and "danger". This can serve as a justification of consequent extreme measures to be taken about the issue.
5. **Intensification/Mitigation:** The use of the verb "feel" may, at the surface, indicate that the speaker wants to mitigate the illocutionary force of the sentence. Employing the phrasal verbs "cut off" and "sealed up" in the same sentence, however, contributes to intensifying its illocutionary force.

### Statement (3)

*"Civilization is confronted with militant Mahommedanism. The forces of progress clash with those of reaction. The religion of blood and war is face to face with that of peace. Luckily, the religion of peace is usually the better armed."* (Quoted in Martin, 1991, p. 109).

### Context

This extract is written in *"The Story of the Malakand Field Force: An Episode of Frontier War"*, an 1898 book authored by Winston Churchill, describing a military campaign by the British army on the North West Frontier (now western Pakistan and eastern Afghanistan) against the Pashtun tribes in 1897, in which he participated.

### Analysis

According to the model adopted, the following discursive strategies have been found to be used by Churchill:

1. **Nomination:** The discursive construction of the social actors, here the religion of Islam and Muslims, is established through the use of the term "Mahommedanism". This term has been used in Europe in the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries to refer to the followers of the Prophet Mohammed (PBUH), i.e., Muslims, in an unacceptable way for the Muslims themselves. This indicates that the teachings of Islam are the creation of its prophet, stripping it from its divinity character. Churchill further identifies Islam by the noun phrase "the religion of blood and war", to imply, according to his ideology, its violent nature. Furthermore, the use of the verbs "clash", and "confronted", and the adverb "face-to-face" denotes that Churchill explicitly sees a war between Islam and

- Christianity, instead of, considering the context, that between Britain and the Pashtun tribes.
2. **Predication:** Labeling Islam, Churchill uses negative traits like "militant", "blood", and "war". On the other hand, he associates Christianity with "civilization", "progress", and "peace". Additionally, portraying a military campaign between a state and rebellious tribes as a war between two religions may serve as an allusion to the historical Crusades. This can reveal Churchill's extreme Christian ideology.
  3. **Argumentation:** In order to justify his stance, Churchill employs a topos of threat "Civilization is confronted with militant Mahommedanism", positioning Islam as an extential threat to "civilization", i.e., Western/Christian dominance. On the other hand, "the forces of progress clash with those of reaction" serves as a binary opposition through which British colonialism is described as a force of progress, while Muslim resistance is described as a force of backwardness.
  4. **Perspectivization and framing:** The use of "civilization" vs. "militant Mohammedism" constitutes a spatial deixis, where the former represents "us" and the latter represents "them". Furthermore, the use of "the religion of blood and war" represents a metaphor that strips Islam not only from its Devine character, but also from its human nature, equating it absolutely with violence. The absence of mitigation and indirect assertion reflects Churchill's explicit stance towards the conflict, with the general frame of the religious war instead of that of the colonial war.

#### **Statement (4)**

*"I hate Indians. They are a beastly people with a beastly religion."* (Quoted in Panigrahi, 2004, p.92).

#### **Context**

This extract dates back to September, 1942 and is taken from a letter from Churchill, then the Prime Minister, to Leo S. Amery, the British Secretary of State for India during the Second World War, and particularly during the Quit India Movement led by Mahatma Gandhi (Panigrahi, 2004, pp.92-93).

#### **Analysis**

According to the model adopted, the following discursive strategies have been found to be used by Churchill:

1. **Nomination:** The discursive construction of the social actors is established through the use of the word "Indians". This word indicates generalization, as all the people of India, including Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs, are being identified to one certain group. Furthermore, Churchill's use of the phrase "beastly people" functions as a metaphor to describe the Indian people as animals, indicating savagery, barbarism, and lack of civilization. The phrase "beastly religion" also associates the religious traditions of Hinduism and Islam to savagery.

2. **Predication:** Churchill negatively labels the social actors -the Indians- by using the negative attribute "beastly". The repetition of this word serves as a hyperbole with the purpose of emphasizing his disgust. The word "beastly", on the one hand, indicates a characteristic of, or resembling an animal, i.e., subhuman. On the other hand, it is associated with brutality, cruelty, and crudeness (n. a., 2006, p.94). These two connotations highlight Churchill's evaluation of the Indian people and their religions in a demonizing manner. Moreover, the explicit use of the verb "hate" signals Churchill's absolute sense of disdain towards the social actors.
3. **Argumentation:** Churchill provides two types of argument through which he justifies the truth of his stance towards the Indians. The first is the implicit argument which is achieved through employing the topos of threat, i.e., since Indians are inherently "beastly", so they, certainly and absolutely, cannot govern themselves. This implicit argument serves as a justification by Churchill for continuing the British colonization on India. The second type of argument is the explicit one in which Churchill says: "I hate Indians". The emotive tone here, unlike that of logic in the first argument, is an attempt to address the common sense of prejudice among the British elite.
4. **Perspectivization and framing:** Churchill's position in this piece of discourse is of total involvement. This is evident from his use of the pronoun "I" which foregrounds his total subjectivity, rejecting diplomatic distancing, and stressing his authority as a statesman. The use of the direct speech, leaving no space for vagueness or ambiguity, also indicates Churchill's involvement. Additionally, the absence of using mitigations tools like hedging, intensifiers and downtoners highlights the solidity of Churchill's claim and stance.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

Through the analysis of the selected data according to the model adopted, the following conclusions have been drawn:

1. Churchill's discourse is not only indicative of individual bias but is deeply rooted in colonial and white supremacist beliefs. His language clearly establishes racial hierarchies, depicting non-white and marginalized communities as inferior, threatening, or at least undeserving of independence.
2. Churchill's use of metaphor is seen as a strategy for dehumanizing the other. So, labeling Palestinians as "the dog in a manger," the characterization of Indians as "beastly," and the depiction of Islam as "the religion of blood and war" show how Churchill employs linguistic othering to justify British imperialism.
3. Nomination and Predication are essential in Churchill's racist discourse. By labeling groups in derogatory terms like "feeble-minded", "insane", and "beastly", he reinforces stereotypes that legitimize extreme and eliminatory policies, such as eugenics against mentally disabled British people or violent suppression of Indian independence movements.
4. The argumentation strategies Churchill uses rely on topoi of threat and superiority, where he frames colonialism as a "natural" outcome of racial dominance, such as "a stronger race", and "a higher-grade race". This clearly

- illustrates Churchill's supremacist and colonialist ideologies that portray the British rule as both inevitable and morally justified.
5. Unlike diplomatic discourse in which hedging or euphemisms are often employed, Churchill's statements explicitly reflect racism and are devoid of mitigation. His use of direct declarations "I hate Indians" and absolute negations "I do not admit that a wrong has been done..." indicates an unyielding commitment to racial hierarchies. This lack of mitigation reveals that Churchill's racism was a deliberate ideological stance, reinforced by his political authority.
  6. Churchill's statements cannot be separated from the broader colonial and imperialist context of British rule. His discourse is a reflection of the general European views of the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, as racial superiority was part and parcel of imperial policy.

## References

1. **Aydınay, G., and Yıldız, F.** (2021). A historical view to the concept of racism. *Atlas Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 1(8), 1–12.
2. **Beard, A.** (2000). *The language of politics*. London, England: Routledge.
3. **Bowser, B. P.** (2017). Racism: Origin and theory. *Journal of Black Studies*, 48(6), 572–590. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934717702135>
4. **Chilton, P., and Schäffner, C.** (2002). Introduction: Themes and principles in the analysis of political discourse. In P. Chilton and C. Schäffner (Eds.), *Politics as text and talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse* (pp. 1–44). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
5. **Crystal, D.** (1995). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
6. **DiAngelo, R.** (2016). What is racism? *Counterpoints*, 497, 107–124.
7. **Fairclough, N.** (1989). *Language and power*. London, England: Longman Group Ltd.
8. **Fairclough, N., and Wodak, R.** (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258–284). London, England: SAGE Publications Ltd.
9. **Gilbert, M.** (1991). *Churchill: A life*. New York, NY: Henry Holt.
10. **Grosfoguel, R.** (2016). What is racism? In *Journal of World-Systems Research*, 22 (1), 9–15. <https://doi.org/10.5195/jwsr.2016.609>
11. **Merriam-Webster.** (n.d.). *Politics*. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/dictionary/politics>
12. **Jenkins, R.** (2001). *Churchill*. London, England: Macmillan.
13. **Krzyżanowski, M.** (2010). *The discursive construction of European identities: A multi-level approach to discourse and identity in the transforming European Union*. Frankfurt, Germany: Peter Lang.
14. **Moloney, R.** (2025). Critical interculturality in the Australian school classroom. In F. Dervin (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of critical interculturality in communication and education* (pp.392-406). New York, USA: Routledge.

15. **Oxford University Press.** (2006). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary* (6th ed.). Oxford, England: Author.
16. **Newmark, P.** (1986). The translation of political language. In *Dimensioni linguistiche e distanze culturali nell'interazione sociale e politica*, Atti del *Convegno, Trieste*, 28-29, (pp. 43–64). Trieste, Italy: EUT Edizioni Università di Trieste.
17. **Oliver, M.** (1994). *Politics and language: Understanding the disability discourse* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Sheffield, England. Retrieved from <https://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/40/library/Oliver-pol-and-lang-94.pdf>
18. **Panigrahi, D. N.** (2004). *India's partition: The story of imperialism in retreat*. London, England: Routledge.
19. **Reisigl, M., and Wodak, R.** (2001). *Discourse and discrimination*. London, England: Routledge.
20. **Reisigl, M., and Wodak, R.** (2009). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods for critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 87–121). London, England: SAGE Publications.
21. **Spolsky, B.** (1998). *Sociolinguistics*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
22. **Van Dijk, T. A.** (2015a). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Tannen, H. Hamilton, and D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 466–485). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
23. **Van Dijk, T. A.** (2015b). Critical discourse studies: A sociocognitive approach. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd ed., pp. 63–85). London, England: SAGE Publications.
24. **Van Dijk, T. A.** (2002). Political discourse and political cognition. In P. Chilton and C. Schäffner (Eds.), *Politics as text and talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse* (pp. 203–237). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company. (Original work published 1997)
25. **Van Dijk, T. A.** (1997). Political discourse and racism: Describing others in Western parliaments. In S. H. Riggins (Ed.), *The language and politics of exclusion: Others in discourse* (pp. 31–64). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
26. **Wodak, R.** (2001). What CDA is about: A summary of its history, important concepts, and its developments. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1–13). London, England: SAGE Publications.
27. **Wodak, R.** (2015). The ideological function of discursive strategies: The politics of fear. In *The politics of fear: What right-wing populist discourses mean* (pp. 45–70). London, England: SAGE Publications.