The Diverse and Dynamic World of 'Us' and 'Them' in Political Discourse

VICTORIA WIRTH-KOLIBA

University of Lodz

wiki192@gmail.com

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to present the diversity and dynamics of interpersonal relationships represented in political discourse. In almost every political activity there is the opposition camp ('them'), as well as that of the allies ('us'), as a result of which relations of inclusion and exclusion are invariably present. The present study deals with 'us' and 'them' constructions from a pragma-cognitive perspective. The means by which these relations are structured depend on the speaker's intentions in the discourse, which in turn determine the way the 'us' and 'them' are presented. What is more, relationships of inclusion and exclusion within a single discursive event are dynamic and prone to alternations, since motives behind and implications of particular fragments which constitute the discursive event as a whole, may vary. All this will be exemplified on the basis of selected fragments of a speech delivered by Nick Griffin (available at http://www.liveleak.com/view?i=b9e_1272829239).

Key words: 'us and them', political discourse, clusivity, ideological square, common ground, proximization, Nick Griffin, British National Party.

1. 'Us' and 'Them' in Political Discourse

The domain of politics is an endless source of various human interactions manifested through language. In almost every political activity there is the opposition camp ('them'), as well as that of the allies ('us'), which results from politics being concerned with a struggle for power and dominance (see Chilton 2004, Okulska and Cap 2010). The 'us' and 'them' opposition is indispensable for the concept of power and dominance to exist: one having power entails another person's lack of it. Someone's superiority and dominance over others implies the latter's inferiority, thus the 'us' and 'them' polarization is clearly visible. Irrespective of the fact that the domain of politics is a broad social world rich in various actions, events, goals, etc., power and dominance are the primary aspects establishing and maintaining a more or less legitimate and stable hierarchy in the political sphere.

The aim of this paper is to present the diversity and dynamics of linguistic means found in the 'us' and 'them' structuring of the political world. Various political events require different inclusionary and exclusionary strategies to successfully and appropriately establish and maintain relations of inclusion and exclusion, and in turn to enable a political actor to exert dominance over

others and gain power. Another reason for a magnitude of 'inclusive' and 'exclusive' linguistic strategies are the dynamics of single political events which entail alternations of the 'us' and 'them' polarization. Within a single instance of political discourse, the function and context may be prone to changes, since the domain of politics is an endless source of various human interactions, and interaction, by definition, is reciprocal (Schiffrin 2006). Reciprocity is concerned with prior utterances being implicative for those succeeding. In other words, what is said manages and influences further utterances as well as their functions, and this seems to be the basis for the dynamics of political discourse.

All this will be exemplified on the basis of excerpts taken from a speech delivered by Nick Griffin, the then leader of the British National Party, entitled, *Emotional speech by Nick Griffin on the Lib/Lab/CON/UKIP warmonger*, released to the public in 2010 on a number of video sharing websites. Research made into the speech's background, critique and potential impact on the British society has been rather unproductive. The only commentary of this particular speech accessible to the public comes from internet user comments, which are small in number and contradictive in nature. The speech can, however, be conceived of as one of the many attempts on the part of the BNP to expand its electorate, thus enhancing its potential for development indispensable in gaining enough political power to fulfill its objectives and goals. The British National Party has been acting in a controversial anti-immigration manner since the very beginning of its existence (Richardson 2013). According to the party, the greatest threat posed to the country are immigrants, as well as the British Parliament which, according to the BNP, does little to find a remedy to the problems caused by massive immigration. Whether or not this particular performance has had a significant impact on the BNP, the fact that the party under Griffin's lead was bound to meet with modest, if any, success, and that he was the cause of its major downfall in 2014, is irrefutable, as indicated on the National Front website:

> Had it have not been for Griffin and his deliberate wrecking of the BNP, the British National Party would have people in Parliament and of course MEPs in the European Parliament. The British people would have a genuine voice in the halls of power against Fanatical Islam and mass Muslim immigration, and against money power and the European Union (Bryan 2014).

Support for the BNP has dwindled from 6.1% to a 1.9% since 2009 (Godfrey 2014). Another factor responsible for the difficult situation of the BNP was, and still is, the strengthening of the UK Independent Party, UKIP, which, similarly to the BNP, concerns itself primarily with independence from the European Union, patriotism and limiting the flow of immigrants into the United Kingdom. The UKIP, however, is believed to be less controversial and a 'polite alternative to the BNP' (Fielding 2011). On July 21st, 2014, Griffin was replaced as the BNP leader by Adam Walker, who so far seems to be as alike the former leader as possible.

As far as the methodology of the analysis is concerned, the speech is investigated from the Critical Discourse Analysis perspective. Moreover, since CDA is primarily 'a problem-oriented interdisciplinary research program' (Wodak 2013: 21) and focuses on particular aspects of the social world, the

present study will orient itself towards the issue of political polarization. It will research the various ways in which the speaker establishes and maintains the 'us' and 'them' camps in chosen excerpts, what impact prior realizations have on succeeding ones, and what their objectives in the overall goal behind the delivery of the speech are. Social inequality and relations of power and dominance in connection with 'us' and 'them' will be investigated, since these are key aspects for all CDA theories and approaches (see Van Dijk 1993; Wodak 2007, 2008, 2013). These notions will be analyzed based on dichotomies such as the BNP vs. the British Parliament, and the British vs. the immigrants.

The analysis itself is pragma-cognitive in nature due to the tendency of CDA to concentrate in more detail on the complexity of various social phenomena rather than on prioritizing or putting focus solely on linguistic properties of the analyzed discourse (see Brokensha 2011, Kopytowska 2012; Wodak 2008, 2013). What is more, the need of a pragma-cognitive dimension of analysis also results from the notion of clusivity, which is the foundation of the 'us' and 'them' polarization in political discourse, and the leitmotiv of the present research. The traditional understanding and definition of clusivity as inclusion and exclusion associated with the first person plural 'we' is problematic as far as English is concerned, since the English language does not differentiate between a grammatically inclusive and exclusive personal pronoun (Wieczorek 2009, 2013). As a result, a pragma-cognitive perspective on 'us' and 'them' must be taken into account in order to analyze clusivity-related discourse in an appropriate and successful manner. Among such means of both pragmatic and cognitive nature used to mark clusivity are proximization (see Cap 2008, 2010ab, 2012, 2013), the ideological square (see Van Dijk 1993, 1997) and common ground (see Clark 1996, Lemke 1995, Van Dijk 2002, Wieczorek 2013), all of which will be dealt with in section 2, preceded by a brief introduction on clusivity itself and a few concepts indispensable in investigating the topic.

2. Pragma-Cognitive Means of Marking Clusivity in Political Discourse

Generally speaking, clusivity is concerned with various means and aspects of inclusion and exclusion manifested in discourse linguistically (Wieczorek 2013), where traditionally the terms 'inclusive' and 'exclusive' were used to denote a type of personal pronoun: 'an exclusive personal pronoun meaning "we", i.e. I and somebody else other than the addressee [...] an inclusive personal pronoun meaning "we", i.e. I and the addressee' (Hartmann and Stork 1972: 168). This is to say that '[i]nitially, clusivity was defined narrowly as inclusion and exclusion marked in the first person plural, i.e. inclusive "we" expressing belongingness and exclusive "we" expressing lack of belongingness or rejection' (Wieczorek 2009: 118). This perception of clusivity, however, seems to be somewhat problematic, since researchers investigating the subject claim that not all languages, including English, possess such a pronoun dichotomy, although many of them do mark clusivity. It is crucial to bear in mind that clusivity in discourse is not limited to the grammatically inclusive or exclusive first person plural and other personal pronouns. In English, the use

of pronouns in discourse ought to be analyzed on a pragmatic and cognitive level to successfully uncover relations of inclusion and exclusion present in the analyzed discourse.

In a discussion of clusivity marking, it is indispensable to introduce the concept of the deictic center. In order to investigate bipolar relations one must have a reference point with respect to which relations of inclusion and exclusion can be identified, and the deictic center serves as such a reference point. The deictic center is defined as the 'anchoring point that utterers and interpreters construct or impose during verbal interaction' (Chilton 2004: 56) and is concerned with 'two conceptualization schemata: that of a container, having its elements inside, outside and near the borderline and that of the centre-periphery, with elements being manoeuvred inwards and outwards' (Wieczorek 2009: 120). The discursive positioning of interlocutors in a given communicative event takes place within and outside the deictic center. Entities may be located at the core of the deictic center, i.e. occupy the central, thus the most significant position, within the center but not at its very core, outside the center or on the boundary in between. All these possible positions in the deictic center indicate that inclusion and exclusion is a dynamic construct and is characterized by degrees of (non)belongingness.

2.1 Proximization

Proximization is a discursive strategy originally used to explain the process of political legitimization (Cap 2008, 2010ab, 2012, 2013). It can be defined as 'a pragmatic-cognitive strategy that relies upon the speaker's ability to present events on the discourse stage as directly affecting the addressees, usually in a negative or a threatening way' (Cap 2010a: 119). These threatening events are to be dealt with, and the interventionist preventive means of doing so are legitimized by proximization (Cap 2012; Wieczorek 2008a, 2008b). Proximization consists of three aspects which link together participants of the discursive event situated inside the deictic center. These participating entities are as follows: the speaker and the addressee, who constitute the inside-the-deictic-center entities (IDCs), and the adversaries, who constitute the outside-the-deictic-centre entities (ODs) (Cap 2010ab). Cap (2008, 2010ab, 2012, 2013) distinguishes three basic aspects of proximization which form the STA model: spatial, temporal and axiological. The spatial aspect of the STA model is involved in the discursive construction of the events touched upon in the discourse. These events are presupposed to be physically dangerous for the entities inside the deictic center. The temporal aspect stresses the importance of the events presented in the discourse. It attempts to draw the audience's attention to the presented issue as being of central significance to both the speaker and the addressee, and needing immediate response. The axiological aspect indicates the ideological clashes between the insiders and outsiders of the deictic center, and any other necessary ground for potential conflict.

This three-level structure of proximization is dynamic. The pattern is prone to alternations depending on, among others, the analyzed discourse itself. However, in order for proximization to be successful, there must be overall balance in its structuring: if one aspect of the threefold structure is downplayed, the salience of another aspect must be increased so as to strike

the right balance between the constituents of proximization (Cap 2010ab, 2012).

The following excerpt, which opens Nick Griffin's speech, is an example of proximization:

> [1] It's their way of saying: "We're here, we're outbreeding you, your government is paying us to take over, and we are gonna fly the black flag of Islam over your number 10 Downing Street. We're gonna run your country".

The speaker constructs the discourse space as a chain of chronological and threatening events which are explicitly situated on all three axes of the STA model. As Cap (2010a) claims, proximization presents distant events as having a negative impact on the speaker and his audience. The temporal dimension of proximity refers to the present and the future. At the present (the time of the delivery of the speech), the immigrants are significantly and rapidly growing in number: they are moving closer to the speaker and his audience. Their enclosing on the speaker and his addressees reduces the physical distance between the two groups: spatial proximity. The verb 'to outbreed' in reference to human beings invokes strongly negative associations with animals. By choosing this verb, Griffin presents his superior attitude towards the immigrants, and indicates that they are worse than him and the British nation and are to some extent primitive and animal-like. Such a representation of foreigners is frequent in racist discourse (Reisigl and Wodak 2001) and is an indication of axiological proximization. There are other words/phrases used by the speaker which invoke negative associations, such as 'to take over' or 'to run your country'.

The next step in the temporal chain of events is something that will happen in the future: the immigrants are going to conquer and take over the country. The speaker constructs this event in terms of a war between the British and the immigrants, with the latter being victorious. Number 10 Downing Street has been used as a metonymy for the British government, which immigrants may gain control over by 'fly[ing] the black flag of Islam'. The metaphor of the black flag of Islam being flown over the PM Office has a symbolic meaning: flags are associated with identity, union, a symbol that distinguishes 'us' from 'them'. The action of flying the flag over an object indicates winning (a battle, war, etc.). In the context of the threatening events represented by the speaker, the negative impact of the massive Muslim immigration is seen as unstoppable, leading to the immigrants conquering Britain: they are 'aggressive and criminal' like any foreigner (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 55). The enemy, though still inferior and dominated by the native British, will struggle against the British superiority, and will eventually become the superior nation. The speaker uses the political strategy of proximization: he presents a threatening event which has to be dealt with. Precautionary steps must be taken immediately (Cap 2010ab). Griffin and his fellow-citizens ('us') are in conflict with and threatened by the immigrants ('them'). He structures these polarized relations in an explicit way, grounding his construction on the concept of racism. There is, however, an element of surprise, namely that the British government is paying the immigrants to take over. This implies that the structure of the discourse space differs from the usual distinction between entirely belonging either to the opposition or to the allies. Although 'us' is

inclusive of the government, government politicians are diverging 'us' members.

2.2 Degrees of Clusivity

The positioning of discursive entities in a given communicative event through discourse takes place within and outside the deictic center. Entities may be positioned at the core of the deictic center, occupying the central, thus the most significant position, within the center but not at its very core, outside the center or on the boundary in between. The inclusionary and exclusionary status of a specific entity is not assumed in an automatic way, but it is rather dynamic and prone to change (Kopytowska 2012). These statuses are acquired as the result of processes in which one moves either to the core of the deictic center or to its peripheral areas. Entities within the deictic center, positioned near the core or moving away from it are those included as long as they do not move outside the peripheral areas. Once beyond this boundary, one is excluded (Wieczorek 2013). Levine divides the process of movement within the deictic center (group membership) into different phases which determine one's inclusion or exclusion (Wieczorek 2013 after Levine 2005). Degrees of clusivity, i.e. belonging and non-belonging, are results of these membership movements: '[s]ome in-group members take more peripheral while others more central positions in the group' (Wieczorek 2013: 21). The movement is not, of course, one-directional: one who has gained membership may be a potential candidate for exclusion in the future, and respectively, one who does not belong to a group may become a member, or reclaim his inclusionary status if one had once lost it (Wieczorek 2013). The following extract is the transition point of Griffin's speech where the clearly racist dimension shifts towards that of nationalism aimed at an open attack not on the immigrants, but on the British government, and other powerful institutions:

> [2] But we're gonna deal with that not by taking on the Muslims, because they just do what they do. You can't blame them for coming here and taking our taxes, and having lots of kids at our expense. It's the politicians who've let them into this country [...] The people who should be talking about it are our politicians, our court masters, and they don't.

Naturally, the speaker does not ignore or omit the problems connected with massive immigration in Britain. He does, however, direct his attention mainly towards those who could solve the problem, those who are in the position to do so, but neglect it. Griffin himself is a politician, but he does not identify himself with the politicians he talks about in his speech. When he says 'It's the politicians who've let them into this country' he refers to two types of 'them': the politicians in opposition to him, as well as the immigrants. As a result, the speaker and the BNP, their electorate and all those against the government's immigration policies are situated inside the deictic center, whereas the government and the immigrants are placed outside the deictic center.

There is, however, a seemingly non-influential linguistic element that questions such a structuring of the deictic center: the possessive pronoun 'our'. The speaker excludes the opposition politicians from the group to which he himself belongs along with his audience, but not in a radical manner. The possessive 'our' is to some extent inclusive of the government both from the

speaker's and his addressees' perspective. This is concerned with degrees of clusivity; some entities are:

> partners (with in-group reference and "us" status), adversaries (with out-group reference and "them" status), as well as potential partners and potential adversaries (referred to both inclusively and exclusively at different stages of the development of a particular discourse situation) (Wieczorek 2010: 232).

Since politics is about cooperation and interaction, Griffin's use of the possessive 'our' includes his adversaries so as to leave ground for potential cooperation. As has been mentioned at the beginning of this section, statuses of inclusion and exclusion are not fixed and stable.

2.3 The Ideological Square

All linguistic devices and strategies discussed in the previous subsections of this paper rely on Van Dijk's ideological square, which bears relevance to clusivity marking. The principles of the ideological square are simple and straightforward: politicians tend to emphasize positive aspects about 'us', and emphasize negative aspects about 'them'(Van Dijk 1993, 1997). The reason for such a structuring of this concept is that political discourse is primarily concerned with the struggle for dominance and power, which leads to inequality, and the ideological square is a means by which it can be legitimized (Van Dijk 1993). Political speakers also use positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation to their advantage so as to gain support and win elections, carry out successful propaganda, etc. In political campaigns for instance, the speakers will emphasize their positive traits or actions so as to create a positive, likeable and trustworthy image of themselves. And respectively, the speakers will emphasize negative things about their opponents in order to enhance the speakers' odds at winning, and diminish their rivals' chances of victory. In sum, the ideological square is concerned with presenting oneself as 'the better one'.

In the excerpts analyzed so far, there were no instances of the speaker's attempts at positive self-presentation, the speaker rather focused on negative other-presentations. This, however, does not mean that no self-presentation appears in the speech, as will be seen in excerpt [4]. For self-presentation to be successful, prior negative other-presentations are vital and indispensable in establishing and maintaining a positive image of oneself. The ideological square is based on oppositions: 'we' are trustworthy, credible, and the good ones, whereas 'they' are deceptive, unreliable, and the bad ones. One's positive self-presentation persuasiveness increases by juxtaposing oneself with the negative traits of 'the other'. Shifting focus after the brief digression above back to the excerpts analyzed so far, the only occurrence of self-reference has been in excerpt [2]: 'we're gonna deal with that', a fairly short utterance whose meaning is crucial: 'we' (the speaker and the BNP) will find a remedy to the problem of immigration, while those responsible for the threatening situation neglect their duties and avoid taking responsibility for their actions. 'We' are active, we want to find a remedy, whereas 'they' (other politicians) are paradoxically presented as passive and active at the same time. They are passive when it comes to dealing with the immigrants, and they are active in making the situation worse by giving more and more rights and freedom to

the foreigners. In political discourse, the state of passiveness in a threatening situation is regarded as a negative stance (Capdevila and Callaghan 2008), thus passive structures in reference to one's opposition are often used to construct the negative image of 'the other'. Griffin emphasizes the modal verb 'should' in order to stress the government's obligations and duties, and the aforementioned fragment of his speech primarily communicates 'they should, but they don't'.

Similarly, excerpt [3] establishes a negative image of the government and facilitates the speaker's attainment of the main goal of his speech, namely that of winning people over, enlarging the BNP's electorate, and presenting it and the speaker as the best political option for Britain:

> [3] But you know that in Manchester, in the recent Iraqi elections they set up polling stations so that refugees, though in the case of Iraq - war is over. Why don't they all go back? But they set up polling stations so that they can vote in our cities in their elections. And the utter scandal about Afghanistan isn't just the bodies and the broken bodies, and the boys coming home legless, armless, eyeless [...] The really awful scandal is the fact that the government is so organized on post-war balance system that the boys and girls fighting supposedly for this country, fighting our cause in Afghanistan are not gonna be allowed to vote in our election.

In this extract, the speaker touches upon a significantly nationalist-sensitive issue: elections and the right to vote. According to Griffin, the British government encourages immigrants to stay in the UK by giving them the opportunity to vote in their elections. Instead of going back home and helping rebuilt their own counties they stay in Britain, 'take advantage of "our" [British] generosity' (Richardson 2013: 194) and pose grave threats to the British nation. Griffin ends this section of his speech with an emotional comment on the fact that those fighting the questionable British cause in Afghanistan and Iraq do not have the same opportunities to cast their votes as the immigrants do, therefore, 'foreigners are always privileged in comparison with "us" ' (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 55). Griffin intensifies the images of the reality of war so as to highlight this unacceptable state of affairs. He claims that the brutal and bloody world of war is not the worst part, but the fact that 'they can' vote and 'we cannot'. From the perspective of morality and ethics, such a claim seems to be wrong. Griffin, however, constructs his speech in such a way as to introduce necessary and indispensable argumentation, manipulative and persuasive enough for his audience to accept this otherwise controversial statement. He uses the political function of coercion with a view to winning the audience's support. The speech event is constructed the same way as in the previous fragments, and the emphasis is put on the immigrants and the British government.

In the following excerpt, the speaker's attention shifts towards the BNP party and himself, as well as their legitimate attempts to 'ask' for support in 'repairing' the poor situation in Britain brought about by the country's immigration policies and the future immigrant-supremacy threat that the UK faces:

> [4] We need support, we need power to change these things, to right these wrongs. We're not here to argue against massive immigration to make ourselves popular. We've spent years arguing against it, arguing against it for our people and our country, because we believe it's right. We here by

> principle, and in principle do not believe it is right that those single British mothers, or aunts, or girlfriends, or sisters should have to cry tears through a lost boy at 18 or 19 in a war that's got nothing but sorrow to do with us.

It is this extract where positive self-presentation is found for the first time in the speech, through which the true purpose behind the speech is exposed: to win support and to create a positive self-image of a good, trustworthy, reliable, competent, etc. candidate, who would be capable and willing to change the situation in Britain. Griffin uses the previous excerpts, which lack positive self-presentation, more precisely [1] and [2], to stress the threatening situation that the British society faces, and to identify himself and his party with the addressees, using the conceptual metaphor immigration is a disease, as in 'foreigners are bearers of infectious diseases' (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 54). This metaphor is realized in excerpt [1] by phrases such as 'we're outbreeding', which may be associated with a highly contagious disease as an unstoppable process, and 'we are gonna take over', as if the human body was taken over by a disease. In excerpt [2], one will find phrases such as 'taking our taxes, having lots of kids at our expense', which imply a loss on part of the British society, and a morally illegitimate gain as far as the immigrants are concerned. As a final remark on this metaphor in this speech, the United Kingdom (the body) is impoverished and deprived of both psychological and material means, for which massive immigration (the disease) is to be blamed.

Griffin also gives examples to ground the belief that massive immigration is a threat to Britain, as well as attacks those currently in power for their inability to find a remedy to the problem. He thus reaches out to those dissatisfied with the current state of affairs in the country in an attempt to conduct a successful political campaign praising British nationalism/patriotism. In excerpt [4], the deictic center consists of 'us' exclusive of the addressees, denoting solely the speaker and his political party. According to Chilton (2004), power resources are not equally distributed in society. The British National Party have enough power at hand to act in a legitimate way, but they need more in order to be more effective in their political actions. This is the reason why all instances of the 'us' pronoun in the fragment in question ought to be treated as exclusive. Moreover, Griffin's audience does not possess the power to act from a politically constitutive level. This, however, does not mean that they are powerless: they do interact with the speaker regardless of whether they agree with him and are likely to vote for him and his party, or not. Although no explicit opposition is found in the fragment above, the speaker uses the third person singular pronoun 'it' which constitutes a metonymic reference to the third person plural 'them': 'We've spent years arguing against it […] arguing against it for our people and our country'. The pronoun indicates the problems and dangers caused by immigration and indirectly by the British government, to which the BNP is in opposition.

2.4 Common Ground

The act of claiming common ground is used to strengthen interpersonal relationships (Wieczorek 2013). It is a clusivity marker, and is therefore used to establish and maintain the 'us' and 'them' opposition in political discourse. In his work, Van Dijk claims that common ground is 'the foundation of all cognition, across and between different groups, and this is also presupposed

by different ideologies' and encompasses 'the general norms and values shared by the members of a culture' (2002: 2). With respect to these two definitions, the concept of common ground can be interpreted on two levels: as a set of general and universal beliefs/values which enable communication and cooperation between members of different groups, and as a set of such beliefs and values but among members of a single group, body, culture, etc. Irrespective of these two levels of interpretation, common ground is invariably a means of both 'including' and 'excluding'.

Among common ground mechanisms one will find mental and context models. The former are concerned with personal representations of events witnessed, experienced or heard of and involve interpretations and evaluations of a particular event, whereas the latter deal with interpretations of the formal aspects of the communicative event itself and control discourse (Lemke 1995, Van Dijk 2002). With regards to the 'us' and 'them' polarization in political discourse, mental models of common ground are more useful in establishing and maintaining relations of inclusion and exclusion, since it is the beliefs, information, values and assumptions people share that are conducive to claiming common ground (Wieczorek 2013). Mental models can be associated with two types of common grounds proposed by Clark (1996): the communal and personal common ground. The former is concerned with 'information based on a person's belongingness to a particular community, such as nationality, ethnicity, gender, occupation, etc.', whereas the latter 'with information based on personal associations with people they accept, like, approve of, befriend, etc.' (Wieczorek 2013: 51).

Griffin organizes his speech in an orderly way, and presents chronological events that give him the ground necessary for further legitimized accusations of the British government, and anti-immigrant expressions directed at Iraqi and Afghan refugees. He makes use of numerous mental models associated with the British society's repulsion towards war and dissatisfaction with the current situation in the country. Positive/negative self/other-presentations are visible most of the time, as well as the 'us' and 'them' polarization. These linguistic actions create a bond between him and his audience, establish and strengthen the common ground between them, create and maintain strong relations of inclusion and exclusion. In retrospect, in excerpt [2] and [3], Griffin takes advantage of his personal outlook on who is to be blamed for the crimes of immigrants in the United Kingdom and the horrors of war, but at the same time he counts on his audience sharing his point of view. Griffin, whilst exposing his personal beliefs, which can most likely be labeled as personal for many British citizens, claims common ground with his audience and combines the personal with the communal, since polarization and common ground is all about constituting a 'form of self and other awareness' (Wieczorek 2013: 51). All excerpts analyzed so far are more or less oriented towards claiming common ground, and provide the speaker with ground indispensable in his encouraging the audience to vote for the BNP. The following fragments address the issue of the British contribution to the war in Iraq and Afghanistan, to which the majority of the British nation opposed, as did Griffin himself. The excerpts are expressions of his strong stance against the United Kingdom's involvement in those military operations:

> [5] It's about building a pipeline from Tajikistan, through Afghanistan, through Pakistan, to India. Because the Americans want it, people of all

America want it. Because, otherwise, the gas has to go through Russia, and they don't want that [...] People all over America want to use our boys, our soldiers, in an endless bloody war so that they can build this pipeline through Afghanistan.

[6] There's no mission for us there. We simply shouldn't be there, we don't need to be there. We're there because people all over America want it, so do oil companies, banks [...] What influence have they got on British politics?

The initial rationale behind the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan presented by the government was 'war against terror', which became an important policy of many countries, especially the United States of America, after the World Trade Center tragedy in 2001 (Chovanec 2010). This justification of war appealed to one's negative face, i.e. the public image responsible for the need for independence, safety, etc. (see Brown and Levinson 1987, Wieczorek 2013, Yule 1996), since 'war' is a threat and an umbrella term for many socially destructive phenomena. When those responsible for the attacks were caught or eliminated, instead of ending war, the invaders, in order to legitimize further military action, presented a different motive, namely that of the Iraqi/Afghan alleged possession of nuclear weapons (Cap 2010a). The vast majority of British citizens were against the course of action taken by the government, thus despite being one nation and sharing communal common ground, the two groups diverged and obtained adverse mental models and were not connected by means of personal common ground. A similar stance to the one taken by the British society towards the British contribution to war was the speaker's and the BNP's, who were among those against the British involvement in the so called 'war against terror', which Griffin represents in his speech as a war for wealth. Throughout his performance, he repeatedly points out that those wars 'have nothing to do with us, there's no mission for us there'. Excerpt [7] elaborates on and reveals further identities of 'them': America, oil companies, banks, etc. They manipulate and use British soldiers to fight their personal wars. The speaker implies that politicians who voted for UK's involvement in the war would personally benefit from it. Griffin, again, touches upon sensitive issues: political corruption, greediness, manipulation, as a result of which the country is undergoing a constant process of downfall and ordinary citizens are represented as victims. By doing so, he claims common ground with his audience. He indicates that he is on their side, supports the everyday citizen who experiences the impact war has on the economic and social situation of the United Kingdom. He appeals to both the positive and negative face of his audience: both to the desire to belong to a group and be understood, as well as to the will to be independent and free. The former is concerned with 'us' being a group whose rights and needs have been neglected and violated, and a group that has been used and manipulated. The latter is concerned with the greediness of those in power which puts ordinary citizens under a lot of strain and deprives them of safety, stability and means necessary to live a satisfactory life.

The following excerpt is an obvious form of political propaganda aimed at positive self-presentation, and an attempt at strengthening the already claimed common ground between the speaker and his audience by presenting the audience as having the power to take matters into their own hands and being capable of making a difference:

[7] We shall have to do something about it [...] Even the people who don't vote for us will come to understand that the British National Party isn't just opposed to immigration [...] We have other streams to oppose [...] war and those who are in favor of it. We are gonna stand up and say we are against it.

The speaker believes that people will come to realize the importance of change, and the BNP's capability of curing the situation in the country. The first person plural pronoun 'we' can be perceived as both inclusive and exclusive of the addressees. In the phrase 'the people who don't vote for us', 'us' suggests the latter: the verb 'vote' takes an object that refers to the BNP party itself, and undoubtedly excludes the audience. On the other hand, the audience is capable of standing up to and showing its opposition towards the British government. This can be done precisely by voting for Griffin and his party in elections, etc. An inclusive perception of 'we', however, is more plausible if an opposite stance towards the government is presented as a future event. This mechanism establishes unity with the audience: 'I' (the speaker) attempt to raise the awareness of the British nation to the threats it faces; if successful, the 'we' inclusive of the addressees can counteract the unwanted future event, since the BNP with the support of its electorate can introduce changes to the policies of the British government. The speaker attempts to win the support of more people, thus uses strategies and devices that would boost the audience's confidence and imply that they possess some power to improve their own future, and the future of their country.

2.5 The Construction of 'Us' and 'Them'

The speech analyzed in this article is very dynamic with respect to the way the 'us' vs. 'them' relationship is constructed. The analysis of particular excerpts of the speech shows that the structure of the deictic center alters and is prone to different pragma-cognitive realizations, depending on the content of particular fragments, the objectives they have, as well as on the overall goals behind the delivery of the speech as a whole, which has a significant impact on the structuring and meanings of particular excerpts. As a result, clusivity is marked by means of various pragma-cognitive devices, and the degrees of clusivity are dynamic. The following paragraphs will briefly summarize how the deictic center is constructed in every excerpt which has been analyzed in section 2. However, the summary will not include the pragma-cognitive means used in the structuring of the deictic center in particular excerpts.

In excerpt [1], the 'us' is inclusive of the speaker, the BNP, the British nation, and the audience; the 'them' is comprised of the immigrants, the Iraqis and Afghans. The 'us' are entities in the deictic center and are dominant, but the increasing 'them' (in the present) is a great threat to 'us' and will gain supremacy over 'us' (in the future). In extract [2], the speaker, the BNP, and the audience constitute the 'us;' whereas the opposing group is divided into categories: the immigrants ('them'), the British government and politicians in opposition to the British National Party ('them nr 2'). 'Us' is used exclusively in a definite manner with regards to the immigrants, but less radically towards the speaker's political rivals: the usage of the possessive 'our'. As a result, 'them' which refers to the immigrants is used exclusively, and 'them' with respect to the British government, etc., is used both inclusively and exclusively. The 'us' and 'them' structuring in excerpt [3] is almost identical to

that in [2], without the division into two types of 'them'. In extract [4], the discourse space is constructed differently than in [1], [2], and [3]: the speaker and the BNP constitute the 'us', as does the audience to some extent; whereas under the label 'implicit them' one will find the problems caused by immigration, the immigrants, and the British government. Excerpts [5] and [6] identify the speaker, the BNP, and the audience as the 'us'. In these fragments, one will find two types of 'them', as in fragment [2]: the immigrants ('them'), and the British government and politicians in opposition to the British National Party, and, additionally, America, companies, factories, etc. ('them nr 2'). Excerpt [7] structures the discourse space as follows: 'us' inclusive of the speaker, the BNP (vote for 'us'), and partially of the audience; whereas 'them' encompasses the British government, politicians in opposition to the British National Party, immigrants, 'war', etc.: all entities causing damage to Britain and depriving the British nation of their rights.

3. Conclusions

The 'us' and 'them' relationship is constantly present in politics, therefore different means of constructing such relations are needed. Throughout this article, various ways and means of marking clusivity in political discourse have been discussed, both in theory and in practice, on the basis of authentic, political speech material. The analysis has indicated that how the deictic center of a political speech may be constructed depends on many factors, such as the goal that a particular section of the speech has (to warn, to persuade, to accuse, etc.), what resources the speaker has in hand (mental context models, joint experiences and beliefs, position/power, etc.), and the development of the communicative event (prior sentences/fragments have influence on/give ground for the ones that follow). Depending on these factors, some devices may be more appropriate and effective in establishing and maintaining the 'us' and 'them' opposition in certain circumstances, whereas others, not necessarily so, may prove to be a better choice elsewhere.

The aim of this paper was to present the diversity of linguistic means found in the 'us' and 'them' structuring of the political world. Moreover, I attempted to investigate the way in which these polarized relations are dynamic and prone to change. Therefore, numerous pragma-cognitive strategies and concepts of marking clusivity have been presented, such as proximization theory, the ideological square, common ground, all of which are used to construct the discourse stage in a different way, depending on the function the discourse in question, or a section of it, has. Proximization strategies are most effective in constructing 'us' and 'them' relationships in discourses concerned with threats and (de)legitimization of a specific course of action (immigration and the British government policies). The ideological square is most successful in marking clusivity in campaigning: presenting oneself as 'the better one' entails a negative image of the speaker's adversary, benefiting the speaker in his potential victory. As far as the concept of common ground is concerned (moral repulsion towards war, the desire of belongingness, unity, nationalism, etc.), it can be found within proximization and ideological square strategies, since common ground is a universal means of inclusion and exclusion. In other words, common ground mechanisms may be used to reinforce/ground other

pragma-cognitive means of clusivity marking in order to present them as more legitimate and to increase their persuasiveness.

Although the aims of the present study have been achieved, more aspects of the 'us' and 'them' relationship in political discourse can be investigated. The topic is open to further studies due to the complexity of social relations and the social world itself, not to mention the fact that many other pragma-cognitive means of clusivity marking have not been discussed in this article. Moreover, combining studies on the polarization in political discourse with other topics in the field of linguistics and social sciences may prove to be an interesting subject of study.

References

Brokensha, S. (2011). Noticing Us and Them Constructions: The Pedagogical Implications of a Critical Discourse Analysis of Referring in Political Discourse. *Per Linguam* 27 (1): 56-73.

Brown, P., and S. Levinson. (1987). *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Use.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bryan, K. (2014). I Am Charlie. *National Front Website.* Retrieved February 6, 2015, from the World Wide Web: http://www.britishnationalfront.net/latestnews.html

Cap, P. (2008). Towards the Proximization Model of the Analysis of Legitimization in Political Discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40: 17-41.

Cap, P. (2010a). Proximizing Objects, Proximizing Values: Towards an Axiological Contribution to the Discourse of Legtimization. In U. Okulska and P. Cap (eds.), *Perspectives in Politics and Discourse.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp. 119-142.

Cap, P. (2010b). Legitimisation in Political Discourse: A Cross-Disciplinary Perspective on the Modern US War Rhetoric Second Revised Edition. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Cap, P. (2012). A War Road to Peace? Legitimization Strategies in the Post-9/11 US Anti-Terrorist Discourse. *Heteroglossia* 2: 79-90.

Cap, P. (2013). Proximization: The Pragmatics of Symbolic Distance Crossing. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Capdevila, R., and J. Callaghan. (2008). It's not Racist. It's Common Sense: A Critical Analysis of Political Discourse Around Asylum and Immigration in the UK. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology* 18 (1): 1-16.

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

Chovanec, J. (2010). Legitimization Through Differentiation. In U. Okulska and P. Cap (eds.), *Perspectives in Politics and Discourse.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp. 61-82.

Clark, H. (1996). *Using Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fielding, S. (2011). The Conservatives: a 'polite alternative' to the BNP? *Ballots & Bullets: School of Politics & International Relations, University of Nottingham.* Retrieved February 6, 2015, from the World Wide Web: http://nottspolitics.org/2011/06/01/the-conservatives-a-polite-alternative-to-the-bnp/

Godfrey, H. (2014). Teacher banned for life appointed to replace Nick Griffin as BNP leader. *The Guardian.* Retrieved February 6, 2015, from the World Wide   Web: http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2014/jul/21/banned-teacher-adam-walker-british-national-party-leader-nick-griffin-vote-collapses

Griffin, N. (2010). Emotional speech by Nick Griffin on the Lib/Lab/Con/UKIP warmongers. *LiveLeak.* Retrieved January 15, 2014, from the World Wide Web: http://www.liveleak.com/view?i=b9e_1272829239

Hartmann, R.K.K., and F.C. Stork. (1972). *Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. London: Applied Science Publishers.

Kopytowska, M. (2012). Editorial: Critical Perspectives on Ideology, Identity, and Interaction. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines* 5 (2): 1-14.

Lemke, J. (1995). Textual Politics: Discourse and Social Dynamics. London: Taylor & Francis.

Okulska, U, and P. Cap (eds). (2010). Analysis of Political Discourse. *Perspectives in Politics and Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp. 3-20.

Reisigl, M. and R. Wodak. (2001). *Discourse and Discrimination*. London: Routledge.

Richardson, J. (2013). Racial Populism in British Fascist Discourse: The Case of COMBAT and the British National Party (1960-1967). In R. Wodak and J. Richardson (eds.), *Analysing Facist Discourse: European Fascism in Talk and Text*. London: Routledge. pp. 181-202.

Schiffrin, D. (2006). From Linguistic Reference to Social Reality. In A. De Fina, D. Schiffrin and M. Mamberg (eds.), *Discourse and Identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press. pp. 103-131.

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

Van Dijk, T. (1997). What is Political Discourse Analysis? In J. Blommaert and G. Bulcaen (eds.), *Political linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp. 11-52.

Van Dijk, T. (2002). Political Discourse and Ideology. In C. Lorda and M. Ribas (eds.), *Analisi del discurs politic*. Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra. pp. 15-34.

Wieczorek, A. E. (2008a). Proximisation, Common Ground, and Assertion-Based Patterns for Legtimisation in Political Discourse. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines* 2 (1): 31-48.

Wieczorek, A. E. (2008b). Legitimisation and Proximisation Values in the Discourse of Historic Change. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics* 4 (2): 263-275.

Wieczorek, A. E. (2009). This is to Say You're Either In Or Out: Some Remarks on Clusivity. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines* 3 (2): 118-129.

Wieczorek, A. E. (2010). And I Quote: Direct and Indirect Point-of-View Switches in Clusivity-Oriented Discourse. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics* 6 (2): 220-247.

Wieczorek, A. E. (2013). Clusivity: A New Approach to Association and Dissociation in Political Discourse. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Wodak, R. (2007). Pragmatics and Critical Discourse Analysis. A Cross-Disciplinary Inquiry. *Pragmatics and Cognition* 15(1): 203-225. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wodak, R. (2008). Introduction: Discourse Studies – Important Concepts and Terms. In R. Wodak and M. Krzyzanowski (eds.), *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in Social Sciences*. Basingstoke: Palgrave. pp. 1-29.

Wodak, R. (2013). *Critical Discourse Analysis*, Volume 1. Lancaster: Sage Publications.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.