

**Discursive Strategies of Legitimation and Ideological
Operation in *Swastika Night***

Youmna Samy Fahmy Abdelwahab
PhD Candidate, Helwan University

Mona Fouad Attia
Professor, English Language and Literature Department, Faculty
of Arts, Helwan University

Mona Eid Saad
Lecturer, English Language and Literature Department, Faculty of
Arts, Helwan University

Abstract

This research draws on critical discourse analysis to explore the relation between power, knowledge and discourse through investigating the strategies of legitimation and ideological operation in Katharine Burdekin's dystopian world of *Swastika Night* (1937). Power is investigated in this research not in conjunction with repression, coercion and conflict, but as a form of productive power which is responsible for constructing and shaping the social world through producing subjects, discourses and bodies of knowledge. The aim of the study is to show how modern philosophical power, mainly the Althusserian power, operates through producing knowledge and discourse. John Thompson's (1990) modes of operation of ideology, Theo van Leeuwen's (2008) model of legitimation and Louis Althusser's (1971) power of Ideological State Apparatuses are incorporated into this study to unveil the role of discourse in constructing and legitimizing ideological representations of reality and turning people into ideological subjects. The study is meant to show that the linguistic representation of reality plays a significant role in the ideological conditioning of individuals through shaping people's knowledge of the world in the interest of some ideologies and ingraining a new version of reality which leads to the hegemony of some groups over the others. Linguistic representations present social constructs as natural products and disguise power in the language of morality, legitimacy, altruism and rationality.

Keywords: Discourse, Ideological operation, power, knowledge, *Swastika Night*.

المستخلص

يعتمد هذا البحث على منهج التحليل النقدي للخطاب في دراسة العلاقة بين القوة والمعرفة والخطاب. وتتناول الدراسة بحث استراتيجيات الشرعية والعملية الأيديولوجية في رواية كاترين بوردكن (١٩٣٧) "ليل الصليب المعقوف". لا يتناول البحث القوة بمفهومها القمعي المرتبط بالصراع ولكن كقوة إنتاج قادرة على بناء العالم الاجتماعي والتأثير فيه من خلال إنتاج وتشكيل الفرد والمعرفة والخطاب. وتهدف الدراسة إلى عرض كيفية ممارسة أشكال القوة الحديثة، خاصة القوة من منظور لويس ألتوسير (١٩٧١)، عن طريق التحكم بالمعرفة و الخطاب. و يرتكز البحث على دراسة جون طومسون (١٩٩٠) لأنماط العملية الأيديولوجية، و دراسة فان لوين (٢٠٠٨) لإستراتيجيات إخفاء الشرعية عن طريق الخطاب في كشف دور الخطاب في بناء وشرعنة صور أيديولوجية للواقع وتحويل الأشخاص لكيانات أيديولوجية وذلك عن طريق التأثير الأيديولوجي في معرفة الأشخاص للعالم و غرس رؤية مختلفة للواقع تؤدي لهيمنة البعض منهم على الآخر. كما تكشف الدراسة دور الخطاب في إخفاء القوة في رداء الفضيلة والشرعية والإيثار والعقلانية.

**Discursive Strategies of Legitimation and Ideological
Operation in *Swastika Night***

**Youmna Samy Fahmy Abdelwahab
PhD Candidate, Helwan University**

Introduction

Power in modern history is no longer associated with conflict, but rather with the ability of shaping people's knowledge of the social world. According to studies on discourse, when reality is linguistically represented, discourse puts constraints on some representations and legitimizes others. Thereby, discourse, as a system of representation, contributes to the construction or suppression of ideologies. Unmasking the role of discourse as an instrument of control is crucial to the process of decoding power, emancipating individuals from subtle forms of domination and consequently empowering them. That is why this study adopts the Critical Discourse Analysis (hereafter CDA) approach and draws on Thompson's (1990) modes of operation of ideology, van Leeuwen's (2008) model of legitimation and Althusser's (1971) power of Ideological State Apparatuses to study the construction of legitimation and ideological operation in the discourse of the dystopian world of *Swastika Night* (1937). Figurative language, relational processes, referential strategies, generic sentences, terms of address, lexical choices, adjectives and other linguistic tools are investigated to 1) demonstrate the role of discourse in constructing meanings, ideological representations of reality and ideological subjects, 2) unveil how meaning is mobilized in the interest of some ideological systems and 3) explore how discourse produces knowledge which engenders power.

Review of the literature

According to Teun van Dijk (2006), discourse establishes specific ideological positions and sustains them. First, he points out that discourse diffuses ideologies and makes them socially shared mental representations. He illustrates that ideologies are acquired through socialization which mainly depends on discourse (written or spoken) as a medium through which the ideas or ideologies of the dominant party are shared and legitimized. Discourse is used to refer to objects of the extensional world (e.g. political issues, race, and women). It influences how these objects are represented to us and impacts our mental image of them. Through this process of representation and meaning construction, ideological positions are diffused and ratified. van Dijk elaborates that "syntactic structures and rhetorical figures such as metaphors, hyperboles or euphemisms are used to emphasize or de-emphasize ideological meanings" (p.126). That is why he views discourse as an analysis of

ideological operation, arguing that ideologies are expressed, acquired, maintained and reproduced by discourse. Second, van Dijk (2006) argues that discourse makes ideologies normalized mental representations with recourse to reason and normality. He believes that discourse

provides reasons and arguments in terms of general norms and values, and in view of the interests of the group and its members; about what is good and bad, just or unjust. It gives examples, and provides images of venerated gods and leaders or other exemplary people. It tells stories about heroes and villains. (p. 134)

According to Victor Klemperer (2006), if language is a means of shaping people's view of reality and their conduct, then people should be aware of the poisonous impact language could have on their view of the world. Klemperer wonders:

What happens if the cultivated language is made up of poisonous elements or has been made the bearer of poisons? Words can be like tiny doses of arsenic: they are swallowed unnoticed, appear to have no effect, and then after a little time the toxic reaction sets in after all. If someone replaces the words 'heroic' and 'virtuous' with 'fanatical' for long enough, he will come to believe that a fanatic reality is a virtuous hero, and that no one can be a hero without fanaticism. (p. 14)

It is a form of totalitarian language which strives to conform people into a unitary vision and seeks to "strip everyone of their individuality, to paralyse them as personalities, to make them into unthinking and docile cattle in a herd driven and hounded in a particular direction, to turn them into atoms in a huge rolling block of stone" (Klemperer, p. 21).

George Orwell (1968) pinpoints that distorting language leads to the corruption of human beings. Newspeak, a linguistic dystopian phenomenon, is invented to provide citizens with only positive diction, no words to express negative aspects of society. So, it eliminates different, or critical, thought by depriving people their linguistic means of criticizing the system. Also, it substitutes meanings or referents of some words by another which contributes to the ideology of the dominant system such as "freedom is slavery." Substitution is also employed to disguise power relations and illegitimate practices "people are imprisoned for years without trial . . . this is called elimination of unreliable elements. Such phraseology is needed if one wants to name things without calling up mental pictures of them" (1968, p. 136).

Samuel Hayakawa (1974) warns us against creating "delusional worlds" where the verbal world provides false or blurred meaning of the extensional world. So, people confuse the concepts, inside their minds,

with the objects, outside in the extensional world (p. 187). This confusion could result from discourse “[T]he distortion of public discourse paralyzed the critical faculties of individual citizens, making them accept lies as unquestionable truths and hollow slogans as profound wisdom” (Kuran, 1995, p. 206). Though language is crucial to our understanding of the dynamics of control in modern societies, most studies criticize 20th century power without a profound study of the nature of that power that operates through knowledge control and meaning construction. That is why this research focuses on exploring the discursive strategies of knowledge and power production.

Power/knowledge/Discourse Bond

Power research marks a transition in the course of power in the modern world. Studies detect that power is depersonalized. It is no longer exercised by agents but through “abstract power structures” and institutions that operate in a more veiled manner (Meusburger, 2015, p. 23). This newly developed, agentless, form of power is mainly based on knowledge. It depends on knowledge as a socially constructed body which is responsible for constructing social realities in which people live. This study draws on Peter Meusburger’s (2015) definition of knowledge as a collocation of “belief systems, values, cultural traditions, worldviews, ideologies, religions, moral positions, mindsets, action-guiding norms ..., and reflection about the ethical conduct of one’s life” (p. 27). Some scholars refer to this form of non-factual knowledge as mystical or non-rational knowledge that could be justified through appealing to authorities such as experts and sacred books. For van Dijk (2006), “knowledge is not justified true belief, as the classical definition in epistemology has it, but accepted beliefs in a community” (p. 130). It is recognized as beliefs in which people can have reasonable confidence. In such a way, the relative nature of non-factual knowledge makes it a powerful instrument of enacting and manipulating power as controlling this knowledge is of major importance to centres of power to govern and mobilize masses and shape their worldviews. Foucault is the first to introduce the term “power/knowledge” to refer to the close interrelation between power and knowledge. He acknowledges the basic role of knowledge in producing power “it is not possible for power to be exercised without knowledge, it is impossible for knowledge not to engender power” (Foucault, 1980, p. 52).

The Althusserian (1971) approach to power pinpoints that the exercise of power depends on the construction and diffusion of specific knowledge. This body of knowledge embodies ideologies that shape our interpretation of the world. Each Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs) in

society such as religious, educational, political institutions undertakes its mission in its own way to support citizens with the kind of knowledge that matches their predetermined role in society. ISAs subject people to ideological processes that build into them particular values and ideas and guide their behaviour in a way that ensures their subjection to the ruling ideology and maintains the control of the state. Ideologies integrate individuals into the social order and induce people to act against their own interests by altering their knowledge of the world.

Constructionism points out the central role of language in shaping our thought and constructing our knowledge of the world. Edward Sapir (1929) and Benjamin Whorf (1956) provide an interpretation of this relationship between language and thought in what is known as the Sapir-Whorf Linguistic Hypothesis. The hypothesis estimates that language is necessary for conceptualization as language influences the process of meaning cognition through arranging data and choosing between different linguistic forms “the world is presented in a kaleidoscopic flux of impressions which has to be organized by our minds - and this means largely by the linguistic systems in our minds” (Whorf, 1956, p. 213).

Foucault, in his social theory of discourse, points out that physical things exist independently of discourse and only within discourse they are attributed meaning and become objects of knowledge. Stuart Hall (1997) refers to this process of giving “meaning to things through language” as representation (p. 16). In more specific terms, representation is “the production of the meaning of the concepts in our minds through language” (p. 17). Linguistic representation could be employed as an instrument of power which could be used as a means of distorting our knowledge of the world. It produces inaccurate version of reality and biased epistemic perspectives turning individuals into ideological subjects.

Theoretical Framework and Methodology

Studying this tripartite relation between power, knowledge and discourse is the main concern of this research. Since power is based on knowledge and knowledge is constructed through a process of representation that operates through discourse, then, studying discursive structures is essential to figure out how knowledge is produced, shaped, legitimized and diffused in society and how it enacts power through shaping people’s view of reality. Mainly through legitimating discursive strategies and modes of ideological operation, structures of language are capable of shaping knowledge on which power is based to produce ideological subjects. Thus, to show how discourse impacts knowledge, the current study employs Thompson’s (1990) Modes of Operation of

Ideology and van Leeuwen's (2008) model of legitimation. The research shows how knowledge generated from this process of linguistic representation is ingrained in the individual and shared in society through means of ISAs as pinpointed by Althusser (1971), creating ideological subjects.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

This research draws on critical discourse analysis to investigate the discursive structure of power, its mechanisms and effects. CDA is mainly concerned with investigating the relation between discourse practices and social practices such as power structures. CDA views discourse as a form of social action that contributes to reproducing forms of power, social identities, systems of meanings and bodies of knowledge. The aim of CDA is to emancipate people from biased understandings of reality. It stimulates people to question their knowledge and defy all forms of mental and social control. CDA approaches stress the importance of studying language use in its social context. That is why CDA is referred to as an "interdisciplinary" approach that integrates textual analysis of discourse with social analysis.

Theoretical Models

The current research attempts to explore the relation between discourse and power as a social phenomenon. It draws on Thompson's (1990) Modes of Operation of Ideology, van Leeuwen's (2008) legitimation strategies and Althusserian (1971) social theory of power. This paper investigates the linguistic representations of the social world in *SN* to unmask latent ideologies disguised in discourse and to draw attention to modern power mechanisms that are responsible for producing ideological subjects.

Thompson's (1990) Modes of Operation of Ideology

Thompson (1990) investigates the relation between language, ideology and power. For Thompson, ideology is how meaning is constructed in the social world to establish relations of domination. He points that meanings influence and shape the way people think and act in life. Some meanings are emphasized and other are excluded for the interest of the dominant party. He identifies five modes in which meaning may sustain relations of domination; namely, legitimation, dissimulation, unification, fragmentation and reification. Each mode of operation of ideology is conducted through certain linguistic strategies.

For Thompson, I) "legitimation" is to attribute acceptability to specific issues by representing them as "legitimate", "just" and "worthy of support" by means of linguistic strategies like rationalization (p. 61). II) "Dissimulation" is to conceal, deny or misrepresent power relations. It

is linguistically enacted through displacement where something is represented in terms of another thing, thereby transferring some, either negative or positive, connotations from the representor to the object or person represented. It is also performed through using figurative language such as “metaphor” and “euphemization” (pp. 62-3). III) “Unification” is to establish power relations by creating “a form of unity which embraces individuals in a collective identity”. This collective power could be linguistically established by means of standardization such as the use of a national language and through employing symbolizations of unity such as anthems (p. 64). IV) “Fragmentation” is to maintain domination by fragmenting unity of individuals or groups to hinder their potential opposition. This is accomplished through emphasizing differences and through “expurgation” of the other by attributing negative features to someone to represent him as a threat that people should unite to resist (p. 65). V) “Reification” is to dominate through representing “a transitory, historical state of affairs as if it were permanent, natural, outside of time.” Reification shows existing power relations as the natural order of things. It may manifest itself through naturalization and eternalization and syntactically through nominalization and passivization (pp. 65-6). CDA offers powerful methods to unveil such “hidden positionalities and power plays that lie buried within even the most seemingly innocuous and ethically neutral discourses” (Harvey, 1996, p. 77).

Modes of Operation of Ideology	Strategies of symbolic construction	Explanation
Legitimation	Rationalization	Justify or defend social relations or beliefs
	Universalization	Presenting institutional relations, which actually serve only few groups, as benefitting everyone
	Narrativization	Current social relations are located within stories from the past
Dissimulation	Displacement	Using a term that normally refers to someone or something else, thus drawing in all the associated meanings and connotations
	Euphemization	Shift in descriptive language that gives described actions a positive valuation
	Trope: synecdoche	“Semantic conflation of part

		and whole” (Thompson, 1990: 63)
	Trope: metonymy	The use of a term which stands for “an attribute, adjunct or related characteristic of something” to refer to the thing itself.
	Trope: metaphor	Using words or phrases as referents to objects to which they do not literally refer
Unification	Standardization	Standardization of language and symbols to unite individuals regardless of their diversity
	Symbolization of unity	Diffusion of a shared set of symbols to create a collective identity among people
Fragmentation	Differentiation	Emphasizing differences between groups
	Expurgation of the other	Constructing a common enemy and uniting others in opposition.
Reification	Naturalization	Presenting situations as natural, as the appropriate outcome of natural processes
	Eternalization	Portraying situations "as permanent, unchanging and ever-recurring" (p. 66)
	Nominalization	Turning actors and actions into nouns
	Passivization	Use passive rather than active voice
<i>Source:</i> adapted from Thompson, 1990, pp. 60-67.		

van Leeuwen’s (2008) Model of Legitimation

In his model, van Leeuwen (2008) develops Thompson’s (1990) mode of legitimation by providing four strategies through which legitimation is constructed in discourse; namely: “authorization”, “moral evaluation”, “rationalization” and “mythopoesis” (2008, p. 106). He defines “authorization” as “legitimation by reference to the authority of tradition, custom, law, and/or persons in whom institutional authority of some kind is vested” (p. 105). He further illustrates that legitimation through authorization could be enacted through six sources. First, “personal authorities,” such as parents and teachers, are assigned power of

legitimation through their role or position in their institutions without having to offer reasons or justifications. Personal authority legitimation is linguistically represented by, for example, obligation modality (p. 106). Second, “expert authority” is that of expertise such as some experts or scholars. This type of legitimation is expressed through verbal or mental process clauses as exemplified in: experts “believe” (p. 107). Third, “role models” or celebrities acquire authority that legitimizes their followers’ actions and believes (p. 107). Fourth, “impersonal authority” is that of laws, rules, policies, regulations, etc. which is realized linguistically through nouns such as “laws say so” or through adjectives and adverbs such as “obligatory” (p. 108). Fifth, the “authority of tradition” is another means of authorization that is brought by the power of “tradition,” “practice,” “custom” and “habit” (p. 108). Sixth, the “authority of conformity” legitimizes through people’s natural tendency to act in accord with the prevailing norms, practices...etc. and it is depicted in explicit comparisons as indicated by “similar to” and “just as” or through “high frequency modality” such as “the majority” (p. 109).

van Leeuwen (2008) mentions “moral evaluation” as the second type of legitimation which draws on values that are perceived as common sense values and realized by adjectives such as “useful.” He differentiates between three categories of moral legitimation. First, “evaluation” is realized by the use of positive or negative attributive adjectives and loaded words such as “honour,” exalting groups of people and stigmatizing others. Second, “abstraction” is to legitimize qualities by referring to them in abstract ways using discourses of moral values. Third, “analogies” are legitimation through comparing two activities and associating positive values from one of them to the other.

The third strategy of legitimation is “rationalization.” Distinctions are made between “instrumental rationality” which enacts legitimation by reference to goals, uses, and effects of social action and “theoretical rationality” which legitimizes practices by reference to “some kind of truth, on ‘the way things are’” (p. 116). Theoretical rationalization is grounded on providing: definitions of activities in terms of other moralized activities, explanations and predictions based on expert knowledge.

The fourth strategy of legitimation is “mythopoesis” that is, “legitimation conveyed through narratives whose outcomes reward legitimate actions and punish nonlegitimate actions” (p. 106). So, legitimation, for van Leeuwen (2008), is a means of shaping social reality through discourse.

Thompson's Five Modes of Operation of Ideology						
		Legitimation	Dissimulation	Unification	Fragmentation	Reification
van Leeuwen's legitimation strategies	Authorization	Displacement	Standardization	Differentiation	Naturalization	
	Moral Evaluation	Euphemization	Symbolization	Expurgation	Eternalization	
	Rationalization	Synecdoche				Nominalization
	Mythopoesis	Metonymy				Passivization
	Universalization	Metaphor				

Althusser's (1971) Model of Power

Althusser's approach to power focuses on how the individual is transformed from a pre-ideological to an ideological subject. Althusser (1971) pinpoints two mechanisms through which ideologies create subjects and produce relations of submission, namely, socialization and interpellation. Socialization primarily operates through ISAs (e.g. religious ISA or educational ISA) which are not ideology-free institutions. Each ISA supports citizens with the kind of knowledge that maintains the control of the state and serves its interests. After being crammed with knowledge "wrapped up in the massive inculcation of the ideology of the ruling class" and legitimized by various discourses and social practices, individuals are then socialized into becoming ideological subjects (Althusser, 1971, p. 30). Althusser places emphasis on the role of discourse in producing ideology, meaning and representation, and legitimizing ideas propagated by the dominant ideology. In other words, language supports knowledge and ideology with the power to make them true and legitimate. Thus, power operates through constructing and diffusing an ideological representation of reality, mediated through discourse.

Not only does ideology naturalize specific forms of knowledge and ingrain its values in individuals through the process of socialization, but it also operates through language via what Althusser referred to as the process of "interpellation." Interpellation, for Althusser, refers to how discourse assigns a certain social position to individuals. To illustrate, when a form of discourse addresses individuals by allocating them a specific social, political or religious position (e.g. a liberal), on realizing that it is really them who are meant by this discourse, individuals are then interpellated. They are interpellated by accepting being the addressee and switching to recognize themselves as subjects of this discourse, "subjects who define and identify themselves cognitively, emotionally and

experientially with the ways that power addresses them” (Zake, p. 223). On adopting subject position, individuals become subjects of ideology. It is a testimony that subjects have successfully internalized these ideologies. Then, they are left to practice their roles in society and reproduce the social order unaware of their being pre-shaped by dominant ideologies, leaving them to think they are acting out of their own free will. The outcomes are subjects sharing same knowledge about the world (i.e. ideological subjects).

The Dystopian World of *Swastika Night* (SN)

Burdekin’s novel *Swastika Night*, first published in 1937, is set in a Nazi totalitarian state. *SN* criticizes human blindness to see the world as it actually is. It is a critic of all kinds of ideologies which control people’s knowledge of their social world. *SN* is an example of the Althusserian conception of knowledge is power. Burdekin warns us against an abusive power developed and maintained through constructing knowledge stating that “you can’t rule men permanently except through an idea” (1985, p. 27). In Burdekin’s novel, the night of the swastika veils the truth by constructing a body of knowledge which represents Hitler as a god and diffuses Hitlerism as an official religion. In *SN*, “Nazism has been elevated to a militaristic religion predicated on the glorification of male tyranny and the absolute diminution of women” (Schnieder, 1997, p. 42). In Hitler’s faked history, women are biologically inferior to men. This faked representation of reality justifies brutalization of women in a world that values men for their brutality. Obviously, *SN* depicts a world that lacks objective knowledge upon which judgements and beliefs are based.

Analysis of Ideological Operation and Legitimation in *SN*

SN draws correspondences between two bodies of knowledge, namely, Nazi ideology and gender ideology or what Burdekin’s refers to as “Hitler’s cult” and “cult of masculinity” according to which “the Nazi Empire treats its subject people the way Nazi men treat women — as objects to be conquered and subjugated” (Patai, viii). The cult of masculinity advocates and legitimizes men supremacy over women and Nazism propagates Hitlerians supremacy over all other people of different races and ethnicities. Obviously, masculinity and Nazism, both, attempt to control people’s knowledge of themselves and the world by creating a collective knowledge and a system of theocratic values and embracing people in a collective conscious. Power in *SN* is a manifestation of Althusser’s (1971) conceptualization of power. It is established through shaping people’s knowledge and building into them an ideological view of reality which induces them to think and act in the interest of the ruling system. It employs ideological state apparatuses to legitimize specific

values and social practices and delegitimize others to maintain the social order.

Legitimation of Gender Ideology via Authorization

Mode of operation of Ideology	Legitimation
Linguistic Strategy	Authorization: Personal Authority of the preacher knight
Example	“be submissive,” “rejoice,” “be fruitful” and “bear”
Linguistic devices	Imperative verbs & verbal process clauses
Effect	Ideological indoctrination of women

Most Hitlerian teachings are communicated to women via the personal authority of the preacher-knight whose utterances incorporate imperative verbs such as “be submissive,” “rejoice,” “be fruitful” and “bear” (*SN* 1:13) which entail obligations to act in a specific manner just because the preacher-knight says so. His verbal process clauses reinforce the process of women ideological indoctrination by dictating women how to think and behave.

Mode of operation of Ideology	Legitimation
Linguistic Strategy	Impersonal Authorization of Hitler’s will & law
Example	“the will of the Lord Hitler” “the fundamental immutable laws of Hitler society”
Linguistic devices	Nouns such as “will” & “laws”
Effect	Legitimize gender discrimination Ingrain in women subjugation to men

Nouns such as Hitler’s “**will**” and Hitler’s “**laws**” are used as means of legitimation. Women are taught to be completely submissive to any man by the authority of the venerated Lord Hitler’s will, “They [women] . . . must be, after the age of sixteen, completely submissive, not only to the father of their children, but to any and every man, for such was the **will** of the Lord Hitler” (*SN* 5:81) which shouldn’t be opposed. Women’s debasement is further entrenched by the power of “the fundamental immutable **laws** of Hitler society” (*SN* 1:7) which are frequently repeated in the words of the Creed, “as a woman is above a worm, so is a man above a woman” (*SN* 1:7) which set women inferior to men and only superior to “a worm,” the most contemptible creature. These sources of impersonal authorities are powerful sources of theocratic authorization which have the ability to provide legitimation to their content regardless of its being really true or false. They shape people’s mind to a patriarchal society which discriminates between genders and legitimize women’s subjugation and sexual enslavement.

Legitimation of Gender Ideology via Moral Evaluation

Mode of operation of Ideology	Legitimation
Linguistic Strategy	Moral Evaluation
Example	“right,” “unnatural,” “natural” & “lunatic”
Linguistic devices	Evaluative adjectives
Effect	Legitimize the masculine dogma of gender inequality Naturalize the idea of women’s subordination to men

In the world of the swastika, “it must be *right* [emphasis added] for women to submit to men. Anything else would be *unnatural* [emphasis added]” (SN 4:70). In this example, women’s submission to men is represented by means of the evaluative adjective “right” and anything else but submission is represented as “unnatural.” Through moral evaluation, reducing women to a subordinate role is represented as their natural order of existence. Thus, discriminative practices of gender ideology against women are legitimized by linking them to discourses of moral values. In another example, male violence against women is also legitimized and morally evaluated as “natural” and “right,” saying “it was *natural* and *right* [emphasis added] that they [women] should always have less food than men” (SN 4:59). The two evaluative adjectives positively modify the practice of putting women in a state of constant privation in a way that serves the masculine dogma of gender inequality. Furthermore, in the Nazi Empire, for women to think of themselves as superior to men is morally evaluated as “a *lunatic* thought” (SN 6:107). The use of the evaluative adjective “lunatic” delegitimizes the anti-Nazi idea of women supremacy over men by associating it to insanity and mentally disturbed way of thinking.

Mode of operation of Ideology	Legitimation
Linguistic Strategy	Moral Evaluation
Example	“sinful act,” “shame,” “defilement” & “blasphemy”
Linguistic devices	Use of Abstractions & discourses of immoral values
Effect	Influence people’s knowledge of women Confine women to a state of social isolation Trigger emotional effects towards women

Watching women is a “sinful act” (SN 1:9), speaking to her is a “shame” (SN 1:7), touching her is “the uttermost defilement” (SN 1:7) and loving a woman is a “blasphemy” (SN 1:11). As represented in these examples, all forms of approaching women are referred to in abstract ways which relate them to discourses of immoral values such as sin, shame, defilement and blasphemy. The use of such abstractions delegitimizes all forms of contacting women and thereby isolate and

exclude them. Through means of exclusion, women are subjugated as “exclusion is an excellent way of making men [people] feel inferior” (SN 7:134/5). Moral evaluation triggers abhorrent effects such as defilement that keep men away from women and confine women to their state of social isolation. Thus, moral evaluation via abstraction functions as a significant means of de-legitimation which shapes and influences people’s knowledge about their social relations.

Mode of operation of Ideology	Legitimation
Linguistic Strategy	Moral evaluation
Example	Woman “ <i>equal to</i> ” worm & women “like” puppies “ill-bred” and “half-witted”
Linguistic devices	Analogy, simile and adjectives
Effect	Constructs the idea of animalization of women or representing woman as an “it” Legitimizes illegitimate practices against women

Loving a woman is compared to loving a worm as exemplified in “to love a woman, to the German mind, would be *equal to* [emphasis added] loving a worm” (SN 1:12). This negative comparison is drawn through the use of “equal to.” It creates in mind a conception of a woman as a low-down insignificant creature. All mean values of a worm are transferred to a woman through this analogy which constructs the idea of animalization of women and delegitimizes the act of loving a woman. Women are further dehumanized through the use of simile. The simile indicator “like” compares women to puppies, “women are like ill-bred weakly and half-witted puppies which any sensible man would drown” (SN 9:184). Besides, the puppies mentioned in this comparison are negatively represented as indicated by the adjectives “ill-bred” and “half-witted” to legitimize violent actions against them. It is an act of influencing people’s knowledge of women by creating an “it” to legitimize illegitimate practices performed against them.

Legitimation of Gender Ideology via Rationalization and Naturalization

Mode of operation of Ideology	Legitimation
Linguistic Strategy	Instrumental Rationalization
Example	“women’s only reason for existence, to bear boys and nurse them to eighteen months”
Linguistic devices	action / purpose link / purpose
Effect	Strip women their real identity and build into them a degraded identity which serves the ideological purpose of the state Determine women’s value and role

In *SN*, it is claimed that “women’s only reason for existence, to bear boys and nurse them to eighteen months” (*SN* 1:11). That is, women exist (action) / preposition “to” (purpose link) / reproduce (purpose). The linguistic representation of women in Hitler’s society reduces them to mere reproductive bodies through legitimizing their existence only to be exploited for procreative and breeding purposes i.e. “to bear” and “nurse”. Women’s reduction is legitimized through means of rationalization by referring to their reproductive function as their only purpose for existence. That is to say, they have a goal oriented existence. Though Hitlerdom could only continue to exist through women’s procreative powers, this reality is wrapped and replaced by a Nazi ideological construction which devalues women and limits their importance to serve the State’s interests by raising fertility rates.

Mode of operation of Ideology	Legitimation
Linguistic Strategy	Theoretical Rationalization & Naturalization
Example	Man is “a being of pride, courage, violence, brutality, ruthlessness”
Linguistic devices	Definition & Relational process
Effect	Shape people’s knowledge of man Justify men’s violent behaviour Share social constructions as nature products

In *SN*, man is defined as “a being of pride, courage, violence, brutality, ruthlessness” (*SN* 2:28). Through relational process, man is identified as a being that is characterized by the attribute of pride, courage, violence, brutality and ruthlessness. Through this description, moral values such as “pride” and “courage” and immoral values such as “violence, brutality and ruthlessness” together construct the definition of man. It is a means of theoretical legitimation which takes the form of a definition. Acknowledging and legitimizing this form of definition assign some kind of truth and credibility to it. The definition states how man is by nature. Thereby, behaving according to his nature, man is not to be blamed for his violent, brutal and ruthless behaviour which constitutes part of his definition. Thus, through means of naturalization, the constructed Nazi view of men is represented as natural and consequently brings to existence its own social realities such as violence.

Mode of operation of Ideology	Legitimation
Linguistic Strategy	Theoretical Rationalization & Naturalization
Example	“women . . . are not human” “women were not fit to rear men-children”
Linguistic devices	Definition, Relational process & Generic sentence

Effect	Justify abusive behaviour against women Bring about social consequences Shape women’s identity and view of themselves
--------	---

In *SN*, women are defined in the following terms “women . . . are not human” (*SN* 1:9) and “women were not fit to rear men-children” (*SN* 1:10). In the two examples, generic sentences and relational processes are employed to define and characterize women as “not human” and “not fit”. They present the Nazi perspective of women as a general truth (i.e. natural, absolute and invariably true). Though both definitions of man and woman are ideologically tainted, they legitimize and construct social realities such as men’s violence against women and their right to rape and deprive women of their children their whole lives.

Dissimulation and Gender Ideology

Mode of operation of Ideology	Dissimulation
Linguistic Strategy	Displacement
Example	Rape is linguistically referred to as a “non-crime”
Linguistic devices	Substitution / Misrepresentation
Effect	Generate new conceptualization of sexual relations Twist people’s view of social reality (i.e. rape) Naturalize and support women sexual abuse

In Hitler’s society, “there was no such crime as rape . . . as rape implies will and choice and a spirit of rejection on the part of women, there could be no such crime” (*SN* 1:13). By definition, a crime is committed against the will of the victim but according to Hitler’s cult, women have neither will nor choice to reject rape, thereby rape is not linguistically referred to as a crime. So, if women’s sexual abuse is not considered guilt, then men are not to be charged with rape nor punished for it. By representing rape as a non-crime through means of displacement, the ruling system generates new conceptualization of sexual relations which naturalizes and supports women sexual exploitation.

Mode of operation of Ideology	Dissimulation
Linguistic Strategy	Figurative language & Abstraction
Example	giving up “their baby sons” is “heroism”
Linguistic devices	Euphemism
Effect	Manipulate women’s actions in the interest of others Reconceptualise experiences

The act of women giving up “their baby sons with the same heroism with which they had been used to give their grown sons to war”

is represented in terms of “heroism” (SN 5:82). Women’s cognition of reality is obscured through adopting euphemistic terms such as “heroism” to draw a correlation between the two acts. Through establishing this positive image or representation, women regard acting cruelly against their motherly nature and abandoning their 18 month babies a heroic action. They surrender their will to men’s will and act in what they construe as a heroic manner. Obviously, through the use of euphemistic expressions, women’s view of reality is altered and their actions are manipulated in the interest of others.

Mode of operation of Ideology	Dissimulation
Linguistic Strategy	Figurative Language
Example	“dirt,” “incredibly repulsive hag,” “nothings,” “empty brains,” “unclean ears,” “lifelong hopeless useless burden on Hitler society,” “a disgraceful event” and “a calamitous accident”
Linguistic devices	Dysphemism & Referential strategies
Effect	Create antipathetic attitude towards women Impact women’s knowledge of themselves and their value and self esteem

In SN, a baby girl is described as “dirt” (SN 8:161). A woman is referred to as an “incredibly repulsive hag” (SN 1:12). Women are “nothings” (SN 9:183), “empty brains” (SN 1:13), “unclean ears” (SN 1:12) and an infertile woman is represented as “lifelong hopeless useless burden on Hitler society” (SN 1:14). Elsewhere, giving birth to a female is described as “a disgraceful event” and “a calamitous accident” (SN 1:14). Such offensive expressions are frequently used to create antipathetic attitude towards women and manage women’s mind to internalize this humiliating view of themselves. So, dysphemism is used to shape people’s view of women and their attitude towards them.

Fragmentation and Gender Ideology

Mode of operation of Ideology	Fragmentation
Example	“women . . . are not human” “family life was an insult to manhood”
Linguistic devices	Generic sentences Misrepresenting & Abolishing terms
Effect	Blur people’s vision of reality Exclude women from the band of human kind

Besides being spatially isolated, women in Hitler’s society are represented as “not human” a gender excluded from the band of humankind as highlighted by Herman’s words, “women . . . are not human” (SN 1:9). Through generic sentences, women are excluded from the band of human kind. In this example, reality is twisted to

fragment any unity that may embrace men and women together. Also, “family life” which symbolizes unity between the two genders is linguistically negatively represented as an insult to men as highlighted in “family life was an insult to manhood” (SN 5:81). In addition, the lexical term “marriage” becomes a “lost word” (SN 4:69). Abolishing the term “marriage” is a means of fragmenting the unity constructed between men and women by a marriage bond.

Mode of operation of Ideology	Fragmentation
Example	“Woman, where is <i>my</i> son?” “Here, Lord, here is <i>your</i> son”
Linguistic devices	Pronouns & possessive determiners Mutual verbal interactions
Effect	Fragmenting unity between genders Excluding woman

Further, it is noticed that there is no trace of collective pronouns or collective possessive determiners in the language system of Hitler’s society that joins men and women together. In the formal utterances exchanged by men and women during the Ceremony of Removal, removing baby boys from their mothers forever and giving them to their fathers, a man asks, “Woman, where is my son?” A woman’s response is “Here, Lord, here is your son” (SN 1:9). They did not say “our” son. Both possessive determiners “my” and “your” used in the two utterances refer to man and exclude woman. These referential strategies are the formal type of response allowed and accepted in Hitler’s society. Moreover, it is observed that men and women hardly participate in common verbal interactions, which is another efficient strategy of fragmentation.

Mode of operation of Ideology	Fragmentation
Linguistic Strategy	Differentiation
Example	“Lord” and “Master” “Woman” and first name “Ethel”
Linguistic devices	Terms of address
Effect	Emphasize differences between gender Polarize them into top and bottom positions Emphasize men’s power & women’s subjugation

As remarked, woman addresses man in terms of “Lord” (SN 1:9) and “Master” (SN 8:158-64) while he calls her “Woman” (SN 1:9) or uses her first name “Ethel” (SN 8:158-64). Terms of address exchanged between men and women in their couple of common verbal acts emphasize differences between them and alienate them from each

other. These forms of address emphasize men's power and supremacy over women and highlight women's subjugation and debasement.

Mode of operation of Ideology	Fragmentation
Linguistic Strategy	Differentiation & Expurgation
Example	"leadership," "Holy Mystery of Maleness," "holy male child," "low and contemptible," "lowest," "meanest" & "filthiest thing"
Linguistic devices	lexical choices and adjectives
Effect	Diffuse an ideological view of the relation between genders Emphasize differences between gender

They also polarize them into top and bottom positions in Hitler's social hierarchy which is further foregrounded by high and mighty lexical choices associated to men such as men's "leadership" (SN 4:70), "Holy Mystery of Maleness" (SN 1:9) and "holy male child" (SN 8:159) in contrast to the low and degrading lexical terms assigned to women such as "low and contemptible" (SN 1:9), "lowest," "meanest" and "filthiest thing" (SN 1:7). Negative evaluative adjectives used to represent women degrade and expurgate them. So, through restricting verbal communication, controlling referential strategies, terms of address and lexical choices, the ruling system is capable of fragmenting any form of unity between the two genders, constraining their behaviour towards each other and diffusing its ideological view of the relation between them.

Reification and Gender Ideology

Mode of operation of Ideology	Reification
Example	"the human values of this world are masculine" "loving a woman is a blasphemy"
Linguistic devices	Generic sentences & Nominalization
Effect	Present social, transitory constructions as universal, permanent and unchanging truth Sharing a man-made version of reality as a taken for granted knowledge

In SN, It is propagated that "the human values of this world are masculine" (SN 6:108). It is noticed that generic sentences are used to represent a socially constructed set of transitory masculine values as if they are universal, permanent and unchanging world values. This kind of representation confines people's apprehension of human values to mere masculine values. Additionally, diffusing the idea that "loving a woman is a blasphemy" (SN 1:11), a social reality is constructed in the interest

of the dominant masculine system to create a repellent attitude towards women. In this example, knowledge is twisted and a man-made reality is represented as an inevitable fate through means of nominalization.

Mode of operation of Ideology	Reification
Example	“were moulded”& “ must not mind being raped”
Linguistic devices	Passivization
Effect	Present products of society as nature products Control women’s response & conduct Manipulate people’s knowledge of social realities

Stating that “women were moulded to the most masculine pattern” (*SN* 6:110), the agent is deleted to shift attention to the act rather than the actor. By deleting the actor, his responsibility of his action is disclaimed. Passivization is another syntactic device employed to influence people’s view of reality. In this example, the act of moulding women is foregrounded as a fact of nature without mentioning who moulded women to such a masculine pattern. Using the strategy of passivization presents the products of human activity or the products of society as natural products that should not be disrupted. Such representation urges women to comply with the quasi-natural masculine pattern. Similarly, in such a masculine society, the passive voice “they [the younger women] must not mind being raped” (*SN* 1:13) is used so that rape is not represented as a sexual assault which a man does to a woman but is rather represented as a thing that occurs to a woman. Through passivization, men who are responsible for committing rape cease to be visible in this scene. They are too holy to be blamed for sexual assaults perpetrated against women. Further, being raped is represented as a natural event that women should not resist or get annoyed about. Through this way of presenting acts of sexual violence, power abuse is legitimized in society as a natural phenomenon. Thus, through the language of representation, people’s knowledge of social realities is manipulated.

Legitimation of Nazi Ideology via Authorization

Mode of operation of ideology	Legitimation
Linguistic Strategy	Authorization: Impersonal Authority of law
Example	“They are all outcast” “Forget it not! . . . Or being cut off from the blood.” “As a man is above a woman, So is a Nazi above any foreign Hitlerian”
Linguistic devices	Obligations, Imperatives & warnings
Effect	Enforce discrimination and hierarchical social relations

Through the impersonal authority of Hitler’s Laws, Nazi beliefs are diffused and legitimized in society as marked in the following laws:

My sons, forget it not! . . .
 Or being cut off from the blood. Heil Hitler . . .
 As a man is above a woman,

So is a Nazi above any foreign Hitlerian. (SN 1:7)

Hitler’s laws of society are composed of obligations and warnings. Obligations, through imperatives such as “forget it not” to compel the masses to follow the standards they enforce and warnings of “being cut off from the blood” (SN 1:7) in case of not conforming to laws. These laws regulate people into relations of superiors and subordinates setting them in a hierarchical order according to their gender and race in which man is superior to woman and Nazi Hitlerians are superior to foreign Hitlerians. Hitler’s immutable laws shape people’s cognition of themselves and their social relations.

Mode of operation of Ideology	Legitimation
Linguistic Strategy	Authorization: Authority of Law & Tradition
Example	“Should,” “general,” & “holy” plan
Linguistic devices	Modality & adjectives
Effect	Impose ideas as normal and mould people’s conduct

By the authority of law and tradition, citizens’ rights and privileges are determined. Hermann “never thought this extraordinary, that an Englishman should be able to read and that he, a Nazi, should be illiterate. It was part of the general plan, the holy plan of life in the German Empire” (SN 2:17). Obligation modality “should,” in this example, deprives Nazis their right to read and write and represents illiteracy as a compulsory state of the Nazi existence. Not only through obligation modality but also through reference to the authority of tradition Nazis illiteracy is legitimized. Nazi illiteracy is not opposed nor defied because it is represented as normal, as “part of the general plan, the holy plan of life in the German Empire”. The use of the adjective “general” to describe the plan and relating this plan to “life” in the German Empire through the use of the preposition “of” make illiteracy sound ordinary and conventional. In addition, the use of the adjective “Holy” to refer to the “plan of life” supports it with divine legitimation. Thus, subjects are moulded into Hitler’s cult through the authority of law and tradition. It is an act of normalizing people to live according to the imposed social plan of life.

Mode of operation of Ideology	Legitimation
Linguistic Strategy	Authorization: Impersonal Authority of divine doctrine
Example	“the divine doctrine of race and class superiority”
Linguistic devices	Nouns , adjectives & of-phrase genitives
Effect	Legitimize race and class superiority

Racial and social discrimination advocated by Nazi ideology is further legitimized through appealing to the impersonal authority of divine doctrines as pointed out in saying, “you couldn’t admit exceptions in the divine doctrine of race and class superiority” (SN 2:21). Representing race and class superiority which are socially constructed realities in terms of an irrefutable “divine doctrine” legitimizes them and justifies social practices based on them. This kind of representation induces people to accept race and class discrimination as indisputable realities.

Mode of operation of Ideology	Legitimation
Linguistic Strategy	Authorization: Impersonal Authority of lessons
Example	“Had not that lesson been driven into Hermann’s childish mind ever since he could understand speech? Nothing is dishonorable, nothing is forbidden, nothing is evil if it is done for Germany and for Hitler’s sake”
Linguistic devices	Parallelism & generic sentences
Effect	Lessons stereotype citizens & shape their beliefs

Legitimation is also constructed through reference to the impersonal authority of lessons taught to Nazis in their childhood, legitimizing the conception that “**Nothing is dishonorable, nothing is forbidden, nothing is evil** if it is done for Germany and for Hitler’s sake” (SN 3:32). These lessons outline the set of norms in Hitler’s society which organizes social practices through the use of parallel structures and generic sentences. Social values are encoded in these generic sentences which ingrain in people Hitler’s codes of conduct by representing them as indisputable principles.

Legitimation of Nazi Ideology via Moral Evaluation

Mode of operation of Ideology	Legitimation
Linguistic Strategy	Moral Evaluation
Example	“better man by blood . . . inferior by blood”
Linguistic devices	Comparative forms
Effect	Shape people’s knowledge of themselves Legitimize Nazi ideology of blood superiority

In SN, the individual is described as “better man by blood. He’s superior . . . inferior by blood” (SN 2:28). People are evaluated and categorized into better / worse and superior / inferior by blood. Blood superiority of the Nazi race is emphasized through the use of comparative forms which categorize people in a polarized scale determined by Hitler’s set of social norms. This blood polarity classification legitimizes and engraves in mind inequality and discrimination.

Discursive Strategies of Legitimation and Ideological Operation in Swastika Night

Mode of operation of Ideology	Legitimation
Linguistic Strategy	Moral Evaluation
Example	“Holy Blood,” “holy Hitler Chapel,” “holy army,” “holy empire,” “highly born,” “sacred race,” “noble hands,” “English-speaking races are savage tribes” and “subject races”
Linguistic devices	Evaluative Adjectives
Effect	Shape people’s knowledge of race

Germans and whatever related to Germans are morally evaluated as exemplified in “Holy Blood” (SN 2:21), “holy Hitler Chapel” (SN 1:5), “holy army” (SN 1:6), “holy empire” (SN 1:11), “highly born” (SN 4:56), “sacred race” (SN 1:13 & 7:134) and “noble hands” (SN 10:195). The recurrent use of the positive evaluative adjectives “holy”, “sacred”, “highly” and “noble” communicates positive judgment and appreciation of the German race. In contrast, the evaluative language used to represent non-German races conveys negative attitudes towards them as displayed in “English-speaking races are savage tribes” (SN 5:77). The adjective “savage” assigns negative connotations to English tribes. Non-Germans are also referred to in terms of the evaluative adjective “subject” as in “subject races” (SN 2:17& 2:22) to emphasize their dependency and subordination to the Nazi Sacred race.

Mode of operation of Ideology	Legitimation
Linguistic Strategy	Moral Evaluation
Example	“unholy” & “irreligious”
Linguistic devices	Prefixes of negation -un & -ir
Effect	Construct a negative image of non- Germans

Foreigners or non-Germans are also referred to as “the *unholy* flesh and bones of a foreigner” (SN 3:43) and “they [Englishmen] were fundamentally *irreligious*” (SN 2:21). They are negatively evaluated through means of prefixes of negation -un & -ir which construct a negative image of them.

Mode of operation of Ideology	Legitimation
Linguistic Strategy	Moral Evaluation
Example	“sully” & “gallop”
Linguistic devices	Evaluative verbs
Effect	Shape people’s knowledge of the other Establish and legitimize power relations of inequality

Non-Hitlerians like Christians, who do not believe in Hitler’s deity, and non-Germans, like Englishmen, are morally evaluated in the following two examples: “the Germans despise the Christians so much

that they won't sully their noble hands with turning over their bits of belongings" (*SN* 10:195) and

"the grass round our churches wasn't put there for herds of Englishmen to gallop over" (*SN* 2:18). Choosing the loaded verb "sully", instead of other neutral verbs, to refer to the act of searching Christians' belongings communicates negative attitudes of contempt towards Christians and shapes people's knowledge of Christians as defilement. Similarly, in the second example, the evaluative verb "gallop" which is often used to refer to horses rather than men legitimizes inequality between German and Englishmen.

Legitimation of Nazi Ideology via Rationalization

Mode of Ideology	Legitimation
Linguistic Strategy	Theoretical Rationalization
Example	"all [knights] must be [superior] or society would crack"
Linguistic devices	Prediction
Effect	Stimulate specific feelings Manage people's knowledge by presenting undesirable reality as a threat Call for actions to avoid the threat

Social inequality and Nazi knights' blood supremacy are themes propagated in Hitler's society as illustrated in, "he [knight] must be [superior], all [knights] must be [superior] or Society would crack" (*SN* 2:21). The conjunction "or" is used, in this example, as a function word to indicate an alternative. In this case, the alternative is a prediction of the destructive consequence which would take place in the future if class and blood superiority is not maintained in the present. That is to say, maintain the Nazi hierarchy & blood supremacy or society would collapse. Through predicting the disastrous effect of breaching the social order (i.e. society would crack) and presenting it as an inevitable alternative which threatens the future of society, the Nazi regime attempts to maintain its power by keeping the status quo. This kind of predictions stimulates in people feelings of insecurity and fear of destruction if they breach the current hierarchy. Thus, legitimation of Nazi beliefs which reinforce blood superiority is created through means of predictions.

Mode of Ideology	Legitimation
Linguistic Strategy	Instrumental Rationalization
Example	"very young girls if just adolescent might bear puny babies as the result of rape"
Linguistic devices	Reference to the Consequences / As the result of
Effect	Set norms of sexual behaviour

Though the Nazi laws legitimize rape and women submission to every man, they delegitimize raping very young girls as stressed by the

reliable source, the preacher knight's words, "very young girls if just adolescent might bear puny babies as the result of rape" (SN 1:13). The action of raping underage girls is delegitimized by reference to the negative consequence it might bring that is, bearing unfit babies for the Nazi military expectations. In this case, delegitimation is established through appealing to instrumental rationalization. Hitler's laws legitimize or delegitimize acts by reference to their effect on the Nazi empire.

Legitimation of Nazi Ideology via Mythopoesis

Mode of Ideology	Legitimation
Linguistic Strategy	Mythopoesis or Narrativization
Example	"colossal height, long thick golden hair. . ."
Linguistic devices	Narrating a myth of Hitler as a divine being Providing descriptive details
Effect	Establish and legitimize a relation of submission and consent to what is portrayed as a divine power

In SN, "God the Thunderer. . . and His Son our Holy Adolf Hitler, the Only Man. Who was, not begotten, not born of a woman, but Exploded!" (SN 1:5). Hitler is presented as a demi-god with divine power who struggles to overcome threats and villains to save his people. Details of Hitler's physical appearance are given, portraying him as a being of "colossal height, long thick golden hair, a great manly golden beard spreading over his chest, deep sea-blue eyes" (SN 4:66). Narrativization legitimizes an ideological representation of Hitler. Hitler's myth is propagated to venerate Hitler, the Saviour, and consequently establish and legitimize a relation of submission to what is portrayed as a divine power. So, people's knowledge is manipulated through weaving a myth of Hitler as a deity and descriptive details are included in the story to add to its authenticity and credibility. Correspondences are drawn between the mythical image of Hitler and Jesus Christ coming down, leading people and then reunited to His Father, God the Thunderer to further reinforce the idea of leader veneration.

Dissimulation and Nazi Ideology

Mode of Ideology	Dissimulation
Example	"I believe in <i>pride</i> , in <i>courage</i> , in <i>violence</i> , in <i>brutality</i> , in <i>bloodshed</i> , in <i>ruthlessness</i> , and all other soldierly and heroic <i>virtues</i> [emphasis added]"
Linguistic devices	Nominal polarity
Effect	Disguise immoral Nazi values & barbaric practices in the cloak of virtue and heroism

The words of the creed share Nazi values and ideas saying, "I believe in pride, in courage, in violence, in brutality, in bloodshed, in ruthlessness, and all other soldierly and heroic virtues" (SN 1:6). In this example, the nouns "violence," "brutality," "bloodshed" and

“ruthlessness” express negative notions whereas the nouns “pride,” “courage” and the noun phrase “soldierly and heroic virtues” express positive notions. Polar values are clustered together in this example through connecting polar nouns together by the conjunction “and,” the commas and the determiner “other” which indicates adding new virtues to the previous list of virtues. Through means of dissimulation, barbaric practices, immoral values and disgraceful reality are disguised via combining them with “soldierly” and “heroic virtues.” Thus, a new ideological representation of reality prevails in service of Hitler’s power system.

Mode of Ideology	Dissimulation
Linguistic Strategy	Displacement
Example	“mind conspiracy,” “self-confessed traitor,” “infidel,” “blasphemer,” “vicious enemy” and “dangerous enemy”
Linguistic devices	Substitution
Effect	Expurgate and demonize the other

Furthermore, as the Nazi ideology rejects equality, it also resists all different knowledge. Anti-Nazi thinking is represented as “mind conspiracy” (*SN* 3:31) and the person who thinks differently is referred to in terms loaded with negative connotations such as “self-confessed traitor,” “infidel,” “blasphemer,” “vicious enemy” and “dangerous enemy” (*SN* 3:31). Through displacement, all negative connotations of the imported terms are transferred to that person, expurgating him as an enemy or a threat to Hitler’s society.

Mode of Ideology	Dissimulation
Linguistic Strategy	Figurative language & Hate speech
Example	“dirty foreigner,” “scum,” “layer of dirt” & “son of a million pig-dogs”
Linguistic devices	Dysphemism and pejorative expressions
Effect	Determine social relations Share negative judgments of the other

It is noticed that English men are represented in terms of “dirty foreigner,” “scum,” “layer of dirt” (*SN* 4:56) and “son of a million pig-dogs” (*SN* 8:154). Through employing the discursive strategy of dysphemism and making use of hate speech and pejorative expressions, social positions towards other races are established and communicated. Referring to English men using offensive expressions evokes and transfers negative judgments of them and consequently shapes people’s attitude and behaviour towards them.

Fragmentation and Nazi Ideology

Mode of Ideology	Fragmentation
Linguistic Strategy	Differentiation
Example	“subhuman people,” “non-German,” “un-German” & “not- Blood”
Linguistic devices	Prefixes
Effect	Emphasize difference Assort the masses into different groups Shape people’s social identity and social relations

Christians in *SN* are referred to through the use of the prefix “sub-” as marked in “subhuman people” (*SN* 4:71) which means under, below, beneath, less important, lower in rank, secondary and subordinate. All meanings of the prefix “sub-” indicate inferiority and subordination to a higher group of people and consequently emphasize differences between the two groups. In *SN*, prefixes classify citizens into humans and subhuman people. Differentiation is also pinpointed through other prefixes such as “non-” in saying “German” and “non-German” (*SN* 2:28) and the prefix “un-” such as “un-German” (*SN* 1:11). Germans are also referred to as the “Blood” and non-Germans as the “not- Blood” as demonstrated in saying, “We are the Blood. All you are the not-Blood” (*SN* 7:134). Though “not” is not a prefix but a content word negator, yet it performs the same function of “non-” and “un-” prefixes. It is employed as a function word which emphasizes difference. Prefixes fragment the unity of people in Hitler’s empire through assorting the masses into different groups. Fragmentation also shapes people’s social identity and social relations according to which group they fit into (i.e. human/subhuman; German/non-German; German/un-German; blood/not-blood).

Mode of Ideology	Fragmentation
Linguistic Strategy	Differentiation
Example	“better,” “superior,” “inferior,” “sacred,” “subject,” “holy,” “knightly” and “German”
Linguistic devices	Comparative & non-comparative adjectives
Effect	Instil diversity and categorize people

Comparative adjectives “better,” “superior” and “inferior” in saying “better man by Blood. He’s superior . . . inferior by blood” (*SN* 2:28) are also employed to emphasize distinction and variation between individuals. They place people into a scale of good and better or superior and inferior. Other non-comparative adjectives are also used to instil diversity such as “sacred,” “subject,” “holy,” “knightly” and “German” as mentioned in “sacred race” (*SN* 1:13), “subject race” (*SN* 2:17), “subject countries” (*SN* 2:30), “holy blood” (*SN* 2:21), “knightly blood” (*SN* 1:8), “knightly

German” (*SN* 1:7) and “German Hitlerians” (*SN* 1:5). Adjectives used fragment people into different races, countries, blood and status.

Mode of Ideology	Fragmentation
Linguistic strategy	Differentiation
Example	“savage” / “civilized” & “superior” / “inferior” “laymen” / “priests”
Linguistic devices	Antonyms
Effect	Shape people’s social identity

Likewise, antonyms are employed as a means of fragmenting the unity of people by categorizing them into “savage” versus “civilized” (*SN* 2:26), “superior” versus “inferior” (*SN* 2:28) and “laymen” versus “priests” (*SN* 7:135). These sets of antonyms are used as referential strategies to different groups or categories of people.

Mode of Ideology	Fragmentation
Linguistic Strategy	Differentiation
Example	“Hitlerian,” “Nazi,” “knight,” “foreign Hitlerian,” “German,” “non-German,” “Der Fuehrer,” “a knight’s son,” “foreigners” and “Christians”
Linguistic devices	Referential strategies
Effect	Fit people into different ranks in Hitler’s hierarchy Include and exclude people

Obviously, in Hitler’s society, there is a multiplicity of referential strategies which construct people’s social identity and their view of themselves as exemplified in “Hitlerian” (*SN* 2:29), “Nazi” (*SN* 1:7), “knight” (*SN* 1:7), “foreign Hitlerian” (*SN* 1:7), “German” (*SN* 7:134) “non-German” (*SN* 2:28), “Der Fuehrer” (*SN* 1:7), “a knight’s son” (*SN* 1:7), “foreigners” (*SN* 7:134) and “Christians” (*SN* 3:36). These referential strategies are also used as means of inclusion and exclusion as they categorize people according to Hitler’s social categories, fit them into different ranks in Hitler’s hierarchical system and define their social relations and attitudes towards each other.

Mode of Ideology	Fragmentation
Linguistic Strategy	Differentiation
Example	“We are Germans. We are holy. We are perfect” “we” and “you,” “our language” and “your language,” “our blood” and “your blood,” “our philosophy” and “your script”
Linguistic devices	Pronouns
Effect	Establish union and disunion Emphasize differences or similarities Categorize people into groups of we and you

Pronouns such as “we,” “you,” “our” and “your” are also employed as means of establishing exclusion as they emphasize either likeness or otherness as inferred from saying, “We are Germans. We are holy. We are perfect” (*SN* 6:121.) All members of the “We” group are similar, they

are all Germans and they are all holy and perfect. Pronouns establish union and disunion as illustrated in the following speech:

If our blood and our language are sacred we cannot have every little Russian and Italian and English boy acquiring our language as a birth language. It is not fit for such as you to have by right, you must learn it for our convenience, that's all. . . . We are the Blood. All you are the not-Blood. So you must speak your own languages and write your own script, and think in English, how holy we are. (SN 7:134)

Obviously, in this utterance, there are two groups: “we” and “you,” “our language” and “your language,” “our blood” and “your blood,” “our philosophy” and “your script.” So, pronouns are means of fragmenting unity of people and emphasizing dissimilarities among them.

Mode of Ideology	Fragmentation
Linguistic Strategy	Expurgation of the other
Example	“a race of subhuman people,” “a wild animal,” “fundamentally irreligious,” “a traitor,” “a self-confessed traitor,” “infidel,” “a blasphemer,” “an enemy,” “savage tribes,” “savages,” “tribal darkness,” “subject races,” “scum,” “a dirty foreigner,” “son of a million pig-dogs,” & “herds”
Linguistic devices	Dysphemism
Effect	Expurgate, debase and demonize the other obscure a version of reality and substitute it by another in service of power

Members of religious sects other than Hitlerism are devalued and dehumanized. Christians, for example, are represented as “a race of subhuman people” (SN 4:71) and “a wild animal” (SN 3:33). A person who has different thoughts and beliefs is represented as “a traitor” (SN 3:32), “a self-confessed traitor,” “infidel,” “a blasphemer” and “an enemy” (SN 3:31) who should be combated. Pre-Hitlerian civilizations such as English and French are degraded and depicted as “savage tribes” (SN 5:77), “savages” (SN 2:26), “tribal darkness” (SN 6:117) and “subject races” (SN 2:17) to distance people from their cultures and ethos. A non-German is described in insulting terms such as a “scum” (SN 4:56) and “a dirty foreigner” (SN 4:56 & 57). Non-Germans are compared to animals by referring to them in terms of “son of a million pig-dogs” (SN 8:154) and “herds” (SN 2:18) as a means of debasing him. Obviously, dysphemism is employed to attribute negative connotations to all different religions, civilizations and races, and to depreciate them in the interest of Hitlerian Ideology. In this sense, language is used to obscure a version of reality and substitute it by another in service of power. Expurgation is a means of defining the Other by diffusing a socially

constructed image of him as an inferior and urging him to accept it, internalize it and act according to it. Once the “Other” internalizes his inferiority, he accepts being controlled by his superiors.

Unification and Nazi Ideology

Mode of Ideology	Unification
Linguistic Strategy	Symbols of unity
Example	“Oath” “Heil Hitler” year of “Hitler 720” “our conception”
Linguistic devices	Oath, Laws, Creed, Myths, Salute, Date & possessive pronouns
Effect	Embrace people in a collective identity & worldview Confine people to a system of norms

It is noticed that Nazi ideology seeks to embrace people in a collective identity under the umbrella of its values and beliefs through constructing symbols of unity through discourse such as the “Oath” taken at 18 (SN 3:32), the immutable “laws” of Hitler’s society and the words of the “creed” which set the norms to which all citizens should conform. These norms are established to build unity through marking the boundaries between acceptable and unacceptable behaviour and stimulating people to act according to these norms. Also, Nazism in the world of the swastika propagates Myths to impose Hitlerism or the idea of Hitler is God to unite the German Empire together under the theocratic principles of Hitlerism. These legends venerate Hitler as a divine entity and set “Heil Hitler” as the standard Nazi salute among people. In addition to greeting terms, date is also used as a strategy of unifying the masses. Years are referred to by Hitler’s birth as remarked in saying, “in this year of the Lord Hitler 720” (SN 1:11). In consequence, people internalize the same worldview propagated by Hitler’s regime as inferred from “it’s all as it should be, it is our Lord’s will, it is men’s will, it is our will” (SN 1:10). People are unified through sharing the same will; they are all homogenized into one will that is their Lord’s will. Citizens’ recurrent use of the possessive pronoun “our” in “our salvation,” “our conception,” “our need” and “our sake” (SN 1:6) bands them together in a collective identity, vision and fate.

Findings and Implications

This study shows that legitimation and ideological operation strategies are used to impose and legitimize a socially constructed conception of men’s supremacy and women’s biological inferiority as well as Nazi superiority over all other races. Through verbal process clauses, imperative verbs, obligations and warnings, people are arranged in a hierarchical order of superiors and inferiors according to their gender, race, rank and religion. Race and gender discrimination is legitimized through representing it as a divine doctrine or an indisputable reality.

Epistemic modality is employed to give credence to illegitimate Nazi practices such as bloodshed, violence and brutality. Through appealing to discourses of moral values, abstractions and analogies, discriminative acts against women are naturalized and justified. Evaluative adjectives, suffixes, prefixes, noun modifiers and analogies are made use of to emphasize blood superiority of the German race. Obviously, language is used to legitimize the illegitimate in *SN*. Violence and misogynistic acts against women such as rape and sexual enslavement are rationally legitimized through representing them as means for a noble end. Generic sentences are used to naturalize men's brutal behaviour towards women by making them appear like natural acceptable behaviours. Acts are legitimized or delegitimized by reference to their positive or negative consequences. Predicting the disastrous impact brought about by breaching the social order and defiling the sacred Nazi blood is another strategy employed to delegitimize the defilement of the holy blood. Relational processes are used to communicate a negative repulsive knowledge about women, evoke emotions of contempt towards them and shape women's view of themselves and their gender. Hitler, in *SN*, is represented as a demi-god through the use of the strategy of mythopoesis which represents him as a divine source of power and represents his ideology as an altruistic one that should be obeyed as it seeks the benefit of the whole world. Hitler's cult legitimizes women's sexual abuse through means of displacement which alters people's knowledge of sexual relations by referring to rape as a non-crime and thereby sets men free from accusation. In *SN*, people's knowledge of reality is controlled through restricting different knowledge via means of displacement which substitutes reality with an ideological version of reality. Strategies of fragmentation are employed to emphasize gender inequality. All these linguistic tools collaborate together to set people apart into groups of different social categories as dictated by the Nazi discriminative ideology.

From the analysis of the linguistic strategies of operation of ideology and legitimation in *SN*, it is realized that the linguistic representation of reality is by no means a neutral depiction of an exterior reality. It entails a process of selection between different ways of representing that reality which brings about some transformations. These transformations are sometimes ideologically driven to shape people's knowledge of the world and affect their behaviour in the interest of some ideologies. Therefore, linguistic representation has a vital role in the ideological conditioning of subjects. Discursive strategies construct and diffuse ideologies and mobilize meaning in the interest of some ideological systems.

References

- Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses. In L. Althusser (Ed.), *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Burdekin, Katharine. (1985). *Swastika Night*. New York: Feminist Press.
- Foucault, Michel. (1980). *Power / Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*. London: Harvester Press.
- Hall, Stuart. (1997). The work of Representation. In S. Hall (Ed.), *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices* (1st ed., pp. 15-74). London: SAGE Publications Ltd. and Open University.
- Harvey, D. (1996). *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*. USA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Hayakawa, S. I. (1974). *Language in Thought and Action*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Klemperer, V. (2006). *The Language of the Third Reich. A Philologist's Notebook*. (1957). Translated by Martin Brady. London, New York: Continuum.
- Kuran, T. (1995). *Private truths, public lies: The social consequences of preference falsification*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Meusburger, P. (2015). Relations between Knowledge and Power: An Overview of Research Questions and Concepts. In P. Meusburger, D. Gregory & L. Suarsana (Eds.), *Geographies of Knowledge and Power*. Netherlands: Springer.
- Orwell, George. (1968). Politics and the English Language. In Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus (Eds.), *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters Of George Orwell*. Vol. 4, ed. 1, 127- 40. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Javanovich.
- Patai, Daphne. (1985). Introduction. In *Swastika Night* (pp. iii-xv). New York: Feminist Press.
- Sapir, Edward. (1929). The Status of Linguistics as a Science. *Language*, Vol. 5, No. 4 (Dec), pp. 207-214.
- Schneider, Karen. (1997). *Loving Arms: British Women Writing the Second World War*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.
- Thompson, John B. (1990). *Ideology and Modern Culture: Critical Social Theory in the Era of Mass Communication*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- van Dijk, Teun. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies* 11(2), 115-140.
- van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Whorf, B. L. (1956). Science and Linguistics. In J. B. Carroll (Ed.). *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf* (pp.207-219). NY: MIT Press.

Zake, I. (2002). The Construction of National(ist) Subject: Applying the Ideas of Louis Althusser and Michel Foucault to Nationalism. *Social Thought & Research*, 25(1/2), 217-246.