LANGUAGE IN INDIA

Strength for Today and Bright Hope for Tomorrow

Volume 11 : 9 September 2011

ISSN 1930-2940

Intertextual Semiosis: An Analysis of Implications of *The White Man's Burden* on Speeches of Albert J. Beveridge and President George W. Bush

Shahzad-ul-Hassan Farooqi

==========

Abstract

This research paper studies as to how intertextual semiosis is involved in linking various texts of different genres with a larger discursive pattern. In this regard the paper examines dominant determinants of American political rhetoric as used by Senator Albert J. Beveridge at the beginning of 20th century and President George W. Bush at the outset of 21st century and how both political figures, although disjunctive in time, intertextually draw upon Rudyard Kipling's poem *The White Man's Burden*. The significance of the poem's ideas and linguistic features is studied along with their implication for political rhetoric reflected in speeches of these two personalities. Intertextual analysis brings out an imperialistic mindset, a hegemonic ideology expressed in a narrative pattern, which permeates the political rhetoric used by these two political figures, under the influence of this poem which was written in 1899.

Key Words/Terms: Intertextuality, Semiosis, Political Rhetoric.

1. Introduction

Texts are inextricably embedded in society. They make meaning by being grounded in dominant discourses of society and are structured through discursive

practices fabricated in linguistically established features which people of a particular community adopt as communicative narratives. In order to ascertain as to what texts mean, it is important to determine as to which discourse they draw upon. In this regard intertextuality helps us find out the particular frame of reference within which we can ground a text for its interpretation.

Since antiquity, rhetorical use of language has been hallmark of political texts like speeches by leaders for capturing the public opinion. *Rhetoric* is the art of speaking or writing effectively (Marriam-Webster's online dictionary, 2011) and its primary purpose is to convince and persuade others. Like other texts, political texts are also intertextually structured by incorporating socially popular discourses, beliefs and ideologies which are considered unquestionable and true. These ideological beliefs carried in popular discourses are perpetuated through repetition so that people get more and more influenced by them. The more deeply a text is grounded in a popular discourse, the more convincing it will be. American political rhetoric also follows a linguistic pattern of drawing upon particular ideological beliefs. My text samples of American political rhetoric are speeches of political figures. These texts are simultaneously a government's perspective as well as a view of public representatives. This paper is an effort to determine as to how intertextual semiosis is involved in designing this political rhetoric, which, at two different points in history, is embedded in themes and ideas expressed in Kipling's poem *The White Man's Burden*.

2. Hypothesis

There is an intertextual link between Rudyard Kipling's poem *The White Man's Burden* and Political Rhetoric of Albert J. Beveredge and President George W.Bush.

3. Literature Review

The way an "utterance is a link in a very complexly organised chain of other utterances," (Bakhtin, 1986, p.69), similarly texts are related to other texts and discourses. Julia Kristeva (1974) asserts that a text signifies on the basis of other discourses existing prior to it and "every text is from the outset under the jurisdiction of other discourses which impose a universe on it" (as cited in Culler, 1981, p.105). She describes texts in terms of axes. Horizontal axis connects the writer and the reader while the vertical one connects a text with other texts (Kristeva, 1980). Jonathon Culler (1981) also observes that we understand a discussion "in terms of a prior body of discourse—other projects and thoughts which it implicitly or explicitly takes up, prolongs, cites, refutes, transforms" (p.101). Intertextuality refers to anything previously said. Stefan Titscher et al. (2000) relating Intertextuality to communication, propound that "every text is embedded in a context and is synchronically and diachronically related to many other texts" (p.24). Through intertextuality, a text may use, imply, or assume other texts. In a way, it is intertextuality which determines the identity of a text as to which discourse it belongs to. It also helps in establishing identity of the authority which generates that particular discourse.

Norman Fairclough (2003) explains intertextuality within the ambit of Critical Discourse Analysis by propounding a relational approach to texts. According to Relational Approach of Fairclough (2003) a text's composition is affected by two types of relations: Internal and external. Internal relations are concerned with those textual elements which linguistically construct a text. External relations are those effects and implications which other texts have on a particular text. Intertextuality is one such relation that a text has with other texts. It helps a text fit itself in a narrative pattern which is readily available for people to understand what text means.

4. Intertextuality and Semiosis

Norman Fairclough (1989) believes that texts belong to a "historical series" existing prior to them and for interpreting it intertextually, we need to link it up with that *series* (1989, p.152). On the basis of intertextuality, texts are related to other texts existing prior to it or on its sidelines, in form of popular discourses which are part of cognitive structure of people. He opines:

> Interpretation of intertextual context is a matter of deciding which series a text belongs to, and therefore what can be taken as common ground for participants or *presupposed*. (Fairclough, 1989, p.152)

An important aspect of intertextual interpretation is to look for *common ground.* When the *participants* of a communication process link up a text with the prior one, on the basis of some *common ground*, intertextual signification takes place. And when linking up with other texts on the basis of some *ground* becomes a conventionalised and regularised linguistic practice within a society, such practice signifies (what is signified) and functions as a sign. Realisation of such sign functioning is semiosis. Any such linguistic practice is like Ferdinand de Saussure's (1983) concept of *parole*, which is and has to be related with *langue* to make meaning. Saussure believed that *parole* is the individual act of language usage in social situations and the *langue* is the system which *parole* draws upon for having meaning. Any isolated act of communication which is not grounded in *langue* would make no sense to members of that particular community. In our meaning making habits we not only relate an act of *parole* to the linguistic *langue* but also to the conceptual *langue* of our society on the basis of which we are able to understand what signs mean. Fairclough (1989) describes this cognitive embeddedness of concepts as *members' resources* (p.11). Charles Sanders Peirce (1931-58) believes that it is on the basis of some *ground* that anything can stand to somebody for something as a sign. Hence, to function as a sign, a thing must refer to something else in the mind of the interpreter who interprets it on the basis of that relational *ground*. By the same implication, anything that refers to something else is a sign, provided that it is understood and interpreted as such by the community in which that discursive activity takes place.

Intertextuality is a significatory discursive practice which gives a text its particular signification. If a new text refers to other texts and it gains meaning through the

previous text's associated meanings, we may say that the new text functions like a signifier of the previous text whose associated meaning is signified. Hence intertextuality works as a sign by simply its presence in a text because it is through intertextuality that we relate a new text (signifier) to a previous one (signified) and interpret its meanings through intertextual semiosis in which meanings associated with a previous text become associated with the new text. Holthuis (1994) describes Intertextual semiosis as intertextual text processing (p.78). I take it as intertextual text signification because intertextuality signifies other texts. Tanner termed it as *semiotextuality* (2001:6,16).

Semiotextuality is something greater than Roland Barthes' (1957) concept of *Myth.* In Myth, signifier of a previous sign is dissociated from its original signified and then associated with a new signified, constituting a new mythological sign. In intertextual semiosis or semiotextuality, signifier and the signified of the first text do not change rather intertextually are involved in structuring a new text. Even if the signifiers change, their signification does not. They will bring to the mind of the reader, not only the signified concepts of the first text in particular but also the previous text on the whole and the entire ambit of perception associated with it, thus forming an intertextual sign. It will reflect as to what larger discourse a new text signifies.

Keeping in mind these ideas I will discuss as to how political texts of Albert J. Beveridge and President George W. Bush intertextually signify the discourse of *The White Man's Burden* and what signifiers in the texts of these political figures have been derived from a previous one, i.e., the poem.

5. Aspects of Intertextuality

Fairclough (2003) elaborated Intertextuality into two kinds: Explicit and Implicit.

Explicit Intertextuality: Explicit intertextual references appear in form of direct quotes or indirect speech. Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) describe explicit intertextuality as "presence in my discourse of the *specific words* of the other mixed with my words as for instance reported speech" (p.49). In explicit intertextuality other texts are directly present in a particular text in form of words and linguistic expressions which determine as to how the new text should be understood. I also take individual lexical items, which signify a similar idea in various texts, as explicit intertextuality.

Implicit Intertextuality: But Intertextuality is not only specifically lexical, but also conceptual. It is the entire field of experience, an idea or a thought which signifies a similar expression found somewhere else. It is implicit intertextuality. It cannot be discerned at the first glance because it is not directly visible. It is in form of (1) Presuppositions, (2) Entailment and (3) Implicature (Fairclough, 2003. p.40).

Presupposition is a back ground belief which is considered as already given (Levinson, 1983). For example President Bush's statement "Saddam Hussein who killed his own people" (2006) presupposes many things. It presupposes the capacity of Saddam to kill people. It also presupposes heightened brutality attributed to Saddam Hussain, which means that he was so much cruel that he killed his *own people*. It significantly

creates a perception about him which leads to the justification of action against such a cruel person. This concept of heightened brutality is not something within the text, rather it is a prior belief which is realised in the text. However, on the basis of this presupposition, the sentence above can be linked to the whole discourse of "Saddam's brutality and justification of action against him" which was made popular in media at a specific period.

Entailment means what comes after the utterance. For example sentence *I have a rose* automatically entails that I have a flower. All statements have a number of entailments. If we agree and accept that "Saddam Hussein who killed his own people" (Bush, 2006), then it will naturally entail that he was a killer and which in turn will once again legitimize the action against him because a killer must be brought to justice. By designating Saddam as killer through entailment, this sentence is also intertextually linked to the whole discourses of "Saddam's brutality and justification of action against him".

Implicature is anything that is inferred from an utterance (Gazdar, 1979, p.49). It is the meaning which is less straight and implied. For example the statement "Saddam Hussein who killed his own people" (Bush, 2006) by implicature could mean that if he could kill his own people, then how brutal could he be with other nations. This implicature would again legitimatize the action taken against such a brute, by forming a specific world view. Suggesting by implicature that Saddam could kill other people as well, the sentence becomes part of the same discourse of "Saddam's brutality and justification of action against him".

Primarily all this linking up is based on the notion of "experiential value*"* which words have (Fairclough, 1989, p.110). It means that words describe a particular experience. They create identities or representations. Various words can describe a particular experience on the basis of their shared value. This value can be associated with particular things, people or even discourses. If various words, expressions signify one particular discourse on the basis of their shared experiential value i.e. what they represent, they would become signs of a common signified. This signified could be a text or a discourse on the whole. In this regard two things are to be kept in mind.

- Through explicit intertextuality, similar words, linguistic choices or expressions (*signifiers)* in various texts can signify one *signified* concept.
- Through implicit intertextuality, different words, linguistic choices or expressions (*signifiers*) may presuppose, entail, or imply or in other words, signify similar *signified.*

In this way, *Intertextual semiosis* is the hidden reservoir of meanings and we need to determine it, relate it and interpret it. It helps a text present a specific world view which is passed on to the reader or addressee unknowingly and manipulatively.

6. ***The White Man's Burden***

Rudyard Kipling's poem *The White Man's Burden* holds very important place in American political rhetoric because written in 1899 in American colonial perspective, the poem is built on linguistic and thematic structures, which are representative of colonial discourse (Eckstein, 2007). The poem represents a peculiar discourse of Western thought. Under the preconceived notion of racial and cultural superiority, Kipling presents or rather represents the non-American, or in broader perspective, non-Western cultures as something less developed by characterizing them through words reflective of their presumed debaseness. In a persuasive manner the poem elevates the identity of the white race, which is called upon to take up great mission of civilizing others. This research paper tries to determine as to how words and ideas of the poem continue to be signified intertextually in subsequent political rhetoric of Senator Beveridge as well as President George W. Bush almost in a narrative pattern.

7. Methodology and Delimitation

This paper adopts Relational Approach of Norman Fairclough (2003, 1989) with prime focus delimited to intertextuality as significatory practice. How a text relates itself with other texts through its textual features. The analysis oscillates between textual features, which are intertextually related to the discourse which the texts draw upon.

An important role of Intertextuality is that it creates identity of texts as well as the identity of those, texts speak about. It gives a specific flavour to texts and becomes a representation of particular world view. According to Fairclough, texts create *representation* as part of their meanings (2003, p.26). I take *representation* synonymous with *creating identity.* Texts create identity of the people about whom they speak and give information or with whom they are simply associated. A simple word "We" describes inclusiveness of the speaker and the listener. It also conveys royalty, superiority or authority of the speaker. In this way vocabulary significantly creates representations of things, because things are not simply described, they are represented.

Analysis in this paper moves forward in conformity with how, in what kind of language choices and in what context Rudyard Kipling takes up various issues related with *representation* or *identity* of the White Man. In other words, how Kipling represents white man's self-image and image of other peoples. Moreover, how this *representation* intertextually appears in American Senator Albert J. Beveridge's (1908) speech "Our Philippine Policy" in the U.S. Senate on 9 January, 1900 and various speeches of President George W. Bush since 9/11 incident in 2001 to 1st May 2003.

In this regard focus has been given as to how within texts of Kipling, Beveridge and President Bush:

1- Similar linguistic choices *(signifiers)* can signify a concept or discourse through explicit intertextuality.
2- How different signifiers can signify similar characteristics, concepts or discourses (*signifieds)* in various texts through implicit intertextuality.

In both cases similarity of *signifiers* brought out by explicit intertextuality and similarity of *signifieds* brought out through implicit intertextuality in various texts would suggest that there is an intertextual relation among them.

In the light of these methodological delimitations now I analyse the intertextual link of *The White Man's Burden* and its implications for speeches of U.S. Senator Albert J. Beveridge and President George W. Bush. The analysis will yield as to how these different texts are intertextually unified on the basis of intertextual semiosis, i.e signification of their intertextual signs and the discourse they draw upon.

8. Analysis

Words are constituting elements of texts and the kind of words, linguistic choices or expressions a text has, constitutes the identity of that text and the discourse type it draws upon. Kipling represents the white man in the poem through using words like, *best breed, sons, exile,* and things associated with him are *living, light, God and you* and *common things.* Whereas, other nations are represented as *fluttered folk, new caught sullen peoples, wild, half child, captives* and things associated with them are *dead, night* and *rule of kings.* Besides, there is a consistent use of *verbs* in relation with self-image and *nouns* or *adjectives* in relation with others. For example imperative usage of *take up, go, bind, serve, send, abide, check, seek, work, fill full, make, mark, better, guard, humour, call loud, will, do,* represent an active, dynamic, focussed, decision taking person which reflects prudence and sagacity. In contrast, the other peoples are *half devil, half child, captive, sullen peoples,* who are *new-caught,* full of *blame, hate,* and *cry.* The experiential value of all these words, i.e., as to what and whose experience do they narrate, constitutes a superior self-image of the white man and degenerated representation of others.

Now we see how these identities permeate the poem and speeches of American political figures exhibiting an intertextual nexus of the three. The poem opens with an inscription of moral nature.

> Take up the White Man's burden. (1)

Right in the beginning, the poem presupposes that the white man has a burden to take up and he has ability to take it up. The question is what this burden is? It is the civilising mission. When somebody takes up a duty willingly, it reflects his or her positive attitude towards life. By making the taking up of burden, binding for the white man, the poet suggests by implicature that the white man has positive attitude and higher purposes in life. It is a psychological strategy to accrue sense of superiority and self exaltation. This thought finds expression in Senator Beveridge's speech (1908) in following words.

> We will not repudiate our **duty** in the archipelago. We will not abandon our opportunity in the Orient. We will not renounce our part in the **mission** of our race. (p.59)

He is of the view that the American colonial enterprise in Philippines is of moral nature. It is a *mission* and being a superior race, it is binding upon the white man to take up this mission. The binding nature of responsibility in poem and speech equates burden and the mission. Senator Beveridge's argument intertextually signifies the *burden* mentioned in the poem and pursues other Senators in the U.S. Senate to take up the burden of civilising mission in new territories. Such mission, in many ways, is full of drudgery, unwelcoming or thankless service as Kipling says in line No. 35 and 36 that the white man will get nothing but *hate* and *blame* in response to service to others. Moreover, this mission demands many sacrifices. In spite of its daunting nature, such an altruism of the white man for other nations is yet another golden feather adorning the American head.

In the perspective of the war on terrorism, taking up the burden of defending American values of *freedom* and *justice* rests with the American nation. Being a sole superpower, America must take the responsibility of defending what President Bush terms as "all that is good and just in our world" (2001a). It is always a matter of being chosen one that one is placed in such circumstances where one has to take such a leading role. It is a responsibility which in the words of President Bush "is already clear" (2001b). And from Afghanistan to Iraqi campaign, the sense of taking up the burden persists. In his address to the nation President Bush said:

> Free nations have a **duty to defend** our people by uniting against the violent. And tonight, as we have done before, America and our allies accept that **responsibility**. (2003b)

This burden finds expression in President Bush's speeches, sometimes as "**calling of our time"** (2001b), sometimes as "**mission and our moment"** (2001c) and sometimes as **challenge**. In his address outlining Iraqi threat he says:

> We did not ask for this present **challenge,** but we accept it. Like other generations of Americans, **we will meet the responsibility** …. (2002d)

In his remarks from the ship USS Abraham Lincoln President Bush puts all the visions regarding the white man's burden together.

> We're working with a broad coalition of nations that understand the threat and our **shared responsibility** to meet it. The use of force has been -- and remains -- our last resort. Yet all can know, friend and foe alike, that **our nation has a mission**. (2003c)

By describing its political enterprise in terms of mission and responsibility, America seeks high-flown moral ground for itself. For this purpose, a metaphysical agency is created: It is sometimes "the commitments of our fathers" (2001b), which is binding Americans to this duty and sometimes it is *history* which has called American

nation towards this duty. In his State of the Union Address the President said, "**History has called America** and our allies to action (2002a).

It is important to note that projection of mission and duty as a call of history is not only a semiotic device to accrue authority but also an intertextual discursive practice. This has been done in every civilization. In his address to the nation, President Bush again terms the campaign against terrorism as a call of history:

> **History has called our nation into action. History has placed a great challenge before us**: Will America -- with our unique position and power -- blink in the face of terror, or will we lead to a freer, more civilized world? There's only one answer: This great **country will lead the world to safety, security, peace and freedom.** (2002b)

Intertextually, Senator Beveridge also constructs the *mission* as holy trust given by *history* by Senator Beveridge. In his speech "Our Philippine Policy" (1908) his reference to *history* and what it signifies, exactly matches the words of President George W. Bush. Both refer to history as source of authority and superiority. President Bush's construction of sentence "Will America ….blink in face of terror…?" (2002b) signifies the same commitment to the mission and duty as the words of Senator Beveridge "what shall **history** say of us? Shall it say that we renounced that holy trust….?" (1908, p.85). In both cases the answer is exactly the same. Senator Beveridge (1908) says *No*!, thereby implying that his nation as "ablest, noblest race" will "captain and command" the mission (p.85). In a similar way President Bush negates his question and by implicature asserts "one answer" that his "great country will lead the world" (2002b).

Different signifiers like mission, duty, responsibility, have been used in speeches, signifying the similar signified concept of *burden*, associated with the White Man. Hence, *burden* is intertextually present in all the three texts as various other words like mission, duty, responsibility have similar experiential value, i.e., they constitute the same experience. There is also explicit intertextuality when President and Beveridge refer to *history* as an Agency supervising the mission.

In order to take up this burden, Kipling (1994) in his poem proposes:

> Send forth the best ye breed
> Go; bind your sons to exile. (2-3)

Rebecca Ann Bach (2000) narrates that sending *sons* abroad for the purpose of warfare, education and exploration has been a tradition the Western nobility followed since the time of Shakespeare (p.1). This tradition finds reflection in Kipling's poem as explicit intertextuality when he calls for binding *sons* to exile. The legacy continues as Senator Beveridge (1908) is also mindful of the fact that execution of the civilising mission has been a task carried out by the noblest *sons* of the American nation.

> …as a Nation, every historic duty we have done, every achievement we have accomplished, has been by the sacrifice of our noblest **sons**. (pp.86-87)

The same explicit intertextual reference to *sons* is also to be found in President Bush's speech when he says:

> Today, those sacrifices are being made by members of our Armed Forces who now defend us so **far from home**, and by their proud and worried families. A Commander-in-Chief sends **America's sons and daughters** into a battle in a **foreign land** only after the greatest care and a lot of prayer. We ask a lot of those who wear our uniform….They are dedicated, they are honorable; **they represent the best of our country**. (Bush, 2001d)

Use of *sons* for those serving the nation by Kipling, Beveridge and President reflects explicit intertextual sharing in them. Through intertextual semiosis one text signifies the other and the other signifies yet another.

The concept of *best breed* is signified in President Bush through words of *Best of our country* associated with *sons and daughters* of army. While Kipling's verse "Send forth the best ye breed" (2) literally calls for sending the best among the Americans to war, President's words that sons and daughters of American military "represent the best of our country (Bush, 2001d) and Beveridge's "noblest sons" (1908, pp.87) assume that those who are already engaged in war and the army are the best. In other words, the President and the Senator appear to shower their praise on those who serve the army and through it their nation. Similarly *best breed* and *best sons* entail a superior generation among the citizens of the country. Senator Beveridge (1908) also is mindful of the concept when he says that in order to embark on the civilising mission in Philippines, administrators of "highest example of our civilisation" (p.75) are required to be sent there. *Best breed*, *best of our country* and *noblest sons* or *highest example* are but different signifiers which have similar signified idea intertextually shared by these texts. They reflect intertextual sharing at the level of implicitness, besides drawing upon similar discourse of the burden of the white man. Sending sons to *exile* by Kipling, President's acknowledgement that sons and daughters of Armed forces *defend us far from home*, and Beveridge's conviction about sending administrator abroad, are also but different signifiers of the same signified discourse. What we actually find here is an indirect replication or implicit intertextual reference of Kipling's concept as reflected in lines 2-3 of the poem mentioned above. Following Kipling, President Bush constructs identity of members of his army in term of a foreign campaign, thereby knowingly or unknowingly implying an intertextual nexus between his own rhetoric and that of Kipling. The whole argument suggests by implicature that the way burden and the mission described in earlier discourse like that of Kipling and Beveridge is commendable due to its moral justification, similarly the operation of the army in current war against terrorism is appreciable.

We can also find intertextual nexus among three texts in the description of the purpose of campaigns, made binding for the white man. The purpose behind all the campaigns is to seek good for others. Kipling (1994) says that the purpose of the colonial enterprise is **"**To serve your captives' need;" (4). And again in second stanza of the poem, he says that the motive behind the white man's struggle is "To seek another's profit / And work another's gain" (15-16). He repeats this aim of seeking others' interest also in third stanza saying: "And when your goal is nearest / The end for others sought" (21-22). Kipling repeatedly emphasizes in all these lines that it is good of others which is the aim of "wars of peace" (18). All these different expressions presuppose that there is a purpose behind sending sons abroad as part of colonial enterprise and this purpose is good of others. It is an effort to euphemize the purpose of the colonial occupation behind the civilizing mission of the empire. The same rhetorical pretext is intertextually signified in Beveridge's words when he says that the purpose of American enterprise in Philippines is noble as it aims at establishing system where people are suffering under chaos. Both the texts signify one discourse which is crafted to justify the mission on the basis of its goodness for others. Signifiers are different, signified is the same. Senator Beveridge (1908) says:

> He [God] has made us the master organizers of the world to establish system where chaos reigns. He has given us the spirit of progress to overwhelm the forces of reaction throughout the earth. He has made us adepts in government that we may administer government among savage and senile peoples. (p.84)

President Bush has also been highlighting the moral purpose of the military campaigns in Afghanistan and Iraq. Hence, the war is justified on the ground that it is primarily for the good of the others, not of us. This has been reiterated in the American political rhetoric of Beveridge. Same is repeated in President Bush's declaration. In his remarks at National Day of Prayer the President staters that war on terror has a purpose and this is "to answer these attacks and rid the world of evil" (2001b). Nobility of purpose, which all these texts entail, creates an intertextual nexus of President Bush, Beveridge and Kipling. Before launching the military campaign in Afghanistan, President Bush justifies it on the ground that it is for the good of Afghanistan's people:

> When the terrorists and their supporters are gone, the people of Afghanistan will say with the rest of the world: good riddance. (2001e)

The way colonizer served their *captives' need* and Beveridge wanted to improve the chaotic lives of Filipinos**,** similarly the United States' military campaign is for ridding Afghan people of terrorists. Same justification is adopted in case of Iraq. President Bush justifies the campaign against Iraq on moral grounds, as its aim is to liberate Iraqi people from a cruel regime:

> Liberty for the Iraqi people is a great moral cause, and a great strategic goal. The people of Iraq deserve it; the security of all nations requires it. (2002c)

We see that military campaign, as a signifier, is associated with seeking other's profit. At first this signifier refers to profit for Afghanistan's people. Then the same signifier is associated with profit of Iraqi people thereby suggesting through implicature that the way military campaign proved good for Afghan people, similarly it will prove beneficent for Iraqi people. The President is of the view that when the military campaign in Iraq will come to an end, "the first and greatest benefit will come to Iraqi men, women and children" (Bush, 2002c).

Being best breed, implies being virtuous and kind which entails that any act performed by such a breed will be a best act or an act of kindness and compassion. The President speaks out in the same address in following words

> By our resolve, we will give strength to others. By our courage, we will give hope to others. (Bush, 2002c).

In his remarks on 1st May 2003, President Bush finally underlines the purpose the war has served. He says that American military was successful in serving other's need and "bring liberty to others" (2003c).

In this way, mitigating suffering of other people has been a projected aim of American political rhetoric, old and new. In the above discussion we have seen that all the good, mission, duty, responsibility and nobility of purpose emanates from the American self.

The question arises as to who these others are who are beneficiaries of the noble mission of the white man? Kipling's concept of *Other* is reflective from how he portrays natives nations as *Fluttered folk and wild* and *new-caught sullen peoples*, who are *devils* and *childish***.** These words are intertextually reflected in Senator Beveridge's speech when he terms Filipinos as *savage blood, Malay blood, barbarous race,* whereas describes his own people as *noblest sons***.** Experiential value of all these expressions implies evil nature of other identified nations and these have been used by leaders of other civilizations as well in their own contexts. Similar intertextual inheritance finds expression in President Bush's speeches who constituted the identity of enemy as *evil*, as *worst of human nature,* while presented American people as *best* and portrayed America as *beacon of liberty***,** as *home of freedom* and *justice* (Bush 2001a)**.** All these different signifiers intertextually signify *similar* characteristics (*signifieds)* associated with the white man and *Others* in various texts.

In the following lines of the poem, Rudyard Kipling (1994) constitutes identity of the white man as a person who does not run away with emotions; who is self controlled and sagacious.

> Take up the White Man's burden--
> In patience to abide,

To veil the threat of terror
And check the show of pride; (9-12)

The white man has been asked to patiently work for controlling the threat of terror and pride. The white man is presupposed to have patience in difficult times. Patience signifies sagacity and superiority of character. Quite a similar picture emerges in the speech of Senator Beveridge who opines that the administrators or representatives of America "must be men of the world and of affairs, students of their fellow-men, not theorists nor dreamers. They must be brave men, physically as well as morally" (1908, pp.75-76), in short, men of high character. Both texts create white man's identity as a person capable of possessing superior traits of character.

President Bush on a number of occasions presents himself and his nation as full of resolve yet patient and self-restrained. In his address to joint session of Congress he says:

Fellow citizens, we'll meet violence with **patient justice** --
assured of the rightness of our cause, and confident of the
victories to come. (2001c)

As in Kipling's poem we notice similar linguistic choice *patience* as signifier of a sagacious, superior *self* is found President Bush's text and this reflects explicit intertextuality. Being patient entails a superior character. Hence, it is nobility of character which has been associated with the American nation in both texts. Intertextuality at both implicit and explicit level is there.

Following lines of Kipling's poem (1994) reflect some of the most important aspects of American way of thinking which continues to be reflected in later political rhetoric of Beveridge and President Bush.

Take up the White Man's burden--
The savage wars of peace—
Fill full the mouth of Famine,
And bid the sickness cease; (17-20)

Every nation projects its stance for going to war as justified and right on the basis of some plea. It is not necessarily peculiar of American political rhetoric that it projects its military campaigns as means to establish peace in the world. Cecil Rhode in his *Will* "The Confession of Faith" says that the primary objective of colonial occupation and "absorption of the greater portion of the world under our rule simply means the end of all wars" (1976, p-249). Senator Beveridge (1908) comes up with a similar argument when he says that colonizing Philippines is "the divine mission of America", as "We are trustees of the world's progress, guardians of its righteous peace." It entails that establishment of, what Beveridge terms as, *system* in place of *chaos* is the prime target of the Americans (Beveridge, 1908, pp.84,85).

Similar aim was set by the President Bush for his war on terror. From uniting Americans in "resolve for justice and peace" (Bush, 2001a) and waging "a war to save civilization" (Bush, 2001e), to laying down the purpose of military action as "help" of "Iraqi people rebuild their economy, and create institutions of liberty in a unified Iraq at peace with its neighbours" (Bush. 2002d), the President continues projecting that "We seek a just and peaceful world beyond the war on terror" (Bush. 2002a). The purpose of the war on terror is also to establish system in place of chaos. The war on terror is actually the *war of peace***.** Besides explicitly sharing expressions containing direct usage of words *war* and *peace*, the experiential value of these texts is same; they signify a unity of purpose. So, the discourse they generate or draw upon is colonial one where going to war is justified for establishing peace in the world.

Directive to *fill full the mouth of famine* in line No. 19 of the poem (Kipling, 1994) presupposes that the white man has ability to perform such a gigantic task. Superiority is presupposed here. As the white man is caught up in a war on various fronts, military action is one front and humanitarian assistance is another. The way these humanitarian issues run side by side in the poem, so they are in speeches of Senator Beveridge and President Bush. Senator Beveridge refers to England's superior government in Egypt which successfully turned the "deserts into gardens, famine into plenty" (1908, p.77). By implicature he foresees a similar task for America in Philippines. Feeding the hungry and helping humanity also remained prime task of the President Bush during the war on terror. In his address to the nation he says:

> **As we strike military targets, we'll also drop food**, medicine and supplies to the starving and suffering men and women and children of Afghanistan. (Bush, 2001d)

The President highlights the same theme in State of the Union Address on 28 January 2003. He says:

> Across the Earth, **America is feeding the hungry** -- more than 60 percent of international food aid comes as a gift from the people of the United States. (Bush, 2003a)

Hence, in line with Kipling's proposal, humanitarian aid to other nations remains a dominant subject of American political rhetoric. *Feeding the hungry*, *dropping food*, *turning famine into plenty* and *filling the mouth of famine* are but various signifiers which intertextually signify the same signified i.e. what the white man can do as superior *self*.

Following lines of the poem presuppose the role of Americans as goal achiever, as planner, while the other nations, by implicature are presented as disruptor and problem creator. Kipling writes:

> And when your goal is nearest
> The end for others sought
> Watch Sloth and heathen Folly
> Bring all your hope to nought. (21-24)

The civilizing mission is always facing risk of being jeopardized by those backward *Others* whom Kipling (1994) has already termed as *half devils and half child* (8). This binary construction of Americans as superior and *others* as inferior and debased may be identified explicitly in the speech of Senator Beveridge. Beveridge is always mindful that "in dealing with the Filipinos we deal with children" because they are "Savage blood, oriental blood, Malay blood" (1908, pp.72&73). Similarly, by taking a leading role in war on terror, America once again assumes its superiority to plan and lead. When the President says "Today, our nation saw evil (2001a)", he entails that an evil *Other* was out there in the form of attackers and evil planners who wanted to destroy the beacon of *freedom* and *liberty*. He suggests through implicature that there is an equal need to develop a counter sagacious plan, which he says, America has always done and will also do this time (Bush. 2001a). These various signifiers or linguistic choices signify one idea of evil nature of the specified *other* (the attackers of 9/11) and the sagacious *self*, constituting an implicit intertextual reference.

Following verses of Kipling's poem uphold what may be called as American dream to raise human dignity by establishing democracy in the world:

> Take up the White Man's burden--
> No tawdry rule of kings,
> But toil of serf and sweeper--
> The tale of common things. (25-28)

The white man takes up the duty to make the world a better place where there is no despot and the government is run by common people. Peoples' government is an achievement, which the American white man is proud of. As Senator Beveridge (1908) puts it, "they are not of a self-governing race" (p.71). Hence, it is responsibility of the civilized West to transplant these ideals of democracy by showing other nations its real examples. In his speech Senator Beveridge (1908) says:

> **Example** for decades will be necessary to instruct them in American ideas and methods of administration. (p.73)

President Bush also upholds American ideals of democracy and establishes an argument that Iraqi people also deserve self-rule and democracy through the removal of the Saddam regime. In his remarks at the UN General Assembly President says that if Iraq meets certain demands, then ultimately the United Nations may help it "build a government that represents all Iraqis" (Bush, 2002c). Hence, the white man will fulfill his duty and will help framing rules of good governance to other backward nations, paving way for a new era where:

> The people of Iraq can shake off their captivity… join a democratic Afghanistan and a democratic Palestine, inspiring reforms throughout the Muslim world. These nations can show by their **example** that honest government, and respect for women, and the great Islamic tradition of

> learning can triumph in the Middle East and beyond. (Bush, 2002c)

President Bush believes democratization of Iraq will inspire the Muslim world, suggesting by implicature that Muslim world may opt for American-type of democracy and rule of people. There is an intertextual flashback of Senator Beveridge's words that *examples for decades* are required for teaching such nations the way of self-rule. All this entails that the purpose of the *war* is the ultimate establishment of peace and it has to be achieved through dethroning *rule of kings*. Under the compulsion of self-adopted moral duty to establish *democratic government*, this mission was taken to Philippines one century ago, now it is being taken to Afghanistan and Iraq. Perhaps it will soon spill over into Arab countries. What American political rhetoric foresees is that removal of *rule of kings* and installation of democracy and rule of liberty everywhere in the world is final destination of humanity. Hence in all the three texts self-image is intertextually projected as democratic loving American nation which will implant democracy in other countries.

Making and *Marking* is another aspect of political rhetoric. When somebody marks a thing, he or she starts possessing that thing. When we name something we actually frame something. Through this, places are renamed, identities are re-represented and histories re-written in every civilization. It is primarily aimed at exerting hegemony through showing one's presence. In the following lines of the poem, Rudyard Kipling alludes to this strategic significatory practice.

> The ports ye shall not enter,
> The roads ye shall not tread,
> Go make them with your living
> And mark them with your dead. (29-32)

A straight forward explanation of these lines is that the white man's colonial enterprise revolves around making, re-making and improving the uncivilized lands which he occupies. In this way he leaves marks of his cultural superiority and beneficiary mission in those lands. But simultaneously this mission is demanding. It demands human blood and price of lives. This is how marks of presence are imprinted on the world—through dying for the cause. Senator Beveridge says that in order to make a land one's own and discharge mission, sacrifice of life is prerequisite:

> ...in the service of the Republic ... Americans consider wounds the noblest decorations man can win, and count the **giving of their lives** a glad and precious duty. (1908, p.87)

Hence, to "mark them with your dead" (32) reflects another aspect of American political rhetoric through which sacrificing lives for the country is projected as part of the sacred mission. This is a topic which has popped up a number of times in President Bush's speeches. For example in remarks from USS Abraham Lincoln on 1 May 2003, President lauds those who lost their lives during duty:

> **Those we lost were last seen on duty**. Their final act on this Earth was to fight a great evil and bring liberty to others. (2003c)

As a matter of fact, all this political rhetoric reflects a flow of thought that is present since beginning up to the modern times in every civilization. Kipling's words, *mark them with your dead,* Beveridge's appreciation for Americans *giving lives,* and Bush's homage for those *lost* in the way of duty are all signifiers which signify a lofty American *self,* which sacrifices life for others.

Along side the construction of mighty stature of the white man, the poem also constructs other nations. The consciousness of "the blame of those ye better" (35) and "**hate** of those you guard**"** (36), in stanza five of Kipling's (1908) poem implies what would be the return for the good the white man seeks. It is an all-pervasive feature of political rhetoric. President Bush, relishing the self-praise, claims that "They **hate** our freedom" (2001c). Hate and blame entail opposition and challenge. That is why President Bush says that Americans "face new challenges" (Bush, 2001e). Association of *Hate* with those who are opposed is intertextually shared perception of white men which we find explicitly in texts of Kipling and the President.

Following lines of last stanza of Rudyard Kipling's poem "The White Man's Burden" (1994), "Take up the White Man's burden-- / Ye dare not stoop to less--" (41-42) are imbued with the sense of superiority. They construct a self-image by narrating as to what the white man opts for. It suggests that the white man, never opts for lesser things, never bows to lesser objectives. Superiority of character and purpose is presupposed. Following this concept, Senator Beveridge claims that Americans shall not abandon their duty and opportunity in Philippines and fulfill the mission as able and noble race. He presupposes that there is ability and nobility of character in the white race. Similarly, President Bush claims that Americans always stand for *human dignity*, and *all that is good and just* (2001a). When one stands for *all* the goodness and justness, one becomes representative of it and signifies it. As *all* is an open ended word which has no limits, so is the stature that represents it. Experiential value of words in different texts reflects an implicit intertextual linkage of the signification, as all of them signify superiority and magnanimity of the white man.

Magnanimity of character is more vividly reflected through magnanimity of deeds. That is why Kipling (1908) says:

> By all ye leave or do,
> The silent sullen peoples
> Shall weigh your God and you. (46-48)

These lines imply that whatever magnanimous will the white man do, will reflect greatness of God. By implicature it suggests a link between human actions and God. Magnanimity of the white man's character is signified through magnanimity of God. This parallel is yet another device to accrue authority and superiority and we find it in every

civilization. No wonder, describing colonial mission as God's divine plan by Senator Beveridge is also such a device to accrue authority and a sense of superiority. He says:

> ...He [God] has marked the American people as his chosen nation to finally lead in regeneration of the world. This is the divine mission of America. (Beveridge (1908, p.84)

Similar rhetoric of linking God with one's deeds, finds expression in President Bush's speeches when he says that by embarking on the mission of war on terror, he submits his will to a "will greater" (Bush, 2001b). At another place President Bush claims that in the war between freedom and fear "God is not neutral" (Bush, 2001c), implying thereby that as we are on freedom's side so is God on our side. In all these texts *God* stands for an explicit intertextual sharing through which what is accrued is authority and superiority of the American system.

9. Conclusion

In light of the above discussion it can be concluded that through intertextual semiosis, texts not only signify the signifieds associated with previous texts' signifiers, they also signify the whole of the discourse they draw upon for meaning making. It follows from the discussion that political texts are intertextually structured and by determining what intertextuality signifies in them, we can establish what discursive structure these texts are part of.

By using conventionally adopted signifiers American political rhetoric creates an identity of superior self, which ultimately binds American nation to embark on a particular mission. This mission is projected sometimes as entrusted to the American nation by history or sometimes by God. In all cases, superiority accrues.

The American identity is projected as someone benign, sagacious, determined and committed to sacrifice for others.

==========

References

Bach, Rebecca Ann. (2000) Colonial Transformations; the cultural production of the new Atlantic world 1580-1640. New York: Palgrave.

Bakhtin, M. (1986). "The problem of speech genres." Speech Genres and Other Late Essays. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Barthes, Roland. (1957). Mythologies . Trans. Annette Levers. New York: Hill and Wang.

Beveridge, Albert J. (1908). "Our Philippine Policy." The Meaning of The Times and Other Speeches. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill.

Bush, George W.(2001a). "Address to the Nation." 11 Sep. 2001 http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010911-16.html. retrieved on 20 Sep. 2004

Bush, George W.(2001b). "Remarks at National Day of Prayer and Remembrance" 14 Sep. 2001 http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010914-2.html retrieved on 20 Sep. 2004.

Bush, George W.(2001c). "Address to Joint Session of Congress and American People." 20 Sep. 2001 http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html retrieved on 20 Sep. 2004.

Bush, George W.(2001d). "Address to the Nation." 7 October, 2001 http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011007-8.html retrieved on 20 Sep. 2004.

Bush, George W.(2001e). "Address to the Nation to Discusses War on Terrorism." 8 Nov. 2001 http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/11/20011108-13.html retrieved on 20 Sep. 2004.

Bush, George W.(2002a). "State of the Union Address." 29 Jan. 2002 http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html retrieved on 20 Sep. 2004.

Bush, George W.(2002b)"Address to the Nation" 6 June 2002. http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/06/20020606-8.html retrieved on 20 Sep. 2004.

Bush, George W.(2002c) "Remarks at the United Nations General Assembly" 12 Sep. 2002 http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/09/20020912-1.html retrieved on 20 Sep. 2004.

Bush, George W.(2002d). "Address Outlining Iraqi Threat." 7 Oct. 2002 http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/10/20021007-8.html retrieved on 20 Sep. 2004.

Bush, George W.(2003a). "State of the Union address." 28 Jan. 2003 http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/01/20030128-19.html retrieved on 20 Sep. 2004.

Bush, George W.(2003b). "Address to the Nation Warning Saddam to Leave Iraq Within 48 Hours." 17 Mar.2003 http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/03/20030317-7.html retrieved on 20 Sep. 2004.

Bush, George W.(2003c)"Remarks from the USS Abraham Lincoln Announcing End of Major Combat Operations in Iraq." 1 May, 2003 http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/05/20030501-15.html retrieved on 20 Sep. 2004.

Bush, George W.(2006). "Remarks by the President at the 2006 President's Dinner." 19 June. 2006. Washington, D.C http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2006/06/20060619-14.html retrieved on 29 April, 2007

Chandler, Daniel. (2002) Semiotics, The Basics. London: Routledge.

Chouliaraki, L. and Fairclough, N. (1999) Discourse in Late Modernity, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Culler, Jonathan. (1981) The Pursuit of Signs. London: Kegan Paul.

Eckstein, Lars. (Ed.) (2007). English Literatures Across the Globe. W.Fink: Paderborn

Fairclough, Norman.(2003) Analysing Discourse; Textual Analysis For Social Research. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, Norman.(1989) Language and Power. London: Longman.

Gazdar, Gerald. (1979).Pragmatics: Implicature, presupposition, and logical form. New York: Academic.

Holthuis, Susainne. (1994). "Intertextuality and meaning constitution." In Janos S. Petofi & Terry Olivi (Eds.), Approaches to Poetry: Some Aspects of Textuality, Intertextuality and Intermediality. Berlin: de Gruyter. (Original work published 1990)

Kipling , Rudyard.(1994). "The White Man's Burden." The Collected Poems of Rudyard Kipling. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Ltd.

Kristeva, Julia. (1974). "La Revolution du Langage Poetique." Paris: Seuil.

Kristeva, Julia. (1980). Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art. New York: Columbia University Press.

Levinson, Stephen C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University.

Peirce, Charles S. (1931-58) Collected Papers. Eds. Charles Hartshorne, Paul Weiss and Arthur W.Burks. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Rhetoric. (2011). In Marriam-Webster's online dictionary. Retrieved March 20, 2011 from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/rhetoric

Rhodes, Cecil. (1976). "The Confession of Faith."1877. See John Flint. Cecil Rhodes. Hutchinson: London.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. (1983) Course in General Linguistics. Trans. Roy Harris. London: Duckworth.

Tanner, Beth L. (2001). The Book of Psalms Through the Lens of Intertextuality. New York: Peter Lang.

Titscher Stefan, Michael Meyer, Ruth Wodak, and Eva Vetter. (2000) Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis. London: Sage.

==========

Shahzad-ul-Hassan Farooqi
National University of Modern Languages
Islamabad
Pakistan
shahzadf2001@gmail.com