Original Paper

Out-Side-Text Knowledge: A Critical Discussion of Its Importance in the Analysis and Comprehension of Political Discourse

Taher Ben Khalifa[1*]

[1] Department of English, Faculty of Letters and Humanities, University of Sfax, Sfax, Tunisia

[*] Taher Ben Khalifa, Department of English, Faculty of Letters and Humanities, University of Sfax, Sfax, Tunisia

Abstract

The relation between knowledge and discourse is a problematic one. While speaking, we may activate one part of our knowledge and leave anther one silent to serve the coherence of what we seek to convey. Having this in mind, this paper seeks to discuss the importance of out-side-text knowledge in the analysis and comprehension of political discourse. To study this issue, concern is devoted to two axes of discussion. First, focus is given to the analysis and discussion of some key concepts to form a workable frame for the study. It also seeks to high-light the boundaries between interpretation and over-interpretation. Second, focus shifts to the analysis of some examples to put into practice the tools of the established approach. Also, the extent to which the knowledge we activated served to produce worthwhile interpretations is questioned. The selected examples are taken from presidential speeches delivered by Bush, Obama, and Trump. The method we used consists of two phases: one simple and the other complex. In phase one, the meaning the speaker sought to convey is decoded based on the types of knowledge he activated. In phase two, we activated the knowledge we have about the context of each speech to communicate the un-said. While doing this, we used the logic of critique to avoid over-interpreting the examples. The results showed that our activation of the required knowledge served to demystify what the speakers hide and to work out deception by highlighting the gap between discursive reality and social reality. It is also proved that the issue of boundaries between interpretation and over-interpretation remains a matter of critique. Though bringing valuable contributions to the critical study of language in use, the paper left the doors open for further research on how to use out-side-text knowledge to communicate the un-said.

1. Introduction

While doing discourse analysis, we need to have a great knowledge of the rules of language grammar (Fairclough, 1995a; Martin, 2000; Chilton, 2005). It is the knowledge of how fragments of this language are being gathered to form a given linguistic structure. This awareness of how structures of this language are constructed is crucial while seeking to decode what is conveyed by a given piece of discourse (Ariel, 2009). Though it is important in decoding meaning, our knowledge of language grammar is not sufficient to reach a critical understanding of the conveyed meaning (Van Dijk, 2014). In other words, we need to introduce another dimension of knowledge that can help us reach an in-depth critique of the piece of discourse under focus. This dimension includes all sorts of knowledge we have about the context of discourse production (Kintesh & Van Dijk, 1983). This knowledge is not absolute. However, it is bounded by such given parameters that are required for the framing of its scope. These parameters include examples like the circumstances of language production, the biographies of language producers, the historical embedding of discourse, the cultural background of language in use, the ideological orientations of language producers, etc. In brief, it is our knowledge of what is outside the realm of grammar, but it can affect the way grammar is being manipulated.

Part of this knowledge is activated by such textual expressions (Van Dijk, 1999; 2008). However, another part of it remains outside the realm of the linguistic expression of ideas and information by the means of the discursive structure of text and talk. We refer to this part of knowledge as an out-side-textual knowledge. It is said to be out-side-textual in that it forms a main part of the background of the produced discourse without being activated by it. The remaining of this part of knowledge away from being activated does not mean that it is away from the reach of discourse analysts or that it is not crucial for the analysis and interpretation of language. Instead, it is in the reach of discourse analysts and plays an important role in the analysis, interpretation, and critique of the meaning conveyed through the linguistics of the text under focus. Though this non-activated part of the knowledge is important for the comprehension of what is expressed by words, phrases, and expressions, it might be central for critical debates. These debates turn mainly around the axe of whether or not the use of this outside-textual-knowledge leads to the over-interpretation of the text under focus. To recapitulate, the importance of the use of this out-side-textual knowledge and the fear to fall in the realm of over-interpretation by involving it in the study of discourse represents the main problematics leading to the writing of this paper.

While producing discourse, language users active various kinds of knowledge. All these kinds are cognitively activated to shape the linguistics of what the speaker or writer seeks to convey in the produced message. The cognitive activation of such knowledge works mainly through the creation of contextual models (Van Dijk, 1999; 2005). These models represent the starting point of the process of

coding meaning as well as that of decoding meaning. In other words, discourse analysts should have in mind the models that the producers of discourse created while speaking or writing. During the phase of discourse comprehension, the set of knowledge constituting these models becomes necessary to enable the receivers to decode what have been coded during the phase of language production. These contextual models could be created in the receivers' minds, as readers or discourse analysts, through many ways of acquiring knowledge such as readings, watching the news, stories, everyday conversations, experience, participation in such events, etc. The fact of framing the obtained knowledge in the form of such models might involve the interference of personal judgment or evaluation. Here, the interference of personal evaluation might lead to the production of a personal opinion towards what is discussed in the text under focus. This personal opinion towards what is said raises the fear to say what might not be said at the level of the text selected for analysis. In brief, the intervention of personal judgments makes the boundary between knowledge and opinion a fuzzy one.

This fuzziness of borders between what constitutes one's knowledge about something and his personal position towards it reflects the fuzziness of boundaries between both objective and subjective interpretation. While the fact of being objective correlates to the state of carrying a straight forward interpretation, being subjective denotes the case of falling in the realm of over-interpretation. During the phase of discourse production, speakers might resort to the manipulation of the limits between knowledge and opinions while seeking to convince their public that what they are delivering as information represents a shared knowledge. To make these boundaries obvious, discourse analysts should be able to make clear the distinction between what constitutes the speaker's knowledge and what constitutes his personal opinions about a given issue. However, during the phase of discourse comprehension, analysts might fall in the mistake of involving their own opinions in the analysis of the linguistics of a given piece of language instead of using what they know about the context of discourse production. The biased interpretations the analysts might produce by involving their opinions will affect the quality of the produced research as well as its reliability. Thus, to overcome the possibility of over-interpreting the results of the linguistic analysis of a given discourse, we need to high-light the line separating both knowledge and personal opinions.

2. Conceptual Analysis

Before analyzing some examples, we are going to embark in the review and analysis of some key concepts and theoretical bases. These are related to the discussion of what is knowledge, what constitute a theory of knowledge, and the re-thinking about what constitute the line of separation between interpretation and over-interpretation.

2.1 Knowledge

Being the opposite of ignorance, knowledge refers to people's awareness or familiarity with a particular issue. The fact of being familiar with one issue or another implies having a set of ideas or information about it. These are the ideas and information we acquire, classify, and store in the form of episodes at

the level of both long-term and short-time memories (Tulving, 1972; Van Dijk, 2003). Their existence in our minds allows us to interact with others as well as to communicate meaning through the activation of the required sequence either in the production or comprehension of discourse. The knowledge we have does not flow naturally during the production of both text and talk. However, it is manipulated based on many parameters such as the needs of the communicative situation, the goals of the speaker, etc. The manipulation of what to activate and what to keep non-active does not mean that the knowledge the speakers/writers hide have no affect on their linguistic procession of meaning. However, what is kept non-active can be implied. Here, the implication of knowledge might be used to serve such goals like the skip of facing confrontations, face saving. Also, it can have a strong impact on how the linguistics of the produced discourse is being processed and how meaning is coded. In other words, while a part of the knowledge that we have is explicitly expressed, another part of it is implicitly conveyed. Thus, our awareness about how things work in a particular context determines how we code meaning in text and talk and how to decode it as well.

Knowledge is the key in any communicative practice. It is the means through which we can create a cooperative atmosphere of interaction. Here, we are talking about the role of shared knowledge in the creation of intelligibility between the sender and the receiver. But, the processing of any kind of knowledge needs reasoning about what to activate while producing language to communicate with our audiences or readers. Also, it entails reasoning about what to activate from our acquired knowledge while seeking to understand what is new in such a given communicative context. In other words, there is a strong connection between what to activate from our stock of knowledge and what we are reasoning for. This connection should be understood in the sense that reasoning is given the priority and that knowledge should be activated to help reasoning about the unknown. Here, priority is given to reasoning because our use of knowledge out-side the realm of reasoning will not help us solve new problems. It will not help in that the knowledge we have represent only the known part of the problem and that the comprehension of the new part entails the use of a logical process of thinking to infer what should be done. Having this in mind, the knowledge we have represents the starting point towards the mental collection of ideas and strategies to find the adequate answer to the problematics facing man in such a given context. Hence, this relation between reasoning and knowledge should be dealt with as the mental configuration of knowledge while seeking to solve complex matters.

Doing discourse analysis is a way of problem solving. It represents personal attempts by such scholars and researchers to communicate the un-said. In CDA, for instance, researchers were interested in the revelation and critique of social inequality, injustice, and power abuses that are not explicitly said in text and talk, yet these are implicitly conveyed (Fairclough, 1995b; Van Dijk, 1993; Lazar, 2005). As far, as problem solving is concerned, our out-side-text knowledge represents the known in the comprehension of a given piece of language. However, the analysis of the linguistics of a text represents the main problematic we are seeking to solve while dealing with the critical investigation of a given topic that is communicated through discourse strata. The results that we are aiming to bring to

light are the new knowledge we are looking for to answer the exiting questions. It represents the contributions to be introduced to the existing body of knowledge. To succeed to reach such convincing contributions, we need to offer a well-framed model of contextual analysis. It is a theory that will enables us to explore out-side-text knowledge in the critical analysis of political discourse away from falling in the realm of over-interpretation. The discussion of the conceptual bases of this theory will be our focus in the coming section.

2.2 Theory of Knowledge

The theory of knowledge we need in the case of our study is the one that is adequate to offer us a well-detailed understanding of how contextual knowledge can be manipulated and activated during both phases: discourse production and analysis. Manner is the most important among other parameters in that the discussion of the importance of out-side-text knowledge in the analysis of discourse puts into concern two opposite kinds of discourse analysis: straight forward interpretation and biased interpretation. The need to be objective and to avoid being subjective entails determining what kind of knowledge we can activate to understand a given piece of language and what to keep non-active since it will not enrich our interpretation. The selection of what kind of knowledge to activate and how to apply it for the interpretation of the results of linguistic analysis requires being aware about how that knowledge could have affected language production. As far as discourse production and analysis are concerned, we need to set clear the different parameters that could frame how contextual knowledge could be processed in the processes of coding and decoding of meaning.

The determination of these parameters entails highlighting the nature of knowledge. Its nature is depicted in terms of the features that can qualify any sort of information constituting one's awareness about a given issue. Knowledge is social (Killer, 2005). It is said to be social in that it is shared by a number of people who belong to the same epistemic community (Van Dijk, 2014). Having this in mind the kind of knowledge we might resort to in the critical study of a given piece of discourse should be shared and not personal. Emphasizing the quality of being shared should be understood in the sense that the use of any kind of knowledge in the study of discourse should take in to account the examination of social structures, relations, actions, interests, etc. These are required to understand how the social affects the construction of discursive reality. Also, knowledge is cognitive (Van Dijk, 2006; 2008). It is cognitive in the sense that it is acquired and processed cognitively. What we acquire as knowledge will be classified and stored in the form of such epistemic models at the level of our minds. These models will be activated when we feel need to a particular kind of knowledge while producing or analysing discourse. As far as discourse is concerned, knowledge is discursive too (Hassen, 2015). It is discursive in that it is acquired and circulated by means of discourse. Knowledge affects discourse production and it could be affected by discourse procession as well. Hence, our analysis of discourse structure should take into account the three dimensions constituting the structure of knowledge: the social, the discursive, and the cognitive.

Having in mind these three dimensions, the study of the role of knowledge in the analysis of discourse

requires taking into account knowledge's connection to such concepts. These are concepts like power, ideology, and goals. First, having knowledge represents a great source of power that language users can manipulate to control their audiences. Also, having power enables language users to control knowledge processing and to make it flows and being re-structured in the way that serves people's personal plans. Second, knowledge is not free from the impact of such social ideologies. However, the acquiring and the processing of knowledge are affected by the intervention of the ideological orientations of both senders and receivers. The sources we get knowledge from are ideologically monitored and the texts we will analyze are not ideology free too. In other words, ideology is there and it should be taken into account during discourse production and comprehension. Third, knowledge is not activated at random. However, it is based on the determination of what kind of objectives we seek to achieve. In discourse production, goals determine what kind of knowledge to activate to convey the meaning that will help us re-shape the receivers' attitudes towards a given matter. In discourse analysis too, the goals of the analysis will serve to determine the sort of knowledge we need to activate. The answers we seek to find while deciding to carry on the study of such given problematics determine the sort of knowledge we should activate. Therefore, the activation of any kind of knowledge depends mainly on one's reading of his context of both producing and studying discourse.

The dependence of knowledge activation on these dynamic concepts makes its utility in the production and comprehension of discourse highly problematic. To deal successfully with the dynamic nature of this relation of dependence, it has become crucial to think about the typology of the activated knowledge (Pritchard, 2014; Van Dijk, 2005). Here, typology is concerned in that it will help visualize how the activated knowledge serves in the structuring of the linguistics of the political speeches under study. Language producers might activate different types of knowledge to code the meaning they seek to convey to their receivers. These types include examples like historical, political, behavioral, religious, ethnic, ethical, ideological, etc. While decoding the meaning of the conveyed messages, we need to activate the required type of knowledge that we think can serve for the comprehension of the piece of language under question. Once the activated types are determined, we might find ourselves concerned to answer another significant question that is concerned with the truth value of the Knowledge we are dealing with in our examination of a given text or talk (Armstrong, 1973; Preyer & Peter, 2005). In the case of our study, for instance, the evaluation of the activated knowledge in terms of truth should be used for the sake of highlighting political deception and misleading. Hence, the determination of both the truth criteria and the typology of knowledge is a way to shed light on how language users resort to the manipulation of knowledge to serve such ends.

To sum up, a theory of knowledge we need here should be a multi-disciplinary one. We need a multi-disciplinary approach to the study of the role of out-side-text knowledge in the comprehension of discourse due to the complex nature of the concept of knowledge. It is complex in the sense that it is a multi-dimensional one. This theory will help us reach a well-detailed critique of how language users activate the required knowledge to decode the massage they want to deliver to affect a given social

reality. It is also a theory that will provide us with the critical ability to activate the knowledge we need for the comprehension of a given discourse. Here, our ability as discourse analysts is said to be critical in that the activation of any acquired knowledge in the study of discourse should be based on the critique of the knowledge activated in the text under focus. In other words, it is the knowledge communicated in the produced discourse which can determine what kind of knowledge the receivers should activate to understand that discourse. So, this theory of knowledge makes clear the bases that monitor the management of knowledge in both discourse production and analysis. However, the fear to fall in the realm of over-interpretation is still there. The line between straight and biased interpretations will be our focus in the coming section.

2.3 Over-Interpretation

Meaning to say more than what is said by the text, over-interpretation is a crucial concept that we should take into account while doing discourse analysis. Being engaged in the practice of studying discourse, one should take into account the existence of three kinds of intension: the intension of the author, the intension of the interpreter, and the intension of the text (Eco, 1990). The discussion of over-interpretation within the scope of the frame constituted by these three intensions highlights that: working in the realm of interpretation refers to the highest possible match between the intension of the interpreter and the intension of the author as well as that of the text. However, falling in the realm of over-interpretation denotes the state of mis-match between the intension of the interpreter and the intensions of both the author and the text. Here, mis-match should be understood in the sense that the interpreter might derive more meaning than what is intended by the author and his text. In the field of psychoanalysis, the concept of over-interpretation refers to the fact of working out an additional interpretation of a dream (Freud, 1989). Freud highlighted that the addition of an interpretation could be sometimes worthwhile and sometimes not. By being not worthwhile, the interpretation we added denotes the fact of falling in the realm of over-interpreting a dream. In the case of my study, for instance, the addition of an interpretation consists mainly in the resort to out-side-text knowledge while seeking to understand what is coded at the level of discourse strata. In brief, the question—when might the use of out-side-text knowledge lead to the production of an over-interpretation?—is what matters in this section.

The answer to this question manifests itself in two logical explanations. First, the discussion and the highlight of the boundaries between what constitute the interpreter's knowledge about something and what constitute his positions towards that thing is of great concern. It is essential in that the activation of such beliefs instead of knowledge in the study of discourse leads to the production of some interpretations that are not worthwhile. In other words, to overcome the problem of falling in the realm of over-interpretation, the interpreter should activate only what he knows about the context of discourse production. In contrast, he should leave his opinions about the issue under question away from being involved in order not to affect the objectivity of the produced interpretation. Second, the selection of what to activate from the knowledge we have about the context of the produced discourse represents

another variable that we need to monitor to avoid producing over-interpretations of discourse. As far as selection is concerned, there should be well-defined rules to control this game of choosing and to make it serves the objective interpretation of what is said by discourse. One of these rules is that our activation of out-side-text knowledge, as interpreters, should depend on the nature of the knowledge that is activated by the text under study. Another rule says that the activation of any sort of knowledge should be the result of a logical critique of what to active from our information to decode the complex message we are dealing with. Moreover, a third rule says that reasoning should be prior to knowledge in the analysis of discourse. Reasoning is first in that the use of knowledge by itself will not help producing new solutions. Thus, setting the limits between interpretation and over-interpretation is a matter of critique.

Having the logic of critique as the only toolkit we can use to set clear the line separating over-interpretation from interpretation, we need to offer a brief understanding of the logic of reasoning. Reasoning refers to the rational processing of ideas following some given steps to infer such conclusions. The conclusions that we are seeking to infer, here, are of two opposite types: interpretation vs. over-interpretation. In other words, to infer the right conclusion, we need to think carefully about the knowledge we have before activating it during the analysis of text and talk. This process of reasoning should start from the critical examination of the knowledge that is activated in the produced discourse. Then, we should question whether or not the activation of the knowledge we have in mind could serve for the addition of such a worthwhile interpretation. The answer to this question will determine our decision about what to activate and what to leave, to avoid producing interpretations that are not worthwhile. The activation of the appropriate set of knowledge and the construction of a critical understanding of discourse away from biases highlight the success of the reasoning strategy we used. However, the failure to find convincing answers to the problematics that a given discourse might rise reflects the limitation of our approaching of the logic monitoring the knowledge activated by the author and the text and the one activated by the interpreter. Hence, escaping the fear to add such subjective interpretations depends on the interpreter's capacity to critical-ly evaluate his context of study.

To recapitulate, the use of out-side-text knowledge in the comprehension of discourse remains a matter of critique. The logic of reasoning that monitors the activation of any typology of knowledge from the stock of information we have in the analysis of a given discourse should be context-dependent. Its dependence to the context of study should be understood in the sense that the structure of the problem determines the structure of the answer. In other words, to avoid bringing such interpretations that are not worthwhile, we have to give priority to reasoning. However, knowledge should be considered as the known part of the answer. This means that knowledge will be inserted whenever we feel need to while seeking to make our thinking about a problem progress to reach the solution. So, discourse analysis should be understood as the analysis of the linguistics of a text where the involvement of contextual knowledge is meant to help progress our thinking about the decoding of that text's meaning. Having this in mind, a theoretical recommendation on how to avoid over-interpreting a text is given. But, how

this happens at the level of practice should be explained. The explanation of how to put what is theoretically said in practice is our focus in the analysis section.

3. Methodology

To put into practice the concepts and the theoretical bases discussed before, we will cite and analyse some examples. These are taken from speeches that are delivered by the three US presidents: Bush, Obama, and Trump. They are delivered in different political contexts. The variation we stressed at the level of context is meant to show at each time how the knowledge we have about the context of discourse production serves for the decoding of what is being mystified. The use of out-side-text knowledge in the analysis of the produced discourse will be carried within the framework that is built mainly upon the bases of the logic of critique. The theoretical paradigm that offers a critical study of language in context is that of CDA. This critical framework consists of a variety of theoretical approaches that are interested in the decoding of textual meaning. However, the most appropriate one for the case of my study is the socio-cognitive approach that is developed by Van Dijk, especially his conceptions that context should be dealt with as a set of mental models (Van Dijk, 2003, 2005, 2006, 2007). The theoretical bases of these frames will be applied to explain how to process the knowledge we have in mind to understand what is coded at the level of discourse strata.

Working within this cognitive approach to the study of the role of contextual knowledge in discourse analysis and comprehension, the method I will use consists of two phases: one is simple and the other is complex. In the first phase, the selected examples will be linguistically explored. In this linguistic examination, I will be interested mainly in the decoding of what is explicitly conveyed. The analysis of the conveyed message will be undertaken through the determination of what the speaker activated as knowledge. In the second phase, I will focus on the determination of what the speakers kept un-active as knowledge to hide what they did not want to express to their hearers. To unveil the un-said is the difficult task to undertake in this phase. It is difficult in that the demystification of what is mystified requires being critical about what to activate from the knowledge we have in mind. My use of the logic of critique is meant to avoid falling in the realm of over-interpretation. The fact of keep being in the sphere of worthwhile interpretation, it is necessary to ask a critical question: are we still in the realm of a positive interpretation? This question will be asked each time we activate a given type of our knowledge of the world. Finally, the results of the analysis we undertook in both phases will be discussed to recapitulate how the use of out-side-text knowledge could serve to communicate the un-said and to help reasoning about the un-known.

4. Analysis and Discussion

Now, it is time to put into practice the theoretical conceptions we have analysed and discussed before. Their use to analyse the selected examples will follow the method depicted in the methodology section. Hence, our task here will be to make what haven theorized to in the above sections closer to the

109

reader's mind. It also seeks to make it at the reach of researchers' use to help them explore their knowledge of the world in the study of such problematics that are related to the analysis and comprehension of discourse.

4.1 Example Analysis

The first example is taken from Bush's address on the start of the war. It was delivered in March 19th, 2003.

(1)   My fellow citizens. At this hour, American and coalition forces are in the early stages of military operations to disarm Iraq, to free its people and to defend the world from grave danger.

What Bush sought to convey to his follow citizens through the linguistics of this couple of sentences is that the US and its allies are at the beginning of their military action against Iraq. In other words, the war against Iraq has become an inevitable action. After, emphasizing the inevitability of the action he claimed, he highlighted the goals that this action is meant to achieve. These goals are of two kinds: one is local and two others are international. While the local one is about freeing the Iraqi people from the regime they lived under its rule for decades, the international ones are related to the disarmament of Iraq and the defense of the world against the threat caused by this regime.

To make his message sound logical and persuasive to the public that he is addressing, Bush resorted to the activation of different types of knowledge. These types can be discussed under three headlines: military, political, and security knowledge.

First, the military knowledge is activated through the use of the to-infinitive construction "to disarm". The use of this verb implies that Iraq is an armed country that represents a great threat to its neighbors and the world. By implying this meaning, Bush sought to activate the knowledge that his public already have in mind. It is their awareness about Iraq's possession of weapons of mass destruction. The mental models that his public have about Iraq's weapons come as a result of the long argumentation process he embarked on since two years before while seeking to convince the Americans and the world that the US should go into war against Iraq. Here, Bush makes connection between what he had already given as information to his public and the world and what he seeks to achieve as goals. The cognitive connection he made was meant to prove that the war the US is going to start soon against Iraq is not declared from the absurd. However, it was well-thought about. Also, it aimed to highlight that the US Army is not meant to attack the Iraqi people. Instead, it aims to achieve a specific goal manifested mainly in the total disarmament of the Iraqi regime from its weapons of mass murder. Thus, the military knowledge Bush activated was meant to highlight the rationality of the action he ordered the coalition forces to start in Iraq.

Second, the political knowledge that Bush activated by using the verb "to free" seeks mainly to highlight that the mission of the US's military action against Iraq is to replace tyranny by democracy. By activating the mental models that the Iraqi people have about the freedom that the Americans live under the rule of the US democracy, Bush sought to tickle the feelings of the oppressed people in Iraq. His playing on the feelings of this group of Iraqis was meant to convince them not to defend the regime

that oppressed them during the past years. He also sought to polish the image of the agents of the coalition forces by making them freedom defenders while seeking to limit the targeted group's desire to resist the US invasion. Here, Bush's cognitive connection between the socio-political context in the US and that in Iraq aims to make a comparison between how people live in both contexts. This comparison is a direct call to push the Iraqis to think about a post war Iraq that is free and more prosperous. The visualization of this new socio-political context in Iraq is enacted through imagination. It is the strategy that Bush used to monitor the dynamics of what people have as knowledge about the American democracy to make them dream of having that kind of political model. In brief, Bush activated the Iraqi people's knowledge about the American democracy to control their resistance to his military.

Third, Bush activated the security knowledge through the use of the verb "to defend". By activating this kind of knowledge, he sought to convince the world that he and his allies are in a humanitarian mission, to save the humanity from Iraq's danger. His insistence on shared security is a wise strategy to re-activate his audiences' knowledge about the tragedy that innocent people lived while no security measures were taken to prevent danger from taking place. Here, the activated security knowledge represents the top of Bush's rhetoric on the demonization of the Iraqi regime. Therefore, Bush implies that if the Iraqi regime will not be removed from power, there will be a great danger to face.

To recapitulate, the types of knowledge that Bush activated in this example are part of his justification of the war against Iraq. They enabled him to draw a negative representation of this regime. In contrast, he succeeded to draw a positive representation of the self to prove that his war against Iraq will serve to defend shared humanitarian values like democracy, peace, security, etc. However, he kept non-active the knowledge that might not serve for the well-structuring of his argument and the achievement of his political ends. The knowledge he left is there in people's minds and can be activated to detect and to criticize the fallacy he used to destroy an independent country. The types of knowledge that can serve to reveal the truth lying behind Bush's invasion of Iraq will be activated and analyzed as an out-side-text knowledge.

First, our knowledge about Iraq's relation with Israel represents a pivotal axe to understand Bush's demonization of Saddam and his regime. America is one of the strongest allies of Israel and a great defender of the Zionist project in the Middle East. Being against the Israeli occupation of the Arab territories in Palestine and having threatened to attack its ally raised the US's anger as well as its fear about the future of the peace of Israel. So, for Israel to live in peace and for the Zionist plan to be implemented with success, the Iraqi regime should be removed from power and Iraq's ability to face the Zionist plan should be destroyed. Hence, the Iraqi regime's declared enmity against Israel is the first reason standing behind Bush's instance on the need to go into war against Iraq.

Second, Iraq represents one of the strongest powers in the Middle East in terms of military forces. It is also a reach country in terms of oils sources. This reality raises America's fear of having a strong power that can affect its interests in the region. This feeling of fear becomes stronger and alarming when the Iraqi regime declares being Anti-American and Pro-Russian. In other words, it has become

111

unacceptable for the Americans to let an ally of one of their greatest enemies—Russia—control the prices of oil in the region. To limit this power from affecting its imperialist interests in a region of wealth, America needs to sanction and destroy Iraq. This represents America's first step towards the maintenance of a full control on the wealth of Iraq and the region. In brief, America's imperialist interests in the region represent another logical reason that justifies Bush's willingness to destroy an independent state.

Third, the materialization of what the Americans planned for under the title of the new Middle East entails the destroying of the big countries in the region. The activation of this knowledge finds its logical justification in the invasion of Iraq and the destruction of its power as well as the attempt to destroy Syria and to divide its territories into such federal states. By stimulating sectarianism and creating conflicting groups in the powerful states of the region, the US paves the way for its political plans to be implemented easily. In other words, the creation of on-going internal conflicts serves to weaken the states of the region and make them unable to resist America's imperialist plans there. Moreover, the American policy makers find in the dismantling of some of the ruling powers in the Middle East the right technique to replace the existing Anti-American powers by such new Pro-American ones. This kind of replacement aims to serve the US's political ends and not to bring democracy and prosperity to people of Iraq as Bush declared in this example (1). So, the US's attempt to re-shape the political map of the Middle East represents another logical reason that can explain Bush's struggle to go into war against Iraq.

To sum up, the activation of out-side-text knowledge enabled us to determine the logical reasons of the war that Bush hided in his speech. These reasons are the main factors pushing for Bush's declaration of war. However, he left the knowledge related to them non-activated in that they did not serve his political argument the tool through which he seeks to get the legitimacy to go into war against Iraq. Though leaving this knowledge non-active on the part of the speaker, our knowledge of the politics of the world served to make the unclear becomes clear. However, what remains here is to question whether or not we fell in the realm of over-interpretation by activating the above three types of knowledge. Different are the logical reasoning that can prove that what we are doing is away from over-interpreting this example. First, the US's defense of Israel and its interests is obvious and represents a shared knowledge for the world community. Second, the US' struggle to dominate the Middle East and to increase its imperial interests there is something obvious too and cannot be denied. Third, the US's struggle to remove Anti-American governments and to replace them by Pro-American ones is something that they cannot deny too. Instead, it is something recognized by the world community. Also, it happened and is still happening across the globe and not only in the Middle East. For instance, the removal Gaddafi from power in 2011 is another example that can justify that our activation of this type of knowledge is away from being biased. So, the activation of our knowledge about the US politics offered us the opportunity to infer what Bush hided.

The second, third, and fourth examples are extracted from Obama's speech on the Libyan crisis. It was

delivered in March 28th, 2011.

(2)   Qaddafi declared he would show "no mercy" to his own people. [...] It was not in our national interest to let that happen. I refused to let that happen. And so nine days ago, after consulting the bipartisan leadership of Congress, I authorized military action to stop the killing and enforce U.N. Security Council Resolution 1973.

(3)   Tomorrow, Secretary Clinton will go to London, where she will meet with the Libyan opposition and consult with more than 30 nations. These discussions will focus on what kind of political effort is necessary to pressure Qaddafi, while also supporting a transition to the future that the Libyan people deserve—because while our military mission is narrowly focused on saving lives, we continue to pursue the broader goal of a Libya that belongs not to a dictator, but to its people.

(4)   The task that I assigned our forces—to protect the Libyan people from immediate danger, and to establish a no-fly zone—carries with it a U.N. mandate and international support.

The linguistic analysis of these examples shows that Obama sought to explain to his follow citizens two main things: the reason why the US intervened militarily in Libya and what the US forces are supposed to do there. He explained the nature of the military task the US will undertake in Libya. Also, he highlighted the on-going political debate about how to keep on pressure on Gaddafi to set down from power as well as how to support the Libyan transition towards the future they deserve. By signaling the need to think about a better future for the Libyan people, Obama aimed to shed light on the role that the US plays to remove atrocity and to build democracy in Libya. After highlighting that the US's intervention in Libya comes as a response to its duties towards the humanity, Obama stressed the two goals to be achieved by this intervention: to stop killing and to enforce the UN Security Resolution 1973. Thus, by stating these goals, Obama gave a clear idea about the mission of his forces in Libya.

To make of what he delivered to his public sound more logical and persuasive, Obama resorted to the activation of different types of knowledge. These types can be discussed under three main titles: political, social, and military knowledge.

Politically speaking, Obama focused on the visualization of Gaddafi's atrocity and his act of aggression against his own people. By drawing this gloomy picture of the political scene in Libya, Obama sought to prove to his nation that Gaddafi is a dangerous man and that he should be stopped from killing his own nation. The representation of Gaddafi as a dictator who shows no mercy to his own people was meant to find the legitimacy for the action that he claimed before 10 days to intervene militarily in Libya. The fact of looking for legitimacy finds its traces also in his resort to the US local political context, the world political context and the Libyan political context too. On the one hand, Obama stressed that before intervening militarily in Libya, he got the green light to act from the bipartisan leadership of the congress. On the other hand, he shed light on the legitimacy the US got from the members of the Libyan opposition who called for the rescue of their nations from the world community. Then, he expressed the world community's agreement on the need to intervene in Libya and to help rescue its people from killing. Therefore, by activating political knowledge, Obama sought to make of

113

his claim to act in Libya a legitimate political decision.

Socially speaking, Obama highlighted that the Libyan people are living in such an immediate danger. They were living under the rule of a dictator for four decades and when they protested peacefully against his dictatorship, he declared to face them with no mercy. Here, Obama's emphasis on the mercilessness behavior of the Gaddafi regime was meant to draw a picture of the darkness of the social reality in Libya. By highlighting the atmosphere of dictatorship and killing, Obama implies that change in Libya should take place to save lives and to bring more freedom to its people. The move from one social context (old) towards another context (new) is meant to stimulate a kind of comparison in the public's minds between the democracy the US people live and the dictatorship the Libyan live in the same era of the world history. This comparison seeks mainly to convince the public to welcome easily what their president claimed to do in Libya. Hence, Obama activated knowledge about the Libyan social context to prove the need for political change in Libya.

Militarily speaking, the knowledge Obama activated is related to three military contexts: the Libyan, the American, and the international. At the Libya local level, Obama highlighted the military aggression that Gaddafi declared against his own nation. He expressed his refusal to what is going on in Libya and he claimed that Gaddafi's aggression should be stopped insisting that this will happen by driving him out from power. At the international level, he claimed that there are international supports from many nations to help the US protect the Libyans from killing and danger. By insisting on the existence of support from many nations, Obama sought to stress that what the US is doing there is legitimate and acceptable for the world community. At the American level, Obama re-assured his citizens that what the US is doing in Libya is limited to saving lives via the establishment of a no-fly-zone. His re-assurance can be read in various ways. By saying this, he might seek to convey to his people that the US's intervention in Libya will not cost much on tax payers. Also, he might seek to highlight to them that there will be no loss of lives among the individual of the US troops. These interpretations are cited among possible ones in that the Americans become against the participation of the US troops in any war after the long fights they have in Afghanistan and Iraq. In brief, Obama activated military knowledge from three contexts to convince his people that the US is there to settle peace.

To Sum up, the different typologies of knowledge that Obama activated are selected based on the political logic that serves the well-functioning of his argument on the need to act in Libya. He activated the political, the social, and the military knowledge to highlight that change should take place in Libya. He insisted that change should start from the removal of a dictator and the building of a new democratic state. These typologies of knowledge constitute part of people's shared knowledge in the US and the world, which means that their activation will serve to make Obama's decision sound legitimate. However, he left another important part of his knowledge non active. Though silenced, this knowledge is there in the mind of people across the globe and especially the one who read and hear about the US-Libyan relations during Gaddafi's ruling. The activation of this part of knowledge will

114

help us, as readers and discourse analysis, understand the US's quick response to intervene militarily in Libya. In other words, it will serve us to determine the agenda motivating the US's military action in Libya while the same happened in other states and the US did not react to save lives.

The history of the US-Libyan relations during the Gaddafi rule witnessed many tensions. The two states confronted each other in different times. This confrontation came as a result of the difference of views. Gaddafi was known by his Anti-American position. He always criticizes the US for its imperialist policies across the globe, and especially in the Arab countries. This political position makes of him a bad guy in the views of the US administration. He was accused by managing such terrorist attacks against the US interests like the bombing of a discotheque in the German capital, Berlin, in April 5th, 1986. After designating the responsible agent, the US reacted by bombing Libya in April 15th, 1986. This history of tension started with Gaddafi's nationalization of the oil industry and his removal of the American oil companies after his raise to power in 1969. Later on, in 1979, the US considered Libya as a sponsor of terrorism after the withdrawal and the firing of its embassy in Tripoli. These facts and other represented a legal proof for the US to impose economic sanctions on Libya. Also, they were important political justifications for America to control Libya's export on military and civil crafts. Thus, the activation of our knowledge about the reality of the US-Libyan relations served to re-activate old contextual models on the readers' minds and enable them to demystify what Obama mystified along his speech.

Gaddafi's support of the Palestinians and his Anti-Israel political position makes of him a man who is considered among the list of the enemies of the US's greatest ally in the Arab region. Being an enemy of the US and the Zionist state it defends puts Gaddafi at the top of the list of the leaders that should be removed from power. His removal represents a great opportunity for the US to restore its political and economic interests in Libya as a sate rich in oil. Also, it is an opportunity to get rid of a man who supports the Palestinians to resist the Israeli colonist plans in their homeland. In other words, his removal among others is required to reduce Arab resistance to the Zionist ideology in the Middle East. Moreover, Gaddafi's claim to coin the African dinar and to sell oil using gold instead of the US Dollar represents a threat to the value of the US currency across the globe. This fact makes of Gaddafi a devil incarnation on the views of the American capitalists and ruling elites. This means that he becomes a real threat to US interests and he should be removed from power. Gaddafi's image become more gloomy on the views of the American leaders after his speech in the UN in 2009. His accusation of the US and his harsh critique of the unjust policies of the UN and its Security Council, the tool through which the US give legitimacy to its policies, hastened the end of his regime. As a result, the Americans and their allies found in the outbreak of the Arab spring the right socio-political political context to remove Gaddafi from power and to change him by a Pro-American leader, Khalifa Haftar.

To recapitulate, the activation of what we have as knowledge about Gaddafi's relations with the US and its allies served to unveil what Obama hid along his speech. The interpretations formulated by activating the knowledge that Obama left non-activated made clear the main reasons standing behind

the US's intervention in Libya. In other words, what Obama stated explicitly represents mere rhetorical justification for the legitimacy of his claim to act. In contrast, what he left implicit is the real proof that can explain the acceleration of his decision to act and to remove Gaddafi from power. Hence, the activation of this knowledge served to communicate the un-said. However, what remains problematic is the fear to fall in the realm of over-interpretation. The denial to fall in this realm finds its justification in several logical reasons. First, Gaddafi's opposition of the US imperialism and his rejection of Israeli use of power is known for the world community. Second, the US's repetitive attempts to remove Gaddafi from power is there and recorded in the archives of the modern history of the world. Third, the US's military intervention to remove Anti-American leaders and to change them by Pro-American ones is something known for all. Fourth, the US's support of Haftar to lead the rebellion and then to lead Libya later on can summarize all about its policy to end Gaddafi regime and to set up a Pro-American regime there. Finally, the activation of the knowledge we have about the US-Libyan relation served to bring worthwhile interpretations away from over-interpretation.

The fifth example is taken from Trump's Proclamation 9683 of December 2017. In this presidential document, he proclaimed the recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of the state of Israel and the relocation of the US Embassy to Israel to Israel to Jerusalem.

(5)   NOW, THEREFORE, I, DONALD J. TRUMP, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim that the United States recognizes Jerusalem as the capital of the State of Israel and that the United States Embassy to Israel will be relocated to Jerusalem as soon as practicable.

The linguistic analysis of this example proves that Trump used his power as a president to proclaim two different claims for action. The first claim is related to the recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. This claim comes after he reminded his public that the US first recognized the state of Israel before 70 years under the rule of president Trauma. The second claim is concerned with the relocation of the US Embassy in Jerusalem. To prove the legitimacy of his claim to relocate the US embassy there to his public, he highlighted the will of the Congress to have the US embassy in Jerusalem expressed in the Act of 1995. Also, the analysis of the linguistics of this example shows that the time of these two claims for action is not specified. However, they are said to be materialized "as soon practicable". Here, Trump sought to stress his personal endeavor to put into practice what the previous presidents of the US left as mere campaigning promises. In other words, he was seeking to show to his voters that he will never hesitate to put into action the claims he gave during his electoral campaign. Therefore, Trump was endeavoring to show to his public that he has the power to materialize his promises under the US laws.

To legitimize his use of power to act, Trump activated different sorts of knowledge. These sorts can be discussed under three headlines: personal knowledge, political knowledge, and legislative knowledge. These three kinds of knowledge are re-activated here in Trump's conclusion to recognize Jerusalem as the state of Israel and to relocate the US embassy in Jerusalem, after being introduced along his

116

argument for action. First, Trump activated his personal knowledge. He presented his name and family name followed by his determination of his personal position in the American society. By saying that he is the president of the US, he sought to attract the attention of his people and the world that he is the representative of the American people and that he can take important decisions under the cover of the US laws. Second, he activated his political knowledge. He argued that he has the adequate political power to claim the recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and to move the US embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. His emphasis on his political power was meant to show to his public that his decisions are inevitable and that they will be put into practice. Third, Trump activated legislative knowledge. His activation of this sort of knowledge was meant to high-light the legitimacy of the two decisions he claimed. He is a man of power who works based on the authority he is given by the constitution and laws of the US. Finally, Trump's argument for the need to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and to move the US embassy to Jerusalem ended with a conclusion stressing the inevitability of these two actions. To justify the conclusion that he reached, he sought legitimacy in the activation of three sorts of knowledge: the personal, the political, and the legislative.

The types of knowledge Trump activated served to code the message he sought to convey to his people and the world. They served for the progress of his argumentation process as well as for the persuasiveness of the argument through which he seeks to defend the recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and the removal of the US embassy to Jerusalem. Moreover, the use of the knowledge he activated enabled us to decode the explicit meaning of his message. However, our activation of the knowledge we have concerning the political context of Trump's proclamation will help us infer what Trump sought to mystify along his argument for action. Trump left an important part of his knowledge about the context of his declaration non-activated to hide the truth standing behind the selection of the time of his claimed actions. He sought to hide why this declaration should take place now and not at any time before or after this moment of the world's history. Here, those who are interested in the issue of the Palestine-Israel conflict have the required typologies of knowledge that can help explain this. Therefore, the activation of the required typologies of the knowledge we have in mind will be of crucial significance to find the logical explanation for Trump's selection of time.

What we have as shared knowledge about the Arab-Israeli conflict represents a variety of mental models that we can re-activate to communicate the un-said. These are diverse types of knowledge that we re-activate to offer a well-detailed critique of Trump's proclamation. We cite and use the knowledge that we activated under three main titles: historical knowledge, political knowledge, and military knowledge.

On the one hand, our historical knowledge about the US's support of Israel to build its state on the Middle East is something shared by all world community. The US is the main defender of Israel's colonialist expansion in the region and the holder of the Zionist plan there. Having this in mind, we can say that Trump found the right time to make everything explicit and proclaim the need to materialize what have been recognized before but not yet practiced. In reality, Trump activated his knowledge

117

about the US's recognition of the state of Israel and its Congress's urgent request to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and to relocate the US Embassy in Jerusalem. Also, he claimed that the right time has come to put these claims into action. However, he kept un-explained why this is the right time. Historically speaking, the Arab community, as the main defender of the Palestinians' right for independence, lives in a period of weakness. Most of the Arab countries are living in either revolution, civil war, or political instability. Being in this critical state, the Arab nations will not have the power to resist such political decisions. They do not have the required power to support the Palestinians to defend their rights for peace. In other words, the US political decision-makers waited for a long period to find the right time to put into practice the plans they elaborated in their political labs. Thus, the activation of our historical knowledge proved that the deterioration of the Arab power to resist represents the main type of knowledge that Trump and his administration built upon to claim that this is the right time to act.

On the other hand, our political knowledge about the representation of the Arab community in the UN represents another important type of context model that we can activate here to explain Trump's proclamation. Formed by a respectful number of countries, the majority of which are members in the UN, the Arab community has no permanent member in the UN Security Council (SC). This implies that the Arab community does not have the right political power that enables them to defend a legal resolution to the Palestine-Israel conflict. In other words, the resolution will be planned for and evaluated from one single perspective. It is the perspective of the US and its allies. In his argumentation to prove the need to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and to relocate the US embassy in Jerusalem, Trump activated his knowledge about the US's support of peace between the two states. However, what remains un-said is that this peace plan is a Pro-Israeli one and not a plan that the Palestinians and their defenders agree upon. This reality is left un-expressed in that the Arab nations do not have the power to act and to influence the UN decisions concerning the Palestine-Israel conflict. The Arab nations do not even have the power to resist what the US president claimed because they fear the US sanctions. The US's imposition of sanctions against the Anti-American policy states is something known and cannot be denied. Therefore, our activation of our political knowledge highlighted that who owns power in the UN owns power on the ground. The Arab nations have no power to affect the UN decisions, which means they have no power to resist the world powers' decisions. This political reality offered Trump the right context to put his electoral promises into action. Then, the activation of our military knowledge about the disbalance of power between the Arab community and the US is important too. It is important in that the logic of fighting says that, as a counterpart to a conflict, you should look for the moment of weakness to triumph and to impose your instructions on the other. In the case of our context of study, Israel and its allies and supporters have the military power to control and to dominate Palestine and its supporters. The power they have came as a result of the weakness of the Arab community due to some internal political divisions. This disbalance of power makes the US leaders, and especially Trump have the power to humiliate Arab leaders,

118

proclaim Israel's right to control some Arab territories, and depict those who defend a legal right as extremists and terrorists. Trump did all these in public and in such direct and live broadcasted speeches without facing any kind of resistance from the Arab officials, except the expression of such personal and institutional condemnations. Having this in mind, Trump Knew that if he claims the recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and the relocation of the US embassy to Jerusalem, he will not face such considerable resistance. In other words, his claim that the right time has come to put these two decisions into action finds its explanation in his reading of what the counterpart can do when these actions are claimed. So, in a historical context in which the counterpart lacks the adequate military power to resist, Trump thought of himself as a strong leader who can produce change for the best of a great ally, Israel.

To conclude, our revisit of the contextual models we have about the Palestine-Israel conflict offered us the knowledge that can help us demystify what Trump mystified. Our activation of the three types of knowledge—the historical, the political, and the military—proved that Trump benefited from the weakness of the Arab community to make of himself the leader who can do what his predecessors did not. Here, we can say that the US leaders were working for many years to reach the day in which they can put into practice what they have planned for before. Hence, the knowledge we have served us to reach a detailed conclusion about how the US benefits from the weakness of its counterpart to materialize its policies on the ground. However, what remains problematic is the fear of falling in the realm of over-interpretation. It is clear that being in the realm of over-interpretation is excluded. The fact of excluding this reality can be justified by several logical reasons. First, our historical knowledge concerning the US's support to Israel and its defense of the Zionist state represents a shared knowledge for the world community. Second, our political knowledge that the Arab community does not have a permanent member in the SC and its weakness to play a leading role in world politics and to affect the UN decision-making process is something known too. Third, the disbalance of power between the defenders of the Palestinian right and the defenders of Zionist state in the region is an undeniable reality either. Finally, we can say that the knowledge we activated served in the formulation of worthwhile interpretations away from falling in the realm of over-interpretation. This conclusion highlights that the interpretations we made explain the real agendas standing behind Trump's articulation of his proclamation 9683, noting that what he delivered was a mere rhetorical justification of his abuse of power.

4.2 Discussion

The analysis of the above examples showed that the activation of out-side-text knowledge serves for the comprehension of what the speakers left un-clear. When they were speaking, the speakers resorted to the activation of some types of knowledge while leaving other types non active. We noted here that the speakers activated only what can serve for the progress and the well-functioning of their argumentation. What they activated as knowledge is useful to decode the meaning they have coded at the level of the linguistics of their speeches. This knowledge is used to shape the rhetorical reality they

sought to create. In other words, its use during the analysis process enabled us to work out the fallacies that the speakers used to convince their public about the need to act in a given context. However, what they left non-active leads mainly to the mystification of the real causes standing behind their production of such a claim. This means that the knowledge they mystify shapes the reality of a given socio-political context in which they are acting. Having this in mind, makes our activation of what the speakers left non active as knowledge required to demystify what they mystified along their speeches. In brief, the activation of the knowledge we have about the issues under focus revealed the legal proofs pushing each of the speakers to act. Also, it makes clear the gap between social reality and the reality that the speakers sought to shape via rhetoric.

The gap we detected between the discursive reality and the social reality that people live in the addressed contexts makes the activation of our knowledge of the world crucial for the critique of discourse. It is crucial in that the process of involving out-side-text knowledge offered us a worthwhile interpretation that can clarify what we could not understand if we do not get back to what we have as knowledge concerning the issue we are targeting in our analysis. However, what appeared to be problematic is what type of knowledge we need to activate from the stock of information we have in mind. Based on our analysis of the selected examples, the activation of the required types of knowledge should be based on our need for what type of information to understand what is left unclear. In other words, to communicate the un-said, we need to start from what is said, determine what the speaker might hide, and decide what knowledge we can activate. Following these three steps, we succeeded to work out the deceptive nature of the speakers' justification to act and to make clear the logical reasons that could be the real explanation for their insistence on the need to act. Also, this logical reasoning enabled us to make clear how the US leaders manipulate universal values to serve their political interests. Hence, the examination of how knowledge's manipulated in the production of discourse is crucial for the comprehension of discourse. However, the activation of the required knowledge to unveil the hidden remains central for over-interpretation.

The issue of over-interpretation is something we paid attention to while activating any sort of the knowledge we have to communicate the un-said. The fear we have about the possibility to fall in the realm of over-interpretation is the main result of the fuzziness of borders between both interpretation and over-interpretation. To make clear that we are away from the over-interpretation of each of the above examples, each time we question whether what we activate as knowledge leads to the production of worthwhile interpretations or not. Our questioning of this fact led to the citing and explanation of the logical reasons which can justify that our activation of a given contextual model will not lead to the production of over-interpretations. The examination of the cited reasons showed that what makes the activation of a given type of knowledge away from over-interpretation is the fact of being shared by the world community. In other words, any information that we might activate to understand a given discourse should be widely recognized as a shared knowledge. By highlighting the need of being shared, we offered a good advice on how to use the knowledge we have to communicate what is left

silent by the users of language.

To recapitulate, apart from affecting discourse production and analysis, the use of knowledge is proved to be affected by such factors at the level of both processes. These factors include examples like context, persuasion, goals, etc. Thus, to have the knowledge we activate serve to demystify what the speakers mystified, we should be aware about how these factors affect the speakers' argument for action. Having this in mind, it was easier for us to select the appropriate knowledge to activate while seeking to work out the speakers' hidden ideologies. The discussion of how to make of the activated knowledge serves the positive interpretation of the above examples revealed that the wider the community who share that knowledge is, the more valid the interpretation will be. So, the activation of a given knowledge should have the (+ logic) value to be fruitful for escaping the possibility to be in the realm of biases.

5. Concluding Remarks

This paper offered a multi-disciplinary discussion to the importance of the use of out-side-text knowledge in the analysis and comprehension of discourse. This discussion has led to the formulation of some important conclusions: some are theoretical and others are practical.

At the theoretical level, we noticed that the activation of the knowledge we have in the analysis of a given piece of discourse should be monitored by several rules. First, priority should be given to reasoning. Our activation of any type of the knowledge we have should be based on what we need as information to allow our reasoning to progress while seeking for the resolution of a given problem. Second, the activation of any type of knowledge from the models we have in mind depends on the nature of the knowledge activated by language users. Here, we need to work out the meaning expressed by the linguistics of the text, to determine what the speaker hides as meaning, and to decide what type of knowledge to activate to communicate the un-said. Third, the fact of activating any type of knowledge should adhere to the logic of critique. We need to question whether what we activated as knowledge can serve for the production of a worthwhile interpretation or not. Fourth, the knowledge to be activated to demystify what the users of language mystified should be shared by the world community and not a personal one. We need to activate only shared knowledge to avoid falling in the realm of biases. Fifth, we need to make clear distinction between what we have as knowledge and our personal attitudes towards a given issue. This distinction is required in that our activation of attitudes instead of knowledge will led to the production of subjective instead of objective interpretations. Finally, discourse should be viewed as a kind of problem solving where the knowledge we have should be considered as the known part of the problem that we can use to reason while seeking to bring to light the un-known.

At the practical level, we noticed that the speakers activated only the knowledge that can serve for the progress of their arguments. However, they left non-active what cannot help them justify their plans to act in a given context. Our activation of the knowledge we have about their context of speaking revealed that there exist two kinds of realities: the rhetorical and the social. While the rhetorical reality

is the one that the speakers created to prove the legitimacy of their claims, the social reality is the one that shapes the logical reasons that push the speakers to act. The speakers hid the social reality in order to hide the political goals standing behind their claims for action and to highlight the humanitarian values they defend. The activation of the knowledge we have served also to reveal that the speakers manipulate the knowledge they have in mind depending on the goals they seek to achieve. In other, words the activation of any type of knowledge in discourse production and analysis is monitored by the logic of serving such goals instead of others. Our critique of how to avoid over-interpreting a text highlighted that the separation between interpretation and over-interpretation remains a matter of critique. In other words, we need to question each time whether the activated knowledge could lead to the production of over-interpretation or not. Our practice, of the logic of this critique revealed that to be away from over-interpreting a text we need to active only what is shared by the large world community. In brief, the activation of out-side-text knowledge is crucial to communicate the un-said. However, the practice of this discipline should be grounded in the logic of critique to avoid being subjective.

Having these two sorts of conclusions in mind, this paper brought valuable contributions to the disciplines interested in the study of language in use. It offered its readers a good idea about how to explore their knowledge of the world to understand what they hear and read in their everyday life. Also, it offered researchers a well-established theoretical approach that they can use to explore the knowledge they have in mind while seeking to communicate the un-said. Though important these contributions are, this paper left the doors open for more research on how to explore out-side-text knowledge to reveal deception and to communicate what the users of language left silent.

References

Ariel, M. (2009). Discourse, Grammar, Discourse. *Discourse Studies*, *11*(5), 5-36. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445608098496

Armstrong, D. M. (1973). *Belief, Truth and Knowledge*. London: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511570827

Chilton, P. (2005). Missing links in Mainstream CDA: Modules, Blends and the Critical Instinct. In R. Wodak, & P. Chilton (Eds.), *A New Research Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis: Theory, Methodology and Interdisciplinary* (pp. 19-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.13.05chi

Eco, U. (1990). Interpretation and Over interpretation: World, History, Texts. *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*. Clare Hall, Cambridge University. Retrieved from https://tannerlectures.utah.edu/_documents/a-to-z/e/Eco_91.pdf

Fairclough, N. (1995a). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1995b). *Critical Discourse Analysis: Papers in the Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.

Freud, S. (1989). *Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis*. New York, NY: Liveright Publishing Cooperation.

Hassen, R. (2015). Discourse as Medium of Knowledge: Transmission of Knowledge by Transmission of Discourse People Live. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *6*(31), 119-128.

Killer, R. (2005). Analysing Discourse: An approach from the Sociology of Knowledge. *From Qualitative Research*, *6*(3), 223-242.

Kintesh, W., & Van Dijk, T. A. (1983). *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension*. New York, US: Academic Press.

Lazar, M. M. (2005). *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis*. New York: Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230599901

Martin, J. R. (2000). Close reading: Functional Linguistics as a Tool in Critical Discourse Analysis. In L. Unsworth (Ed.), *Researching Language in Schools and Communities: Functional Linguistics Approaches* (pp. 275-303). London: Cassell.

Preyer, D., & Peter, G. (Eds.). (2005). *Contextualism in Philosophy: Knowledge, Meaning and Truth*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press and Clarendon Press.

Pritchard, D. (2014). *What Is the Thing Called Knowledge?* (3rd ed.). London and New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315889443

Tulving, E. (1972). Episodic and Semantic Memory. In E. Tulving, & W. Donaldson (Eds.), *Organization of Memory*. New York, US: Academic Press.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. In *Discourse and Society* (Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 249-283). London, Newbury Park and New Delhi: Sage. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006

Van Dijk, T. A. (1999). Context Models in Discourse Processing. In H. Van, Oostendorp, & S. R. Goldman (Eds.), *The Construction of Mental Representations during Reading* (pp. 123-148). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2003). The Discourse-Knowledge Interface. In G. Weiss, & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical Discourse Analysis. Theory and Interdisciplinarity* (pp. 85-109). Houndsmills: Palgrave-MacMillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230288423_5

Van Dijk, T. A. (2005). Contextual Knowledge Management in Discourse Production: A CDA Perspective. In R. Wodak, & P. Chilton (Eds.), *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis* (pp. 71-100). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Ben Jamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.13.07dij

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse, Context and Cognition. *Discourse Studies*, *8*(1), 159-177. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445606059565

Van Dijk, T. A. (2007). Comments on Context and Conversation. In N. Fairclough, G. Cortese, & P. Ardizzone (Eds.), *Discourse and Contemporary Social Change* (pp. 281-316). Bern: Peter Lang.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Text, Context and Knowledge* (Unpublished Paper). Retrieved from http://www.discourses.org/UnpublishedArticles/Text,%20Context%20and%20Knowledge.pdf

Van Dijk, T. A. (2014). *Discourse and Knowledge*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107775404