

*Salomi Boukala**

CRITIQUE AND ARGUMENTATION: RETHINKING ANTISEMITISM AS COMMON SENSE

ABSTRACT

Based on the Aristotelian tradition and the Critical Discourse Studies roots on critique, I introduce a Discourse Argumentative Approach (DAA) that focuses on the examination of the decryption of political arguments that appeal as common sense. In particular, this paper seeks to demonstrate through a reflexive approach that the integration of CDS with argumentation theory not only enhances analytical rigor by mitigating the risk of interpretive bias, but also challenges the analyst's own ideological assumptions and epistemic positioning. To do so, I utilize the DAA to examine in depth the discursive normalization of antisemitism as a form of "common sense" knowledge.

Keywords: *Discourse Argumentative Approach, common sense, critique, antisemitism*

*Assistant Professor of Critical Discourse Analysis, Department of Social Anthropology, Panteion University, e-mail: salomi.boukala@panteion.gr

Σαλώμη Μπουκάλα*

ΚΡΙΤΙΚΗ ΚΑΙ ΕΠΙΧΕΙΡΗΜΑΤΟΛΟΓΙΑ:
ΕΠΑΝΕΞΕΤΑΖΟΝΤΑΣ ΤΟΝ ΑΝΤΙΣΗΜΙΤΙΣΜΟ
ΩΣ ΚΟΙΝΗ ΛΟΓΙΚΗ

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

Αξιοποιώντας την αριστοτελική παράδοση και τις βασικές αρχές των Κριτικών Σπουδών Λόγου (Critical Discourse Studies – CDS) σχετικά με την έννοια της κριτικής, προτείνω στο πλαίσιο του παρόντος άρθρου μια Επιχειρηματολογική Προσέγγιση του Λόγου (Discourse Argumentative Approach – DAA), η οποία επικεντρώνεται στην ανάλυση της αποκωδικοποίησης πολιτικών επιχειρημάτων που παρουσιάζονται ως αυτονόητα ή κοινώς αποδεκτά. Ειδικότερα, το παρόν άρθρο μέσα από μια αναστοχαστική προσέγγιση επιδιώκει να αναδείξει ότι η σύνθεση των Κριτικών Σπουδών Λόγου με τη θεωρία της επιχειρηματολογίας όχι μόνο ενισχύει την αναλυτική αυστηρότητα, μειώνοντας τον κίνδυνο ερμηνευτικών στρεβλώσεων, αλλά ταυτόχρονα θέτει υπό αμφισβήτηση τις ιδεολογικές παραδοχές και τη γνωσιακή τοποθέτηση του/της ίδιου/-ιας του/της αναλυτή/-τριας. Για τον σκοπό αυτόν, αξιοποιώ την DAA προκειμένου να εξετάσω σε βάθος την κανονικοποίηση του αντισημιτισμού ως μορφής «κοινής λογικής».

Λέξεις κλειδιά: Επιχειρηματολογική Προσέγγιση του Λόγου, κοινή λογική, κριτική, αντισημιτισμός

*Επίκουρη Καθηγήτρια Κριτικής Ανάλυσης Λόγου, Τμήμα Κοινωνικής Ανθρωπολογίας, Πάντειο Πανεπιστήμιο Κοινωνικών & Πολιτικών Επιστημών.

INTRODUCTION: RE-EXAMINING CRITIQUE IN CDS

The critical orientation and its role within Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) have been a central concern for scholars since the field's inception. From its early development, CDA has positioned itself as a socially committed form of discourse analysis, aiming not only to describe language usage but also to uncover and challenge the power relations and ideological processes embedded within discourse (Fairclough, 1995; Van Dijk, 1993). Critique in CDA involves a political stance—one that is aligned with the goal of challenging injustice, inequality, and domination in society (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999). CDA's commitment to critique, however, has sparked ongoing debates regarding the nature, scope, and legitimacy of critical engagement in discourse studies (see the Introduction of this Special Issue). As such, the integration of critique into CDA remains both a defining feature and a source of methodological and epistemological tension within the field.

Drawing upon the sociophilosophical orientation of critical theory, Reisigl & Wodak (2001, p. 32) explicated the complex concept of social critique by presenting three interconnected aspects, two of which are related to the dimension of recognition and the last one to the dimension of action— the immanent critique, the sociodiagnostic critique and the retrospective critique (see Archakis; Serafis & Bennett and Introduction, in this special issue). As they also noted, “in order to avoid an excessively simplistic and one-sided perspective, social critique has to be carefully and self-reflectively applied” (p. 35). CDA has been subject to critique for its perceived ideological orientation. Scholars within this tradition have been accused of allowing their ideological predispositions to influence the analytical process, resulting in interpretations that may be both selective and aligned with their personal beliefs. To reply to this critique, Teun Van Dijk (2001, p. 96) was claiming that “CDA is biased —and proud of it”— an assumption that gives rise to dogmatic perspectives and frequently complicates the discourse surrounding the critical stance within CDA. As Fairclough (2001) had earlier explained, the ideological dimensions of discourse are often implicit and obscured. In this way, there is a risk that analysts may inadvertently project their own ideological assumptions onto the data. This can occur through the identification of linguistic features presumed to carry ideological weight, from which broader ideological conclusions are then inferred. To minimize the risk of critical biasing and to avoid simply politicizing, instead of accurately analyzing, Reisigl and

Wodak (2001, p. 35) introduced the principle of triangulation, emphasizing DHA's methodological rigor and interdisciplinary analysis (see Introduction to this special issue).

An important distinction between CDA and other schools of Discourse Analysis and Critical Linguistics lies in the differentiation between understanding and explaining texts. As Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) argue, interpreting discourse through an ideological lens should not be conflated with achieving a direct understanding of the text itself. Rather, such interpretations serve as part of a broader explanatory framework that seeks to uncover the underlying power relations and ideological structures embedded within discourse. In this view, ideological analysis is not about reconstructing the intended meaning of the text but about situating it within a socio-political context that reveals how language contributes to the reproduction or contestation of power. Moreover, Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) argue that critique in CDA is reflexive; analysts must be aware of their own positions and the ideological implications of their analyses. They contend that CDA scholars need to examine not only the discourse under study but also their own roles in producing knowledge and how their analyses may contribute to broader societal shifts. Building on the core principles of Critical Discourse Studies (CDS) — particularly, its orientation toward power, ideology, and critique— this paper seeks to demonstrate that the integration of CDS with argumentation theory not only enhances analytical rigor by mitigating the risk of interpretive bias but also challenges the analyst's own ideological assumptions and epistemic positioning. To do so, I introduce a *Discourse Argumentative Approach* for examining the discursive normalization of antisemitism as a form of “common sense” knowledge. Furthermore, through a reflexive engagement with my positionality and intellectual trajectory, I address the motivations behind my decision to investigate a topic that directly confronts aspects of my own cultural and political identity.

CHOOSING CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AS AN ACADEMIC RESEARCH PATH

I was raised in a family environment deeply immersed in politics and journalism. My decision to work in the media after completing my postgraduate studies may have stemmed from my familiarity with the art of writing, or perhaps from my comfort within that field. Nevertheless, it soon became evident that this professional path was not ideally suited to my

aspirations. While working in the field of journalism, I acquired valuable insights —both practical and theoretical— into the mechanisms of media discourse and its intersections with political processes. Most significantly, I developed key skills in writing and time management, which proved essential in meeting the demands of text production.

My first encounter with Discourse Analysis occurred during my postgraduate studies in Communication and the Mass Media at the University of Leicester in the United Kingdom. From the outset, I was captivated by the analytical tools the field offered. It was precisely this type of critical engagement I had sought within the context of Greek media practice, although I quickly came to realise the fundamental differences between journalistic writing and scholarly analysis. This realization led me to Lancaster University, where I pursued doctoral studies under the supervision of the distinguished Professor of CDA, Ruth Wodak. While my initial engagement with Discourse Analysis was intellectually stimulating, my subsequent immersion in CDA —supervised by Ruth Wodak— was transformative. It shaped my academic orientation, as well as my personal and political commitments, insofar as I minimized dogmatic views and attempted to focus on texts and their importance.

At Lancaster, I found myself at the very core of CDA. Ruth Wodak's generous mentorship and scholarly sensitivity provided a unique intellectual environment —rich in dialogue, collegiality, and rigorous academic output. In contrast to the dystopian atmosphere of crisis-ridden Greece in 2010, I was now part of a vibrant academic community that cultivated critical inquiry under Ruth's careful guidance. And then, quite unexpectedly, an academic debate about the notion of *topos* disrupted the peaceful environment I was trying to integrate into while studying disciplines of linguistics like pragmatics and semantics. It made me wonder: how does argumentation relate to linguistics, and what does *topos* actually mean? I recall posing countless questions to Ruth during our supervision meetings—questions that she addressed with exceptional clarity and patience. Through her, I came to understand the interrelation between argumentation theory and the Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA). Her persistent efforts to elucidate this nexus led me to explore the Aristotelian tradition in depth.

Although I was already situated at the source of CDA, I also wanted to reach the source, the foundations of Aristotelian rhetoric. As a Greek scholar, I aspired to engage with Aristotle's work in its original text. This ambitious endeavor would not have been possible, actually it would have

been a disaster, without the guidance of my uncle, Pantelis Boukalas, a journalist, poet, and of course distinguished expert in ancient Greek literature. He provided critical support in selecting appropriate texts, consulting reliable translations, and developing interpretative strategies for engaging with the ancient Greek texts. Following a productive and reflective period during the 2010 Christmas break in Athens, I returned to Lancaster and began writing on the notion of *topos*, once again under Ruth's enthusiastic supervision. This effort led to a number of publications on the subject and an innovative PhD thesis.

Fifteen years after my initial engagement with argumentation theory, this paper offers me an opportunity to express my deep gratitude to Ruth and to Pantelis, and to trace the origins of my scholarly engagement with argumentation and Aristotelian rhetoric. These themes are elaborated upon in the sections that follow. Furthermore, I now present here the Discourse Argumentative Approach (DAA) —a methodological framework that informs the analysis developed in the subsequent parts of the study that follows. By employing DAA, I anticipate being able to demonstrate how Aristotle's *topos of things that appear to be common sense* is connected to the dissemination and reproduction of shared assumptions, in an effort to counteract biased perspectives.

The events of October 7th occurred while I was conducting ethnographic research on the revival of the Ladino language among Greek Jews. Many of my interlocutors, who identified as members of the Greek Jewish community and held predominantly leftist political views, were deeply affected by the brutality of the attacks and the political aftermath of Israel's response to it. These individuals expressed to me their growing anxiety and concern regarding a resurgence of antisemitism in Greece and the fact that they had been verbally attacked by leftist for being Jews. My academic engagement with antisemitism and the discursive construction of Greek Jewish identity had long been informed by personal reasons —particularly the cultural significance of my own name. However, the current context also challenged my political identity as a leftist. This convergence of the personal and the political prompted me to focus on the normalization of antisemitism as a form of "common sense" discourse that is extended across the political spectrum. Moreover, I regard the DAA as an especially appropriate methodological framework for my study, as it enables an in depth examination of a topic of such complexity. Finally, I assume that the DAA brings back into focus the notion of critique and the interdisciplinary nature of CDS.

CRITIQUE AND ARGUMENTATION – TOWARDS A DISCOURSE ARGUMENTATIVE APPROACH

CDA is underpinned by a robust theoretical foundation and a rigorous methodological approach (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001). Instead of pursuing an illusory objectivity, CDA is committed to uncovering and interrogating the power relations and ideological mechanisms embedded within discourse, offering a coherent and structured framework for analyzing language as a form of social practice. Thus, the ideological position in CDA is informed, justified, and open to scrutiny — not arbitrary or dogmatic, and the analysis could not be characterized as biased. As Wodak and Meyer (2009) claim “CDA does not deny the subjective positioning of the researcher, but rather tries to make it explicit, reflected upon, and part of the analysis” (p. 9). I assume that CDA’s commitment to exposing power asymmetries and social injustices is supported by rigorous methodological practices, such as triangulation and discursive strategies, which enhance validity, add a systematic form of analysis and shield the analysis against arbitrary interpretations.

One of the most obscure discursive strategies, but extremely important for the comprehension of power relations and the minimization of biased conclusions is related to argumentation. According to Toulmin (2003), argumentation can be understood as a speaker’s effort to provide justification for a given claim. This process is not confined to epistemological or scientific contexts; rather, it is equally prevalent in everyday social practices. Argumentation often plays a central role in political and authoritative discourses about the “Other,” where it serves persuasive functions and contributes to the construction of in-group and out-group distinctions. Consequently, I contend that scholars engaged in CDA, as well as researchers focusing on political discourse, must attend to argumentation strategies — particularly as they are examined through the use of *topoi* and fallacies. In this way, they secure their analysis and avoid arbitrary conclusions.

The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA), one of the principal strands of CDA, has already placed significant emphasis on argumentative strategies, incorporating the notions of *topoi* and fallacies — albeit in ways that have provoked scholarly debate (Boukala, 2016, 2019). Within the DHA framework, a *topos* is conceptualized as a warrant that links an argument to its conclusion. Moreover, the DHA does not differentiate between the terms *topoi* and *loci*, treating them as interchangeable in its analytical

practice and interconnecting two different Schools of thought and two different historical and political eras. More specifically, Aristotle evolved his dialectical syllogism and argumentation theory through the prism of Athenian democracy; he emphasised *endoxon*—previous accepted opinion—and the value of the majority’s opinion and acceptable “knowledge” and claimed that *endoxon* have to be challenged, whereas Cicero’s *loci* were developed in the era of the Roman Empire with its autocratic form of governance. As Aristotle explains in *Topics* (1992, Book A), *topoi* refer to the lines of argument employed by individuals when reasoning toward what is perceived as the “only truth”. These argumentative strategies are intrinsically linked to *endoxa* (commonly accepted opinions) and *predicables* (categories of predicates). In essence, *topoi* function as the tools through which a dialectician seeks to validate *endoxa* and address dialectical problems via the application of predicables.

Topos examines *endoxa* and selects those accepted opinions that can develop dialectic arguments and lead to the solution of a dialectical problem and the pursuit of a “truth” that can always be challenged. Thus, the aim of Aristotelian dialectic is verification of commonly accepted opinions and the production or legitimation of “knowledge”. Moreover, Aristotelian “dialectical *topoi*” are argument schemes which can be used to establish or refute a controversial standpoint, and enable speakers to argue in dialectical debates that intend to produce “knowledge”. On the other hand, Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* presents *topoi* as rhetorical tools designed to guide the speaker toward emphasizing a particular conclusion in a given case, thereby functioning primarily as instruments of persuasion. Unlike in dialectical reasoning, *topoi* in this context are not conceived as logical warrants, nor do they presuppose the authority of established knowledge. Instead, Aristotle positions *topoi* as frameworks that enable the articulation of *endoxa*. However, these *endoxa* are not treated as fixed truths; rather, they are subject to scrutiny and contestation, forming the basis for deliberation that may ultimately lead to revised understandings and, potentially, to a more accurate or truthful position.

Drawing upon the Aristotelian tradition, I argue that the CDA analyst as other dialectician doesn’t aim to defend *truths* outright but rather to engage with common or reputable opinions (*endoxa*) to explore their logical coherence and potentially arrive at stronger conclusions (Aristotle, 1992, Book I). In this vein, Aristotle explicates that truth is not always evident and reasoning begins with what is widely accepted- not what is known on the basis of authority. Furthermore, as he explicates in the *Rhetoric*,

endoxa also serve as the basis of persuasion, insofar as they aid to the transformation of the speaker's argument into a shared belief. And this is exactly what a CDA analyst does—challenges arguments that are presented as ultimate truths, decodes arguments that are utilized by speakers as *endoxa*, and explicates how beliefs are represented as *endoxa* and shape common sense.

Another important concept in the Aristotelian thought that has also been used by the DHA scholars in the analysis of political discourse is fallacy. In the first lines of the *Sophistical Refutations*, indeed, he provides an implicit definition of fallacy by explaining that in this work he intends to discuss “arguments that appear to be logical refutations, but in fact there are not; they are fallacies (paralogisms)” (Aristotle, 1994, pp. 164a19-21). Fallacies are important argumentation schemes that serve the justification of discrimination, however, as Reisigl and Wodak (2001) claim, the lines between reasonable or fallacious argumentation cannot be drawn clearly in any case. Political discourse is based on fallacious arguments that are used to demonstrate false truth or distribute common sense. In addition, Wodak (2024) underlined the usage of fallacious arguments and appeals to common sense in the analysis of populist, far right discourse.

Based on the Aristotelian tradition and the CDA roots on critique, I introduce a Discourse Argumentative Approach (DAA) that focuses on the examination of the decryption of political arguments that appeal as common sense. The main strengths of the DAA are its interdisciplinary orientation—based on political science, argumentation and CDA, and its in-depth study of political discourses. It encourages an equivalent dialogue between disciplines and avoids empirical or arbitrary research. By paraphrasing the Aristotelian *endoxon* as hegemonic knowledge and utilizing *topoi* and fallacies, DAA's main aim, is to illustrate how *hegemonic knowledge* is developed by social and political elites and established as “*common sense*”.

EXAMINING GREEK ANTISEMITISM AS COMMON SENSE

In 2010, amid the sovereign debt crisis, Greece became embroiled in a significant corruption scandal involving a list of approximately 2,000 prominent Greek citizens who were reported to hold undeclared funds in Swiss bank accounts. This list—later widely known as the *Lagarde List*—was handed over to the Greek government by Christine Lagarde, then French Minister of Finance and current President of the European

Central Bank, with the aim of assisting efforts to curb tax evasion. Despite its potential implications, Greek authorities initially refrained from investigating the matter, largely due to the inclusion of names linked to high-ranking politicians and government ministers.

In October 2012, the then President of the Greek Socialist Party (PASOK), who had served as Deputy Prime Minister of Greece and was also former finance minister, Evangelos Venizelos, was speaking to parliament's institutions and transparency committee on the *Lagarde list* and as he explained in his testimony to MPs: "I looked at the printouts of the list and got the unpleasant impression that three of the names were of Greek Jewish origin"¹ – a statement that prompted a reaction in the Greek Parliament and led Venizelos to explicate himself by saying:

What I meant about religion is that they were names that gave the impression that these were Greek citizens of Jewish origin. And this is something I commented on somewhat negatively. Why do I have here three names that happen to be names of Jewish origin? It made an impression on me and it wasn't a pleasant impression (Venizelos, 12 October 2012).²

Venizelos' statement does not constitute an instance of verbal aggression or overt hate speech traditionally associated with far-right discourses targeting Jewish communities. Nevertheless, his negatively charged reference to Greek citizens of Jewish origin, whose presence on a list of alleged tax evaders he described as creating an "unpleasant impression", reveals the extent to which antisemitic conspiracy narratives referring to the symbol of the wealthy Jew – prevalent in Greek society during the financial crisis – transcended far-right populist parties (Georgiadou, 2019). Moreover, the lack of political condemnation and the silent tolerance of such antisemitic references reflect a broader cynicism, revealing the persistence of a "common knowledge" about Jews and their alleged tactics. The above argument is linked to the Aristotelian "topos of things that appear to be common sense" (Rhetoric, 2004, B23, 1400a) that is based on the conditional scheme: "if Greece is facing financial hardship, then it is commonly assumed that Jews are responsible", revealing the deep roots of antisemitism across the Greek political spectrum and society. Richardson and Wodak (2022) similarly highlight how figures like George

1. <https://www.iefimerida.gr/news/71896/γιατί-ο-βενιζέλος-στοχοποίησε-τρεις-εβραίους-για-τη-λίστα-λαγκάρντ>

2. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KcYCw6YdOkA&t=123s>

Soros have been transformed into symbolic scapegoats, instrumentalized to serve various political objectives —not only by far-right actors, but increasingly by mainstream political figures as well.

Several years later, under the governance of SYRIZA, Deputy Prime Minister Yannis Dragasakis invoked a culturally charged allegory by referencing the Jewish character Shylock from Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*. In doing so, he portrayed Greece's international creditors —specifically the troika, consisting of the European Commission, the European Central Bank, and the International Monetary Fund— as ruthless and exploitative. During a parliamentary debate, Dragasakis employed this literary reference to underscore the perceived severity and inhumanity of the lenders' demands, effectively drawing on antisemitic tropes historically associated with financial greed and moral indifference. As he noticed "Shakespeare's Shylock was more honest than the Troika. He asked directly for human flesh" (Dragasakis, February 10, 2015).

Although Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* could be considered as an example of diachronic antisemitism, what I would like to underline here is that Dragasakis employs Shylock's significance as a symbol of antisemitism to accuse Greece's international lenders for their cruelty. In this way, he adopts a common-sense Shakespeare's antisemitic plot and the diachronic anti-Jewish prejudices.

The analogy between Jews and global capitalism is common in Greek extreme right political rhetoric and was raised during the Greek financial crisis that contributed to the increase of far-right parties (Angouri & Wodak, 2014; Georgiadou, 2019). However, this instance further demonstrates that associations between Jews and global economic control are not confined to far-right discourses; rather, they circulate across the entire political spectrum and are often propagated as common-sense narratives, insofar as they are perceived as socially acceptable forms of knowledge. (Fairclough, 2001; Boukala, 2024).

It was not the response of the Central Board of Jewish Communities in Greece (KIS) to his reference, but rather the publication of an article in *EFSYN* addressing antisemitism in Greece, that prompted Deputy Prime Minister Yannis Dragasakis to publicly distance himself from antisemitic interpretations. As Yannis Dragasakis announced via his profile on Twitter: "Using the Shylock analogy, when criticizing capitalism, does not constitute antisemitism. Have you lost moderation?"³

3. https://www.efsyn.gr/ellada/koinonia/109503_o-sailok-prokalese-syzitisi

Dragasakis' tweet illustrates the establishment of anti-Jewish stereotypes in Greek society as common sense that is based on intertextual relations, namely, reference to an acknowledged piece of art. However, such references recontextualize discourse produced in different contexts as contemporary common ground. They thus lead to the normalization of power relations (Fairclough, 2001) on the basis of the Aristotelian "topos of things that appear to be common sense" (see above); they also demonstrate the incapacity of a part of the left to comprehend the negative representation of Jews via the utilization of antisemitic allegories that disseminate conspiracy theories as universally acceptable, as common sense. Moreover, the then Deputy Minister utilizes a rhetorical question to highlight the columnists' view and accuse them of overreacting. Thus, Dragasakis adopts an accusatory stance, without demonstrating critical reflection or offering an apology for his statement. This response, framed in an aggressive tone, exemplifies a broader lack of critical engagement with antisemitism within parts of the Greek left. Such responses not only signal a failure to confront embedded prejudices but also actively contribute to the normalization of Judeophobic attitudes in public discourse. Paraphrasing Billing (1995) here, I assume that Dragasakis' statements reveal a "banal antisemitism" that characterizes the Greek political spectrum, insofar as discriminatory ideas are subtly integrated into everyday language and arguments, rendering them seemingly innocuous and socially acceptable as common knowledge.

On October 7, 2023, the brutal attack carried out by Hamas against Israeli civilians resulted in the deaths of more than a thousand and sent shockwaves across the international community. Political leaders and numerous parties across Europe, including Greece, swiftly condemned the violence and expressed their solidarity with the Israeli people. Here, I should clarify that I do not refer to the genocidal acts committed by the Israeli government as a response to October 7th and of course, I do not deny them. What I attempt to show is that certain segments of the political left and their representatives, while attempting —consistently with their historical stance— to express solidarity with the Palestinian people, did so in a manner that conflated that support with the legitimization of a horrific act of violence. In this climate of grief and terror, right after the events of October 7th, the Greek Communist Party (KKE) issued the following statement:⁴

4. https://www.efsyn.gr/politiki/exoteriki-politiki/407143_i-thesi-ton-ellinikon-kommaton-gia-ti-flegomeni-m-anatoli

KKE condemns the longstanding occupation by the Israeli state and the crimes it systematically commits against the Palestinian people — with the support of the USA, the EU, and their allies — which have resulted in thousands of Palestinian deaths, thousands more injured and imprisoned, ruined cities and villages, and settlements on Palestinian land. Today's events are not a “bolt from the blue,” and those seeking their causes must confront the truth head-on. This truth reveals the daily escalation of attacks by the Israeli army, resulting in dozens of Palestinian deaths, including elderly individuals and young children. These are crimes that have intensified recently and have been repeatedly condemned by KKE. The aggression of the Israeli state ultimately targets even the Israeli people themselves.

According to the Greek Communist Party, the real culprit of the attack by Hamas is Israel and its allies (USA, EU) that systematically commit crimes against the Palestinian people. They claim that the events of October 7th are an aporia of Israel's occupation politics against Palestine that also turn against the Israeli people. Hence, the representatives of the Communist party, by blaming the state of Israel for the attack, reveal their anti-Israel position that is further elaborated by the Aristotelian “topos of correlatives” (Rhetoric, 2004, B23, 1397b) that is further substantiated via the conditional: “if one member of a group acts in a bad way, then the other members will accept the consequences of a bad act” and explicates why Israeli people were attacked due to the Israel state's politics. Thus, the Communist Party establishes its anti-imperialism by blaming Israel and the West for the attack. In this way, the Communist Party implicitly justifies the events of October 7th in a Fanonian (1963) way and activates the presupposition that Israeli civilians deserve the violence due to their citizenship and their identification with the state of Israel and its allies. Hence, the Communist party employs anti-imperialism and not antisemitism in the announcement under scrutiny. However, KKE's reasoning here, the aggressive rhetoric and the fact that a condemnation of the attack is absent from the party's statement illustrates KKE's clear alignment with one side of the conflict. What is more, there is an indirect second identification between the Palestinian people and Hamas as fighters against Western imperialism, which shows how the Greek Communists have built their view regarding Israel-Palestine conflict over generalizations preventing them from distinguishing people and states or institutional agencies. Thereafter, the Communist party's statement concludes:

The ND government and SYRIZA, with their unacceptable statements which support the occupying forces, are doubly exposed, as they have been turning a blind eye since 2015 and refuse to recognize the Palestinian state in accordance with the unanimous decision of the Greek Parliament. The Palestinian people have the right to defend their rights and need greater popular support and solidarity to continue their struggle to end the Israeli occupation, for an independent state at the 1967 borders, with East Jerusalem as its capital.

In the concluding paragraph of its statement, the Greek Communist Party reframes an international crisis through a domestic lens by attributing blame to Greece's mainstream political parties, New Democracy and SYRIZA, for their policies concerning the Middle East. The authors of the statement openly express their support for the Palestinian people and their right to fight against Israeli occupation. However, they employ a fallacy of homonymy (Aristotle, 1994) that identifies Hamas with all the Palestinian people as supporters of Hamas' tactics. In doing so, the statement implicitly legitimizes acts of violence against Israeli civilians under the guise of national liberation. Moreover, KKE asks for the return to 1967 borders, the Green Line that recognizes the Palestinian West Bank. How is this possible? KKE suggests it by means of violence constructing an argument that is further explained via the "topos of indication" (Rhetoric, 2004, B23, 1401a) that here is based on the syllogism: "if Palestinian people want to end the occupation then they need to fight and forbid the establishment of the state of Israel with its current borders": Thus, by endorsing Hamas' actions under the banner of anti-imperialism—an approach that relies on broad generalizations, the Communist party fails to differentiate between people, states, and military actions and establishes an argumentative scheme that is common in the Greek left as an attempt to support Palestinian guerillas by justifying violence.

CONCLUSION

The above analysis does not seek to attribute antisemitism to Greece's left-wing or center-left political parties as a deliberate ideological stance. In contrast, its aim is to illustrate how DAA, as part of the broader framework of CDS, can reveal the presence of antisemitic tropes even within political discourses that are conventionally regarded as progressive and committed to anti-discrimination values. Here I should clarify that

the consequences of Israeli policy following October 7th are both evident and deeply alarming. These measures have primarily targeted Palestinian civilians, who now face the threat of genocide and are in urgent need of international condemnation and protection. However, the absence of any explicit denunciation of Hamas's actions and the brutality inflicted upon Israeli civilians on October 7th in the official statement of the KKE — issued promptly after the events — reveals an underlying logic that equates Israeli civilians who oppose Netanyahu's tactics with the Israeli state and, by extension, rationalizes violence. While I maintain that the Greek Communist Party's anti-imperialist and denunciatory rhetoric is not, by no means, antisemitic, the arguments it employs risk fostering antisemitic interpretations when they are adopted uncritically, particularly within a framework that legitimizes violence as a response to violence via the topos of indication and generalizations. On the other hand, Venizelos and Dragasakis' antisemitic references illustrate how theories of conspiracy against the Jews are linked to the Greek culture and identity.

To conclude, it can be contended that such findings underscore the fact that CDS do not promote a biased perspective; on the contrary, it often interrogates and problematizes the very ideological assumptions even of those conducting the analysis. In a socio-political climate where ideology constructs different or even opposite views of reality, and political correctness is frequently dismissed as ineffective and supplanted by increasingly aggressive rhetorics that have already become mainstream, I argue that CDS and DAA offer critical tools for unpacking how arguments function and how they appeal to shared values and so-called "common sense".

REFERENCES

- Aristotle (1992). *Topics*. Kaktos.
 Aristotle (1994). *Sophistical Refutations*. Kaktos.
 Aristotle (2004). *Rhetoric*. Zitros.
 Angouri, J., & Wodak, R. (2014). 'They became big in the shadow of the crisis': The Greek success story and the rise of the far right'. *Discourse and Society*, 25(4), 540-565.
 Billig, M. (1995). *Banal Nationalism*. Sage.
 Boukala, S. (2016). Rethinking Topos in the Discourse Historical Approach: Endoxon Seeking and Argumentation in Greek Media Discourses on 'Islamist Terrorism'. *Discourse Studies*, 18(3), 249-268.
 Boukala, S. (2019). *European identity and the representation of Islam in the mainstream press: Argumentation and media discourse*. Palgrave.

- Boukala, S. (2024). The Greek left-wing and the 'Jewish problem': Analysing antizionism and antisemitism as forms of soft hate speech. In *Critical Discourse Studies*, online first.
- Chouliaraki, L. & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media discourse*. Edward Arnold.
- Fanon, F. (1963). *The wretched of the earth* (R. Philcox, Trans.). Grove Press.
- Georgiadou, V. (2019). *Far Right in Greece* [in Greek]. Kastaniotis.
- Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and discrimination: Rhetorics of racism and antisemitism*. Routledge.
- Richardson, J., & Wodak, R. (2022). Anti-Sorosism: Reviving the 'Jewish world conspiracy'. In M. Demata, V. Zorzi and A. Zottola (Eds.), *Conspiracy Theory Discourses* (pp.395-420). John Benjamins.
- Toulmin, S. (2003 [1958]). *The uses of argument*. CUP.
- Van Dijk, T. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: A plea for diversity. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 95-120). Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis*. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249-283.
- Wodak, R. (2024). Appeals to "normality" and "common sense" in the face of global uncertainty: An interdisciplinary discourse-historical approach. *Informal Logic*, 44(3), 361-398.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). What CDA is about. In R. Wodak, and M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp.1-33). Sage.