

Daniela Matić*

University of Split, Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering and
Naval Architecture Croatia

IDEOLOGICAL DISCOURSE STRUCTURES IN POLITICAL SPEECHES

UDC [808.51:32]:81'42
Original scientific paper

The purpose of this paper is to identify and compare, using tools offered by critical discourse analysis, political discourse structures, i.e. semantic macrostructures, local meanings and linguistic devices which were used in the speeches of two American candidates in the 2008 presidential election, especially those aimed at positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation and explain the global and local contextual levels which shape such discourse structures.

Key words: *critical discourse analysis, ideology, political discourse structures, political speech.*

1. Introduction

Politics is a social activity that can be defined, first and foremost, as a struggle for power, between those who are in power and those who are not but would like to be, although it can also be defined as a set of cooperation strategies carried out by some social institutions with a view to solving some social conflicts (Chilton 2004:3). Inherent properties of politics are a clash of interests, persuasion and manipulation, imposition of opinions as commonsensical, defining allies and opponents.

The term "ideology" has several definitions out of which Fairclough chooses two: „any social policy which is in part or whole derived from social theory *in a conscious way*" and the Marxist definition according to which ideologies are, when struggle for political power is at issue, "ideas which arise from a given set of material interests" (Fairclough 2001a:77). Van Dijk (1998:8-9) defines it as "the basis of the social representations shared by members of a group" so that there is "a mental framework of beliefs about society and the cognitive and social functions of such a framework for groups". Ideology as a system of beliefs can be expressed in "symbols, rituals, discourse and other social and cultural practices" (van Dijk 1998:26). When certain individuals or groups in a society accept some social construct, that is, some ideology either because it enables them to achieve their goals or because they truly believe that it gives the right answers to challenges and problems, these ideological beliefs are often presented as commonsensical and therefore the only ones possible. These groups may acquire political legitimacy through elections, gain political power and persuade citizens

* University of Split, Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering and Naval Architecture, Ruđera Boškovića 32, 21000 Split, Croatia; e-mail daniela.matic@fesb.hr

into believing that their rule is the natural order of things. Since they have access to various types of discourse, they can control its creation and its content and hence control and steer public opinion.

Van Dijk (1998:244) defines persuasion as a process in which listeners change their opinions under the influence of some discourse. The very fact that the speaker can influence listeners and their reasoning means that the speaker can influence their subsequent activities and participation in society (van Dijk 2003:355). Language, therefore, proves to be very important in persuading (and manipulating) and one of the most important means of domination and control. For that reason, politicians tend to politicize the public by speeches or interviews with dramatic overtones and unrealistic promises, which means that various language forms can influence the intensity of social conflict. Unfortunately, listeners sometimes have to believe or accept what political speakers say since there are no alternative ideas or opinions or they are not knowledgeable enough to dispute speakers' words.

According to van Dijk, "discourse" can refer to a description of all genres in politics or to politicians' discourses, so in politics "discourse" is "a socially constituted set of such genres, associated with a social domain or field" (van Dijk 1998:196). Political speech is a genre of political discourse and is part of public discourse. It is characterized by formal lexis and monolog form and it is usually carefully crafted by professional speechwriters, which leaves no room for improvisations on the part of the speaker. Ideology can enter discourse at several levels, therefore both form and content can be ideologically marked, but ideological meaning can also be reproduced through interpretation of text.

2. Aim

The aim of this paper is to identify, compare and contrast discourse structures within ideological strategies used in the speeches delivered by two presidential candidates of two ideologically opposed political parties in the US presidential election in 2008. Several levels will be observed: semantic macrostructures (topics), local meanings and lexical style within speech acts, rhetorical devices, forms of indirectness and strategies especially aimed at positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation in order explain to what extent the speakers' partisan ideologies are reflected in their linguistic choices. The point that has to be tested or contested is whether the speeches follow the postulates of the "ideological square" as presented by van Dijk (1998, 2008).

3. Corpus

The material studied in this paper was extracted from the two transcribed speeches held by the Republican Party candidate John McCain (Speech 1 or S1 henceforth) and the Democratic Party candidate Barack Obama (Speech 2 or S2 henceforth) in the final days of the election campaign.

4. Methodology

The methodology framework in this paper draws on critical discourse analysis as conceived by its most outstanding theoreticians (Fairclough 1992, 1995a, 1995b, 2001a, 2001b, 2003; Fairclough and Wodak 1997; van Dijk 1997, 1998, 2001, 2008; Chilton and Schäffner 1997; Chilton 2004) and it is a combination of various approaches adapted to the corpus and the aim of research. The analysis first establishes the social practice, that is, how various social, economic, political and other phenomena manifest themselves in discourse and how some text can influence and even trigger some changes in society. The next step is the description of discursive practice, which includes the production, distribution and consumption of texts. Finally, the interpretation of discourse occurs at two levels (Fairclough 2001a): the level of context and the level of text. At the contextual level we mention the global and local situational context and on the other hand the intertextual context. At the textual level the global meaning, i. e., semantic macrostructures or topics are studied and compared in order to establish whether there is some pattern in the choice and sequence of topics. This analysis is followed by the analysis of local meanings in propositions, which is the focal point in this paper. At this level the presence as well as the absence of some lexical unit and how some choice contributes to the positive or negative self-presentation are studied.

5. Analysis and discussion

5.1. Social and discursive practice

In the social practice of elections there are two concepts nowadays, one based on the ideological program of a political party and the other based on the needs of electorate and the problems they perceive as critical. The presidential campaign organization in the USA exemplifies the latter.

As for the discursive practice, both speakers produce their speeches in real time in front of their audience. At first the distribution of speeches was limited, but videos were soon uploaded on the candidates' websites or websites of some newspapers so that materials could reach and be consumed by not only most

Americans, but also by every individual interested in these elections throughout the world.

5.2. Contextual levels

What marked and directed the course of the campaign at final stages and shaped our global contextual level was the breakout of financial and economic crisis and it is reflected in the speakers' descriptions of grim circumstances that people happen to be in and in speakers' empathy, but also in their references to the unsuccessful policy of the then administration during the two mandates (2000-2004, 2004-2008).

As to the local contextual level, both speakers delivered their speeches on October 21, two weeks before the Election Day, but in different cities in front of different audiences: McCain in Bensalem, Pennsylvania and Obama in Miami, Florida. This local context may have influenced the speaker's lexical choice, degree of formality, speech acts and discourse structures. The speeches may be viewed as speech events within elections which represent discursive practice.

5.3. Participants

The audience at pre-election rallies is diverse in the sense that among them one can find political party members and registered voters, but also those still undecided, as well as political opponents and those that incidentally attend such events. They may be listeners with diverse political or social backgrounds and hence have identities formed by their education, profession, class, age or race.

The speakers may also have several identities: John McCain was an educated soldier who spent six years imprisoned in Vietnam and he gladly and readily brought up this topic in his speeches or interviews. He is a public figure that entered the field of politics in the 1980's, the senator of Arizona, the Republican Party presidential candidate and a "normal" person. During the speech some of his identities surfaced: the identity of a politician who promises a better life, of a warrior who is ready to fight for that life, but also of a "normal" person who understands American citizens and shows empathy. Barack Obama has a law degree, he is a former university lecturer, activist and volunteer in his local community. He is a writer and also the senator of Illinois, the Democratic Party presidential candidate and a "normal" person. Some of his identities, such as the "normal" person identity, can be noticed in his use of colloquial style or in some personal stories that can show his empathy with the audience. None of the speakers mention their party affiliations; nonetheless, their speeches are ideological because they do represent views held by their respective parties. Both

parties advocate capitalism and do not contest its tenets such as freedom of enterprise and free market economy. What they do differ in is the degree of deregulation and government interventionism they would allow in tax policy, wealth distribution, social security and health care.

5.4. Political discourse structures

In this part of the analysis (following van Dijk 1998, 2008) we tried to show how relevant these discourse structures were for the presidential election as a political process of our interest and how they contributed to the political strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation.

5.4.1. Topics (semantic macrostructures)

Information emphasized as the most important in the speech is expressed in topics or semantic macrostructures and many of them are already worded with a view to positively representing the speaker and negatively the opponent. In these macrostructures we can find ideological opinions which can shape the coherence of the speeches.

Table 1 - **Speech 1 (S1)**

Introduction – The speaker expresses his thanks to his associates, announces a brighter future and entices the audience to vote.
1) Senator Obama is inconsistent and hypocritical.
2) Senator Obama attacks small entrepreneurs like Joe the Plumber
3) The speaker has seen through his opponent's plan of wealth redistribution and it is bad.
4) Senator Obama's tax plan is bad; it is just another tax increase.
5) The McCain-Palin tax cut is the real thing.
6) America is the land of opportunity, but it is facing many difficulties that Senator Obama is not capable of dealing with.
7) Senator Obama was many times wrong when international affairs were at issue.
8) America needs a new direction and the speaker will fight to shake up Washington.
9) The speaker will take America in a new direction.
10)The speaker has a plan for saving mortgaged homes, for retirees and for new job positions.
11)The government spent too much over the last eight years and this has to be stopped, but senator Obama will not do that.
12)The speaker will freeze government spending on all but the most important programs like defense, veterans care, social security and health care.
13)The speaker will not fine small business and families with children and will lower the health care costs, unlike senator Obama.
14)The speaker will not make it harder to sell American goods overseas and close down many businesses, unlike senator Obama.
15)Senator Obama does not know how to store nuclear power and is against offshore drilling, but the speaker knows and he is for drilling which will end America's dependence on foreign oil and gas sources.

16)The speaker admits that his campaign is lagging behind the opponent's but he does not give up.
17)At a moment of national crisis America needs a fighter.
Conclusion - The speaker is an American and he chooses to fight for a new direction and against corruption.

Table 2 - **Speech 2 (S2)**

Introduction – The speaker announces change which cannot be achieved without fight
1) Negative campaign from the opponent's team is aimed at stopping the change we need.
2) Senator McCain deludes small business people about the speaker's tax plan.
3) The speaker's tax plan is good and Senator McCain used to support ideas from it.
4) America does not need straw men and misleading charges but honest leadership and real change.
5) This crisis is the worst since the Great Depression.
6) The speaker believes in American people when faced with great challenges.
7) A new direction, new leadership and a real change in the policies are necessary.
8) President Bush and McCain disregarded the warning signs of the financial crisis and did nothing to prevent it.
9) Long time ago the speaker proposed some tax relief measures but senator McCain his advisors thought them unnecessary or even mocked the idea.
10)John McCain's plan does nothing to create jobs or help people.
11)John McCain should know that people need help right here and right now.
12)We want to grow the pie and then we wanna slice of the pie after eight years of failed economics.
13)The opponent tries to distract people's attention from the economy by attacking the speaker's character because he is out of other ideas.
14)America needs policies that grow the economy from the bottom-up so that every American has the chance to succeed.
15)The speaker offers tax relief for the middle class, unlike his opponent who offers tax cuts for rich people.
16)The opponent seems to have forgotten that he opposed the Bush tax cuts for rich people.
17)The speaker makes a promise that people who earn less than 250,000 dollars a year will not see their taxes increase.
18)The speaker wants to keep jobs in America and not ship them overseas.
19)America needs new investments in renewable sources of energy to end the dependence on Middle East oil and in infrastructure for the 21 st century.
20)The speaker will fix the problem of the health care system.
21)The speaker promises to give every child in America a world class education.
22)The speaker will invest in young people if they serve their country in some way.
23)The change will not be easy and quick, but everybody has to sacrifice and take some responsibility.
24)Despite all social, political, racial and other differences, Americans have fought for their country because they love it and they cannot afford to be divided.
25)Unified, America has been through many challenges.
26)The speaker asks of people to believe in themselves and in the future they

will build together.
27)The nation cannot fail at the moment of crisis when too much is at stake.
28)Every American has someone in the family that worked hard and endured all difficulties so that the future generation could live a better life.
Conclusion – Together, the speaker and the people of America can fight to change the country and the world.

After comparing the global meanings of S1 and S2, what can be noticed is that the number of topics was higher in S2 and that they were more varied. Nevertheless, the topics that both speeches shared were as follows:

- change/new direction (S1 – topics 8, 9, conclusion; S2 – introduction, topic 7, 23, conclusion)
- small entrepreneurship (S1- topics 2, 13; S2 - topics 2, 17),
- wealth redistribution (S1- topic 3; S2 - topic 12),
- tax plan (S1- topics 4, 5; S2 - topics 2, 3, 9, 15, 16),
- keeping jobs in the USA or creating new ones (S1 – topics 10, 14; S2 – 10, 11, 18),
- energy sources (S1 – topic 15; S2 – topic 19)
- wrong government policy and government spending (S1 – topics 11, 12; S2 – topic 8),
- what America is and what it needs (S1 – topics 6, 8, 9, 17; S2 – topics 4, 14).

As to the *schemata*, that is, the global schematic organization of these texts, we could say that both speakers followed similar outlines and order up to a point, but the S2 speaker dedicated comparatively more time to taxes, the key topic at the time of financial and economic crisis, unemployment and job losses, whereas the S1 speaker more often presented his patriotism, what America, in his opinion, is and what it needs. Wealth redistribution and small entrepreneurship were the topics that the S1 speaker used to bring up as they complemented his presentation of the S2 speaker as a “socialist”, so the S2 speaker retorted with counter-arguments but ordered them somewhat differently than the opponent.

The ideological communication, according to van Dijk (1998), consists of four moves that make the “ideological square”: emphasizing positive information about Us and negative about Them and de-emphasizing positive information about Them and negative about Us. In an ideologically polarized text, as a rule, negative information about Us will not be topicalized, whereas negative information about Them tends to be topicalized. Van Dijk also states that these moves are directed toward participants representing a political group as ideologies are group-based, but in these two speeches the speakers never spoke

on behalf of their political parties. Moreover, we found the discursive polarization predominately at the personal and not in- or out-group level and the parties that nominated the speakers were not mentioned; as a result, the polarization we found was most often conceptualized as "I, the speaker" vs. "him, the opponent". It could be even said that the elections and consequently these speeches were conceived first and foremost as the ideological confrontation of two politicians and their political stances and not of two political parties they formally represented.

Both speakers interwove their opponents' attitudes, plans or moves into their topics. While exposing his plans, the S1 speaker, in almost every passage, mentioned his opponent's plans predicting what he would or would not do, attacking him, addressing him as "Senator Obama", presenting him as an inconsistent, hypocritical, incompetent and frivolous politician that will redistribute and waste the nation's wealth, referring to him 64 times. The S2 speaker as well addressed his opponent as "Senator McCain" or by his surname, pointing out his inconsistency, lack of ideas and vision, concern for rich people and the attempts at smearing his character - all in all 50 times, which could mean that the S2 speaker was less focused on his opponent than the S1 speaker. On the other hand, the S2 speaker criticized the then administration for failing to recognize the looming crisis, pointing out that he had warned the nation about what might happen. However, the S1 speaker's critique of the Bush administration could not be direct and radical since it was the government of the party that had nominated him. He had a serious problem with how to convince the electorate that he would bring some change without overtly criticizing the government that people blamed for not reacting to the crisis. Therefore, he had to fight indirectly against the government and directly against his political opponent.

5.4.2. Local semantics (local meanings)

Most ideological beliefs can be usually found in local meanings since they are under the direct control of the speaker who chooses what propositions and lexical content will be presented to the audience. The positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation (often inextricably combined) are achieved mostly through lexicalization.

Speech 1: Positive self-presentation

1) We're gonna **change** America and we're gonna **clean up the mess**, and we're gonna **drain the swamp**, my friends. – The speaker starts the utterance with the exclusive "we", referring to his team. Using the metaphors,

the speaker presupposes that there is "the mess" that has to be cleaned up and "the swamp", the place of filth and rot that has to be drained. Obviously, the speaker has to resort to a rhetorical device in order to avoid naming those that have brought about this state, and that is the Republican Party administration.

2) And a sudden **tax-hike** for those businesses would **kill jobs** at a time when we need to be **creating more jobs**. I'm not gonna let that happen, my friends. I'm not gonna let that happen. – One of the key topics of the campaign were taxes: the speaker claimed that his opponent's plan is to raise taxes at the time of crisis. Here he presents himself as a savior that will prevent such an outcome, but his opponent's plan is to raise taxes only for the richest citizens and not for those who make less than 250,000 dollars a year. The speaker underlines the contrast between the opponent's and his policy by using the metaphorical expression "kill jobs", the job reduction which would ensue due to heavy taxing, contrasted with "create jobs".

3) America has an alternative to **the phony tax cut** my opponent started talking about only months ago. **The McCain-Palin tax cut** is the real thing. We're gonna **double** the child deduction for every family in America. We'll **cut** the capital gains tax. And we'll **cut** business taxes to help create jobs, and keep American businesses in America. – The speaker, even when announcing his tax plan and positively presenting the in-group, rarely misses the opportunity to contrast it with the opponent's plan, as in "the phony tax cut" vs. "the McCain-Palin tax cut", which shows that negative other-presentation cannot always be disentangled from the positive self-presentation. The other contrast is "cut" vs. "double", two verbs that in the above expressions most probably evoke positive feelings in the audience, though the former is less precise than the latter. The speaker again uses the exclusive "we", referring to his team or the future administration.

4) America didn't become the greatest nation on earth by giving our money to the government to **"spread the wealth around"**. In this country, we believe in **spreading opportunity**, for those who need jobs and those who create them right here. – Once again, using the "we" which is probably inclusive, the speaker draws a line between those who believe in "spreading the wealth around", the metaphor uttered by his opponent, and those who believe in "spreading opportunity", two metaphors that epitomize the crucial ideological differences between the policy represented by the out-group and that of the in-group and its followers. In this utterance the speaker presupposes that America became rich under those that created opportunities, those being the Republican administrations. Quoting the intertextual example "spread the wealth around",

the speaker indirectly refers to his opponent who used this metaphor, but the speaker recontextualizes it and fills it with the connotative meaning that may delegitimize his opponent.

5) **I'm** gonna make sure **we** take care of the working people **who were devastated** by the excess, greed and corruption of **Wall Street** and **Washington**. – In this example the speaker interchanges “I” with “we”, the former that will “make sure” and the latter that will “take care” – such a choice of personal pronouns may be accidental, but may also imply that the speaker will have to invest some additional effort to persuade his in-group, as they are not in unison, to help the “working people”. The passive voice fronts the subject which is more important than the actual agents hidden in the metonymies “Wall Street” and “Washington” that symbolize the centers of financial and political world without naming any persons responsible for the devastation during the Republican Party rule. The indefiniteness of his utterance distributes the responsibility uniformly on all the members of the establishment, which diminishes the strength of the allegation and it fades into generalization.

6) I will **freeze government spending** on all but the most important programs like defense, veterans care, Social Security and health care until we **scrub every single government program**. – This utterance contains two metaphors which follow different personal pronouns: “I” which will “freeze government spending” by some formal act, and “we” which will “scrub every single government program” and which implies thorough and meticulous work of unnamed others. Once again the speaker presupposes that the current administration has spent too much on its social programs but avoids mentioning the culprits for this financial behavior. Obviously, the speaker presents himself as the proponent of even stricter deregulation and *laissez-faire* policy.

7) I've been **fighting** for this country since I was 17 years old, and I have the scars to prove it. If I'm elected president, I will **fight** to shake up **Washington** and take **America** in a new direction from my first day in office until my last. I'm not afraid of the **fight**; I'm ready for it.

8) What **America** needs more in this hour is a **fighter**, somebody who puts all his cards on the table and trusts the judgment of the **American people**. I've **fought** for you most of my life.

9) I'm an **American**, and I choose to **fight**.

These three examples are illustrative of the speaker's character but also of his personal history where the key word is “fight”. In example 7 he reminds the audience of his days spent in the Vietnam War and later in captivity, but the continuous tense indicates that his fight is an ongoing process for which he has all

the necessary qualities. The repetition of the word should show that he is the right choice. He has conceived the whole campaign as a fight, which is understandable, since the words "campaign" and "fight" are in some contexts synonymous, and his future presidency is also envisaged. Still, the mere fact that someone was an active soldier does not qualify them for such a political position, regardless of the proven patriotism. The inductive conclusion that the speaker tries to imply does not necessarily ensue from his war experience. His fight also includes a metaphorical shake-up of the metonymical Washington and America, but he does not specify what the new direction will be after eight years of the Republican administration. Once again he implicitly criticizes the current administration by presupposing that the change is necessary. Since the topic of "change" was the opponent's motto, the S1 speaker could not simply copy the expression, so he used it, as a verb or noun, 3 times only. Adopting the term would mean that the speaker implicitly admits that the current policy was not good. On the other hand, the economic and financial situation forced him to approach the topic, but instead, he speaks vaguely about "a new direction".

Example 8 contains a sentence that could be understood as a general statement if it were not limited by a time adverbial. The three sentences in this utterance could imply a syllogism: "America needs a fighter", "I'm a fighter", "I'm the fighter president that America needs". The last example has the conjunction that may imply that being an American necessarily means that they are ready to fight, which could be qualified as a conventional implicature (Grice 1989).

Speech 1: negative other-presentation

1) We've finally learned what Senator Obama's economic goal is, as he told Joe, he wants, to quote, "**spread the wealth around**". – The speaker refers to a conversation that his opponent had with Joe Wurzelbacher, middle-class voter and small entrepreneur, concerned about his future. He recontextualizes his opponent's metaphor and supplies it with a connotative meaning that necessarily implies some bad consequences for the nation – redistribution of wealth that the opponent had not contributed to in any way.

2) My friends, we've seen that **act from the left** before a long time ago. He believes in **redistributing wealth**, not in **policies that grow our economy and create jobs and opportunities** for all Americans. Senator Obama is more **interested in controlling who gets your piece of pie than he is in growing the pie**. – The speaker dwells on the ideological difference between "the left" and what he and his team represent, and that is "redistribution" vs. "growing economy", "creating jobs and opportunities", "controlling" vs. "growing", the "pie"

becoming the economic term that has lost somewhat of its initial metaphoric value. He mentions "the left" as the political option that used to redistribute wealth though he does not directly refer to the Democratic Party. By correlating some former and in this case indefinite administrations and their alleged actions with the opponent who has not come to power yet, the speaker flouts the maxim of relevance (Grice 1989). Moreover, by supplying indefinite and insufficient information he flouts the maxim of quantity, too. The flouting results in two implicatures: that all Democratic Party administrations acted that way so the opponent's will not be any different and that the Democratic Party is leftist, which may imply that it is prone to solutions close to the socialist or even communist way of thinking, and which may be interpreted, in the American social context, as a serious allegation. Such an utterance may warn but also intimidate the voters, who become worried about the job loss and their income. However, the speaker does not specify what the "policies that grow our economy" would be and who would run them. For eight years the Republican administration had been running the low tax policy that the speaker favors when the crisis broke out, so his statement in the present tense form does not reflect the actual state of the nation.

3) **The Obama tax increase** would come at the worst possible time for America and especially for small businesses. – The speaker uses the noun + noun sequence where the opponent's name functions as a modifier. Whether he opts for this structure because of its succinctness and density typical for the media or because he wants to blur the intended logical relationship (of identity or source) between the two nouns or because he wants to use the proper noun as subordinate to the head common noun cannot be concluded. Nevertheless, he used the same structure when talking about his tax plan, "the McCain-Palin tax cut", therefore he probably did not use it in order to be implicit. What he did not mention here is that his opponent's plan is to increase tax only for the richest, which was presented in the media, so he not only warns but also deliberately misleads the audience into thinking that the consequences would be devastating. He withholds information and flouts the quantity maxim which produces the above implicature.

4) The **explosion of government spending** over the last eight years has put us deeper in **debt**. – In this utterance the speaker criticizes the current administration, not the opponent, and resorts to a hyperbolic nominal phrase which hides the doer as he cannot directly blame the Republican Party, which nominated him, for the result. He has to convince the audience that what his party did to "us", probably the whole nation, was unsuccessful and detach himself

from their actions and on the other hand, convince the audience that his opponent would be the wrong.

5) Now, if I'm elected president, **I won't spend** nearly a trillion dollars more of **your** money. **Senator Obama will**. And he can't do that without **raising your taxes** or **digging us further into debt**.

6) When I'm elected president **I won't fine** small businesses and families with children. **Senator Obama will**. He will **force them and you** into a new huge government run health care program, while he **keeps the cost of the fine a secret until he hits you with it**.

These utterances contain both positive self-presentation and negative-other presentation expressed by the contrast of the speaker's promise and the speaker's prediction of the opponent's action expressed in both literal and rhetorical devices. In example 5, by emphasizing the property over money ("your money") that will or will not be spent, the speaker draws the audience into the topic of money flow, evoking some emotional response. The prediction is *irrealis* and may or may not come true but it negatively presents the opponent as a person who will continue what the current administration was doing, which could imply that there is no ideological difference between the Republican administration's attitude toward public spending and the opponent's (probably the speaker's inadvertent move). The speaker brings the two close together in order to produce the perlocutionary effect of intimidating the audience, though such an association is untenable. In example 6, the speaker negatively presents the opponent as the one who will fine (another prediction and therefore *irrealis*) people with small children, which is aimed at provoking an emotional response of repugnance and fear of future. According to the media reports of the time, the opponent's ideas were quite opposite to what the speaker stated. Such an act flouts the quality and quantity maxims and produces the implicature that the opponent deliberately withholds important information on spending and taxing from the public.

7) Senator Obama wants to **raise taxes** and **restrict trade**, and...You know my friends, the last time America did that in a bad economy it led to **the Great Depression**. – "Raising taxes" is this time joined by "trade restriction" though the speaker once more avoids mentioning which taxes are supposed to be raised by his opponent. Furthermore, according to the media reports, the opponent does not want to restrict trade in general, but only with certain countries. The correlation of the opponent's policy and the Great Depression of the 1920's and 1930's that happened in different social and economic circumstances is a sophism warning and intimidating the audience, leading them

into thinking that the Depression will inevitably follow. What the speaker misses to mention is that the Great Depression and the current crisis broke out during the Republican administrations.

8) For example, offshore drilling. He said he would "consider" it. He said he was for nuclear power only **he doesn't know** how to store it and **he doesn't know** how to reprocess spent nuclear fuel. – In this utterance the speaker uses some intertextual and interdiscursive examples to indirectly report the opponent's words on energy sources. The speaker repeatedly emphasizes the opponent's alleged lack of knowledge how to deal with the problem, something that no politician can show or admit, which could delegitimize him as a desirable candidate. According to the media reports, the opponent said that he had to consider how to store nuclear waste. The speaker's interpretation is wrong and in fact he violates the quality maxim since he attributes to the opponent the words he did not utter. Less informed audience, however, can accept such informational input as trustworthy, relying on the speaker's ethos.

9) Senator Obama's campaign announced that **he is choosing his cabinet. He's measuring the drapes, and planning** with Speaker Pelosi and Harry Reid, Senator Harry Reid, to **raise taxes, raise taxes, increase spending and concede defeat in Iraq**. – This is one more intertextual and interdiscursive example attributed to the opponent's team metonymically presented as "campaign" who already chooses the colleagues to work with, the "cabinet" (another metonymy) as if the election was over. Such an example should testify to the opponent's brazenness and frivolous behaviour. One cannot say whether the latter example is just the speaker's observation or not, for it is highly unlikely that the Obama team's official statement would report on such trivial details. However, these examples are aimed at smearing the opponent's character, and the speaker flouts the quality maxim which produces an implicature that the opponent is a person who cares more about becoming a president than dealing with problems for which he lacks knowledge. Once more, the speaker brings up the leitmotif of his speech, taxes and spending, along with one international affairs topic, presenting the three most important Democratic politicians in the hierarchy as the people with no other goal than "to raise taxes, increase spending and concede defeat in Iraq".

Speech 2: Positive self-presentation

1) In just fourteen days **you and I** can begin to bring some **badly-needed sunshine** to **Washington D. C.** – The speaker presents himself as a torchbearer that will bring light to the capital city, metonymic center of political

power, obviously presupposing that it is metaphorically a dark place that needs light/change. Briefly, the political opposition brings light, the current administration is dark. However, he insists on joint effort of all the people as he cannot succeed without their support.

2) We **were thrilled** this weekend when **a great American statesman, General Colin Powell**, joined our **cause**. – The exclusive “we” in this utterance probably refers to the speaker’s team who were “thrilled” with a recent event. The importance of the event is found in the fact that Colin Powell, who used to be a high-ranking Republican Party member in the Bush administration, decided to support the speaker’s campaign. The speaker provides background information about Colin Powell in an appositive noun phrase for those who may not be acquainted with his service, but also to underline how important a supporter they got. This example may be very persuasive for some voters, because it implies that even the Republican Party members no longer believe in the Republican campaign and administration.

3) I wanna **help rebuild the middle class** that **has taken such a hit** these past eight years under **the policies of George Bush**, with a **big assist from John McCain**. – In this utterance the positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation cannot be disentangled: the speaker offers his help to the middle class which suffered, not the rich entrepreneurs, and with which he empathizes but readily finds the guilty party in the current administration and his opponent. He connects them together, showing there is no difference between them, implying that choosing McCain will not bring any change.

4) Then, Senator McCain and Sarah Palin called me **“socialistic.”** Now, first of all, I think it’s hard to imagine that **Colin Powell** and **Warren Buffet** would endorse somebody **socialistic**. – This utterance starts with an intertextual and probably interdiscursive example attributed to the speaker’s opponents followed by the speaker’s counterargument. The word “socialistic” in the American social context evokes communist ideology which negates private property and advocates state interventionism. In the context of presidential election naming somebody “socialist” may be a serious allegation against which the speaker fights with the argument that two public figures, such as the above mentioned Colin Powell, and Warren Buffet, one of the richest people in the world and also a philanthropist, would not speak in favor of someone who plans to expropriate their possessions for public purposes. It is an ideological strategy of referring to unquestionable authorities and the argument is presented as commonsensical and which cannot be countered. As before, this utterance serves for the speaker’s

positive presentation but it also negatively presents the opponents who try to delegitimize the speaker by name-calling.

5) Well, what **we** need now is not **straw men**, we don't need **misleading charges**. What we need is **honest leadership** and **real change**, and Miami, **that's why I'm running for president of the United States of America**.

6) Well, I've got news for John McCain: **hard-working families who've been hit hard by this economic crisis**, (...). They can't afford to go to the back of the line behind **CEO's and Wall Street banks** that are already **getting help**. Right here and right now, **they** need help. **That's why I'm running for president of the United States of America**.

In the first utterance of example 5 the speaker's "we" probably refers to him and the whole nation for which he will sacrifice himself by running for president. The first part of the utterance contains the expressions "straw men" (logical fallacy) and "misleading charges" but the speaker does not specify where they come from, so he flouts the quality maxim which gives rise to implicatures negatively presenting the out-group. On the other hand, the expressions "honest leadership" and "real change" may presuppose that the former or current administrations or his opponent's team have not been honest or have not brought or will not bring any substantial change. This utterance is followed by another in which the speaker gives the reason for his candidacy; in fact, he flouts the relevance maxim in that he apparently states the reason, associates what "we need" with his candidacy and implies that he is that honest leader that will bring real change.

Example 6 also positively presents the speaker who this time refers to "them", they being "hard-working families" who are now dissociated from the people in the audience. He is running for president not for the sake of power, but for the sake of people. He also legitimizes his policy as opposed to his opponent's, whom he indirectly addresses, or the current administration that has bailed out banks and CEO's with taxpayers' money and has not helped the middle class.

7) **My opponent doesn't want you to know this**, but under **my plan, tax rates** will actually be less than they were under **Ronald Reagan**. That's true, I wanna roll back the **Bush tax cuts** for the wealthiest Americans and go back to the rate they paid under **Bill Clinton**. - The topic of taxes was crucial throughout the whole campaign, so the speaker presents his plan, accusing his opponent of hiding information. The speaker wants to refresh people's memory, make them think of some better time using the strategy of referring to well-known public figures and therefore singles out three politicians: two ex-presidents, R. Reagan and B. Clinton, Republican and Democrat, and G.W. Bush,

Republican, presidents of different party affiliations that ruled at different periods and had different tax policies, and the first two were known for their successful leadership and relative prosperity they achieved. This could imply that the speaker's policy will also bring prosperity as he will apply the same procedure that proved to be successful.

8) And I won't let **banks** and **lenders** off the hook when it was their **greed** and **irresponsibility** that got us into this **mess** in the first place. We should not be **bailing out Wall Street**, we should be **restoring opportunity on Main Street**, that's what I'll do when I'm president. – The speaker gives two promises concerning his future office, but also a statement what "we", probably his team, should do. Here he contrasts two metonymical worlds, Wall Street and Main Street, the world of "banks and lenders", of "greed and irresponsibility" that is being bailed out and the world of the middle class from small towns, that should also be given opportunity to recover. However, the modal "should" extenuates both prohibition and obligation, as if the speaker were not sure whether the steps he proposes are appropriate. Anyway, the speaker presents himself as the champion of fair distribution of crisis and wealth, and the advocate of the middle class.

9) My opponent's chief economic advisor said well, we can't afford to help on college affordability because we can't give money to **every interest group** out there. I don't think **young people** in America are an interest group, I think they're **our future**. – This utterance, too, contains negative other-presentation found in the attributed intertextual and interdiscursive example contrasted with the speaker's views which are positive and aimed at young people who are almost exclusively referred to metaphorically as "our future" with all politicians. The term "interest group", which the speaker finds inappropriate, may connote that its members put pressure on the government to achieve their aims, often by scheming. Knowing that the young are also voters, if not present, than future, the speaker presents himself as the one who understands their needs.

Speech 2: negative other-presentation

1) In the final days of campaigns, the say-anything, do-anything type of politics too often takes over. **We've** seen it before. And **we're** seeing it again now. **The ugly phone calls. The misleading mail and television ads. The careless, outrageous comments** – all aimed at working, keeping **us** from working together, all aimed at stopping the change that **we** need. – In this utterance, which is at the beginning of the speech, we find several noun phrases with which the speaker avoids naming the doer of the actions aimed against his

campaign. The referents of "we" shift from "we, the team" to "we, the nation", but not always straightforwardly. The speaker presupposes that the public has been well acquainted with the various manifestations of negative campaigning, but he does not name the main protagonists yet; instead, he fronts their actions. The indefiniteness of his utterance and lack of reliable information give rise to various interpretations and speculations. The speaker evidently flouts the manner maxim since he does not express himself clearly, but also the quality maxim as he withholds important information and this results in implicatures about the participation of politicians in negative campaigns.

2) **President Bush** and **Senator McCain** were already **ready to move heaven and earth to address the crisis on Wall Street**, **President Bush** has **failed to address the crisis on Main Street** and **Senator McCain** has **failed to fully acknowledge that crisis**. Instead of commonsense solutions, month after month, they've offered lit- little more than **willful ignorance** and **wishful thinking** and **outdated ideologies**. – In this utterance the speaker negatively presents not only the opponent, but also the current president, and points out the fundamental difference in their approach to crisis and in their crisis management. Again, he opposes two metonymical worlds, Wall Street and Main Street, which obviously live separate lives by different rules. Here, the roots of such an approach would be in the ideology of helping the rich (metaphoric "ready to move heaven and earth") and leaving the middle class on its own ("failed to address the crisis", "willful ignorance"), offering empty talk ("outdated ideologies"). The speaker uses this utterance and example to persuade the audience of the opponents' incapability to face and fight the crisis, but also of their selective approach to solving it.

3) Nine months ago back in January **I called for a stimulus plan** to provide immediate relief for states (...). **Senator McCain**, on the other hand, **insisted that the fundamentals of the economy were strong**. His advisors openly **mocked the idea of a stimulus package** (...). **President Bush and John McCain thought that a second stimulus package was unnecessary**.

4) Today, after nine straight months of job losses, when our **Federal Reserve chairman** says he **supports another stimulus** to get our economy moving, **something even the Bush Administration is open to**, **John McCain's economic advisor made it clear** that **John McCain isn't ready to support a stimulus**. He's taking what he says is a wait and see approach. Instead of offering a real plan to boost our economy, **John McCain's offered a proposal that does nothing** to create jobs, nothing to help families with falling wages and mounting bills, and next to nothing to help people stay in their homes.

– These two examples contain elements of positive self-presentation and negative-other presentation, that is, the speaker points out his proposals and how they were rejected by the ruling party in example 3. However, he got some kind of satisfaction in that his predictions and moves proved to be right (example 4). Several persons are introduced in example 3: besides the speaker (“I called for a stimulus plan”), his opponent and G.W. Bush (“insisted that the fundamentals of the economy were strong”, “thought that a second plan was unnecessary”), there are the opponent’s advisors (“openly mocked the idea”). The speaker presents himself as a lonely fighter for the stimulus plan rejected by everyone in the Republican administration. Example 4 brings a twist in the Republican Party attitude due to changed economic circumstances: there are the Federal Reserve chairman (“supports another stimulus”) and the Bush administration (“open to [another stimulus]”); still, the opponent does not change his attitude, but he speaks through his advisor (“made it clear”, “John McCain isn’t ready to support a stimulus”). This intertext may indicate that the opponent was not ready or did not dare to face the reality when it became obvious that the economic situation was serious. The crisis itself delegitimized the Republican policy, and the speaker used it to contrast his and the opponent’s behavior in crisis. On the one hand, the speaker shows his concern for the middle class, trying to persuade the people that he will take good care of them as president. On the other, the speaker’s examples of his opponent’s attitude should show that he is stubborn and incapable of predicting and managing the crisis, even when experts have changed their views, so his proposal will not bring any good.

5) Y’know, with, with, with ***Bush’s policies***, what we’ve had is ***lower wages, declining incomes, plummeting home values and rising unemployment***. That’s not ***growing the pie***. – In this utterance the speaker summarizes the bad effects of the Bush administrations with contrasting adjectives and adjectivized participles used in business English (“declining income”, “plummeting home values”, “rising unemployment”). This utterance should also remind the audience what it was like during the current administration, and that the new Republican administration will not bring any prosperity, will not “grow the pie”, even though that is one of the major ideas of the opponent’s campaign.

6) So my opponent is doing his best to ***change the subject***. He wants to try to ***distract your attention from the economy***. His campaign actually said a couple of weeks ago that they were gonna ***launch a series of attacks*** on my character because, they said, “If we keep on talking about the economy, we’re going to lose.” And I have to say, ***that’s a promise John McCain has kept***.

He's been on the attack. – In this utterance the speaker reveals the opponent's tactics ("change the subject", "distract your attention from the economy") and negatively presents him as a person whose knowledge is deficient, but who is ready to attack someone who has ideas and a vision. The example also contains an intertext attributed to the opponent's campaign and another quoted intertext. The speaker presents the opponents as people who, having run out of ideas, try to smear the speaker's character ("launch a series of attacks"). The final sentence contains a presupposition that the opponent has given many promises and has not kept them, but he has kept this promise about attacking.

7) **It's time to turn the page** on eight years of **economic policies** that put Wall Street before Main Street. – Once again the speaker expresses his concern for the middle class through his metonymical pair Wall Street/Main Street, but the metaphoric beginning of the utterance may not only introduce a statement but an indirect speech act with deontic modality in which the speaker wants to stir some excitement and readiness to fight among the audience. In this case the speaker does not name the proponents of the failed economic policy, as they have been mentioned many times.

8) **John McCain** may call that **socialism**, but he **doesn't remember** that he opposed those **Bush tax cuts**. He **needs to remember** that he said they were **irresponsible**. He **needs to remember** that in good conscience he said he couldn't support those tax cuts. – The speaker refers once more to the topic of taxes: his views on taxing were proclaimed as "socialism", but the speaker reminds the opponent of his former attitude toward lower taxes for the rich ("Bush tax cuts", "irresponsible") when he was not the presidential candidate and when he was brave enough to oppose something that his Party proposed. As he changed his attitude in the campaign, the speaker points out to the opponent's lack of consistency and presents him negatively as a politician who changes in order to gain power. Repeating the verb "remember" the speaker implies that the opponent chooses to forget something he should be proud of ("in good conscience he said he couldn't support those tax cuts").

To sum up, the main ideological differences between the two candidates were found in the following topics:

1) in Speech 1:

- raising taxes is bad, cutting taxes is good: sudden **tax-hike** for those businesses would **kill jobs**; **the phony tax cut** my opponent started talking about / **The McCain-Palin tax cut** is the real thing; **Cut** vs. **double**; **The Obama tax increase**; Senator Obama wants to **raise taxes**

and **restrict trade; raise taxes, raise taxes, increase spending and concede defeat in Iraq; I won't fine** small businesses and families with children. **Senator Obama will.**

- wealth redistribution is bad, growing and creating opportunities is good: **"spread the wealth around"** vs. **spreading opportunity**; [Obama] **redistributing wealth**, not in **policies that grow our economy and create jobs and opportunities**; more **interested in controlling who gets your piece of pie than he is in growing the pie.**

Besides his direct opponent, the S1 speaker had an enemy he could not directly name and address, and that was the current administration:

- financial and political centers: **Wall Street** and **Washington**;
- wrong policies that have to be changed: **freeze government spending, scrub every single government program**; the **explosion of government spending.**

2) In Speech 2 the ideological differences surfaced in the following:

- low taxes for the middle class are good: under **my plan, tax rates** will actually be less than they were under **Ronald Reagan**. That's true, I wanna roll back the **Bush tax cuts** for the wealthiest Americans and go back to the rate they paid under **Bill Clinton**.
- low taxes for the rich are irresponsible, higher taxes for them are good: **John McCain** may call that **socialism**, but he **doesn't remember** that he opposed those **Bush tax cuts**. He **needs to remember** that he said they were **irresponsible**. He **needs to remember** that in good conscience he said he couldn't support those tax cuts.
- concern for the middle class and not the rich: **help rebuild the middle class** that **has taken such a hit** these past eight years under **the policies of George Bush**, with a **big assist from John McCain**; **hard-working families who've been hit hard by this economic crisis**, (...).They can't afford to go to the back of the line behind **CEO's and Wall Street banks** that are already **getting help**; We should not be **bailing out Wall Street**, we should be **restoring opportunity on Main Street**; **President Bush** and **Senator McCain** were already **ready to move heaven and earth to address the crisis on Wall Street**, **President Bush** has **failed to address the crisis on Main Street** and **Senator McCain** has **failed to fully acknowledge that crisis**.
- wrong policies that have to be changed: **It's time to turn the page** on eight years of **economic policies** that put Wall Street before Main Street;

with ***Bush's policies***, what we've had is ***lower wages, declining incomes, plummeting home values and rising unemployment***. That's not ***growing the pie***.

As far as linguistic devices are concerned, in their positive self-presentation both speakers used the exclusive and inclusive "we" which sometimes shifted to "I", especially in speech acts lexicalized as promises which they both gave. They also used metaphors, sometimes paired in order to contrast ideological differences and metonymies to contrast two opposing worlds: both referred to "Wall Street", but the S1 speaker blamed it together with "Washington", and the S2 speaker opposed it to "Main Street". This choice can show where their respective interests lie and whether they are more concerned with the financial world, political world or the middle class. The S1 speaker's repetition of word "fight" also underlines his aptness for the presidential office.

In negative other-presentation the S1 speaker used a wider range of structures and strategies since he had two opponents: Obama he could openly fight with and the Bush administration he could only implicitly address. When referring to the Bush administration he used rhetorical devices such as metaphors (often one lexicalized positively, one negatively), metonymies and hyperbole in speech acts of objection, but he often criticized indirectly and implicitly and that is why he used nominal phrases and passive forms as well as structures of indefinite meaning, presuppositions and implicatures. The negative other-presentation was also done through assertive speech acts lexicalized in such a way as to warn and intimidate the public and through the assertives that contained predictions of the opponent's moves. He resorted to strategies such as recontextualization of an expression used by the opponent, sophism, misinterpretation, withholding information or presenting untrue information. In this way the S1 speaker, although trying to present himself as a politician capable of leading the country, dedicated more varied linguistic devices and structures and comparatively more time and space to his open and hidden opponents.

The negative other-presentation in S2 was also done through somewhat more diverse devices; this time, along with metaphors and metonymies we found presuppositions and implicatures that brought about indirectness and also indefiniteness expressed e.g. by verbless nominal phrases. The speech acts were mostly assertives, often those that contained objections and open criticism of the opponent and the Bush administration. The speaker also used intertextual examples to present the opponent's inconsistency in political behavior, remind him of his former attitudes or unveil his plans and tactics.

6. Conclusion

Political speeches are social and representative of some ideology, but also personal and individualized to some extent. In this paper we focused on the political discourse structures within ideological strategies used to express political stance through the topics the speakers approached.

Having analyzed the two speeches we can say that they were conceived and written according to van Dijk's ideological square only up to a point: namely, neither of the speakers even implicitly brought up or de-emphasized any positive information about the opponent. However, on several occasions the S2 speaker emphasizes what his opponent used to say when he opposed the ruling party decisions and which was in agreement with what the S2 speaker advocates. The speakers did not bring up any negative information about themselves either, so there was no need for any mitigating language devices, such as euphemisms or disclaimers.

Undoubtedly, there were similarities in the speeches as regards the linguistic devices that might be used to express their ideological beliefs. In both speakers we found assertives in which the lexis was used not only to describe or state facts, but to express objection and criticism directly and indirectly, often through some intertextual and interdiscursive examples and to contrast the two ideologies, as well as to empathize with the audience. However, only in S1 did we find assertives meant to warn and intimidate the audience. In both speakers we found some indefiniteness and indirectness that gave rise to implicatures or presuppositions, and both speakers provided some information that can mislead in interpretation, though in S1 by far more often than in S2. Both speakers used commissives to express promises, speech acts which are the *topoi* of political speeches.

As to differences, we find more of them in ideological strategies: the S1 speaker's recontextualization of the S2 speaker's expression, the deliberate omission of his party affiliation and the current US president, referring to the center of political power and distributing the blame for the crisis over not too precise "Washington" and "Wall Street". He is in an ideological trap, unable to explain what makes him different from the current government and better than the opponent. He also omitted important facts about his opponent and provided untrue information, often smearing his character in speech acts that could instill fear in voters.

The S2 speaker, on the other hand, used the strategy of referring to important political figures that could endorse his campaign and reinforce his trustworthiness or to former presidents whose economic measures proved to be

successful, often through intertextual examples. He avoided denigrating his opponent's character, but never failed to mention the opponent's dubious political moves and lack of political consistency. He also showed that he has some background knowledge in business and acted as a unifying factor that wants to work with the people toward their common goal. Moreover, he presented the future presidency as a joint effort of him and the whole nation for who he repeatedly expressed concern and empathy. Unlike his opponent, he offered some positive emotions to the audience such as comfort, hope and pursuit of happiness.

Although the use of these structures within strategies may be commonplace in those genres of political discourse where the speakers try to polarize, antagonize, manipulate or unite the electorate, the critical discourse analysis framework offers means for recognizing them so as to raise awareness in common people about how these structures function and to what aims they are used.

REFERENCES

- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: theory and practice*. Abingdon-New York: Routledge.
- Chilton, P., Schäffner, C. (1997). Discourse and Politics. In: Teun van Dijk (ed.). *Discourse as Social Interaction, volume 2*. London: Sage Publications Ltd., pp. 206-230.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995a). *Critical discourse analysis*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Fairclough, N. (1995b). *Media Discourse*. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Fairclough, N. (2001a). *Language and Power*. (2nd edition). Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Fairclough, N. (2001b). Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research. In: Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer (eds.). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications Ltd., pp.121-138.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N., Wodak, R. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis. In: Teun van Dijk (ed.). *Discourse as Social Interaction, volume 2*. London: Sage Publications Ltd., pp. 258-284.

- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Van Dijk, T. A.(ed.). (1997). *Discourse as Social Interaction, volume 2*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). Discourse as Interaction in Society. In: Teun van Dijk (ed.). *Discourse as Social Interaction, volume 2*. London: Sage Publications Ltd., pp. 1-37.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. (1998). *Ideology*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: a plea for diversity. In: Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer (eds.). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications Ltd., pp. 95-120.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and Power*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wodak, R., Meyer, M. (eds.). (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.