

THE LANGUAGE OF POWER AND JUSTIFICATION: A STUDY OF EVALUATIVE AND INTERACTIVE DEVICES OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS IN BUSH AND BLAIR POLITICAL SPEECHES

Saiful Akmal

*MA Applied Linguistics at Post Graduate School
Faculty of Arts and Humanities
University of Liverpool-UK*

I. Introduction

The arguments which put forward language as an important factor in political speeches are well known and have widely been used. As Schaffner (1996) pointed out, 'in fact any political action is prepared, accompanied, controlled and influenced by language' (p.1). Therefore, since it is a type of discourse that is often studied by discourse analyst, political speeches have become one of the most appealing areas of study in language.

It is, indeed, very likely that the political speeches in discourse analysis typically could be assessed through some interactive and evaluative language features inside. This is an incredibly dynamic area which has attracted so many researchers and language experts.

For that reason, in this assignment, I would like to analyse how two extracts of political speeches could conform to some extent with some items in discourse analysis, primarily, with respect to interaction devices that is, personal pronoun, certainty or uncertainty, judgement, appreciation, and affect. Both extracts occurred within the similar context of time and topics where both leaders were addressing the nation to justify the commencement of Iraq war.

The extracts of two famous political speeches have been marked up to display the interaction devices in discourse analysis for the readers. The results will then be discussed in this assignment analytically. I will try to distinguish all those items in separate ways and exhibit a table of analysis to make it more obvious to be observed by the reader.

There are four sections in this assignment. After having a very brief outlook of this assignment in the first chapter, I will proceed to the literature review on how the concept of political speeches and discourse analysis could evoke a mixture interpretation in linguistic studies in general and discourse analysis in particular. Subsequently, the material and methods on how this assignment will be done will appear in the next section to clarify the reader about the techniques and approach that are being used. Having covered the method and material, I would signify the analysis and discussion in order to breakdown all the points in a relevant way in the following chapter. At the very last chapter, this assignment will be completed with conclusion, bibliography and appendices.

II. Literature Review

2.1 Political speeches and discourse analysis

As we all know, speech is one of many different types of spoken discourse. Mcarthy (1991:119) classified speech or speeches as monologue category along with stories and jokes in discourse studies. Thus, since speeches or more specifically, political speeches have become one of the most interesting aspects to be analysed by

discourse analyst, it is understandable if many linguist nowadays pay more attention in this field of study.

A discourse, then, is “an institutionalized way of speaking that determines which statements can be considered true” (<http://www.idealspeech.org/>). In Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics discourse analysis is describes in relation to the study of how sentences and written language from larger meaningful units such as paragraphs, conversations, interviews and so on.

In political speeches, we often perceived some language aspects that perhaps can make the speeches become more empathic, interesting or even embarrassing. The word choices to express the ideological aspect, values, norms, attitude, and opinion are playing an important role in political speech. Therefore, certainly, political speeches can be most successful if the speakers utilize a proper choice of language or linguistics structures to determine a political message across to the audience.

Inside political speeches, there are messages that need to be delivered to the addressees. The messages used to be an ideology, judgement, evaluation or values. Here, language or discourse organization assists to create an appropriate or a desirable speech or text of speech. So, we possibly could confirm that language or at least language styles, types, categories and genres have something to do with ideology, authority and power (as an element of a political speech). This argument is supported by two well-known linguistic scholars, Kress and Hodge (1972) they say:

‘Language is ideological in another, more political, sense of that word: it involves systematic distortion in the service of class interest’. (Kress and Hodge, 1972: 6)

For example, political speeches mainly reflected the philosophy, values and beliefs of particular party, organization, community and society. Moreover, the speakers will tend to use a very specific personal pronouns, evaluation and certainty or uncertainty to characterize which side they stand. As a simple illustration, a politician would probably say ‘terrorist’ for the other groups who are threatening their political ideology and of course, would use a word of ‘warrior’ or ‘fighter’ for his own group in the other way round. Another sample could simply be taken from how frequently a speaker pronounces the word ‘we’, ‘our’, ‘us’ or ‘I’, ‘me’, ‘you’ or ‘your’ in his/her speeches.

Speeches, then, undeniably have become a part of the political state of affairs. Once someone has got involved in a political situation or being a political figure, there will always a time when he or she, he/she will be confronted with political speech. Nevertheless, we should keep in mind that, when we deliver a political speech, we are not only as an individual, but we are the person who speaks on behalf of the community. Or more precisely, Sapir (1927) mentioned ‘as society speaks through the individual’. Besides, I believe we are familiar with some eminent leaders that can arouse massive sympathy and emotions through their spoken words (Garrecht, 2002). For this reason, we already know how Martin Luther King, Margaret Thatcher, Abraham Lincoln has succeed to evoke sentiment, feeling and spirit through their remarkable speeches.

On the other hand, in a specific situation, a specified lexical choices, repetition, evaluation, speech acts and interaction which implied in the speeches must also be carefully selected, structured, organized and presented in order to achieve the targeted message to the hearers or audience (Schaffner 1996 and van Dijk 1994). As an illustration, in the state of emergency, the speeches may probably content more command and imperative lexical words and sentences. However, if the leader is

attempting to address the nation about his/her controversial decision or policy, the language of justification which involves a plenty of personal pronouns then could be the right option for that kind of circumstance, because he or she speaks towards the nation and for all fellows.

2.2 Evaluation

In order to explain evaluation, we need to bear in mind that as has been massively used in social practice, the term of evaluation and its categories somehow varies from one expert to another. For example Thompson (2004) labels evaluation with 'appraisal'. Although this wide and different terms and categories, it is reasonable to infer that valuation in a text will divide into three sections; namely judgement, appreciation and affect (Martin, 2000).

In relation to judgement, a process of evaluation could be done by means of judging people's character or behaviour (animate), whilst in sense of appreciation, the things that we are going to evaluate is inanimate object. On the other hand, affect is something to do with our feeling about something, or in other words, our emotional expressions towards something or someone and how it has an effect on us. It should be taken into account that the evaluation devices, to some extent, could be manipulating for the hearers. Especially in monologue circumstances such as in speech (in political discourse) whereby 'patterns of prejudice'. In this situation as Billig (1991) quoted from a *Vanguard* magazine published on April 1987, a pattern of prejudice is:

"It is generally taken to mean forming an opinion, especially about an issue or person one group of people, without knowing, or without taking into account, all the relevant facts."

2.3 Certainty and Uncertainty

Expressing certainty and uncertainty is noticeably can not be separated with a reader-writer or speaker-audience interaction in a written or spoken discourse. Halliday (1994) introduced this term as modalisation (probability and usuality) and epistemic is the term used by Bybee and Fleischman (1995) to represent probability and certainty. This part of discourse is important to grasp the speaker or the writer expression or opinion in a text or speeches.

2.4 Personal Pronoun

Textual interaction also seems to be one of the most developing areas in linguistics studies in general and discourse analysis in particular. It has long been favoured by many researchers. Apart from the diversity of research that has been conducted so far, personal pronouns, question and commands as the elements of interaction could deliver a sense of relationship level or it could also be regarded the formality and informality context. The more pronouns we use in a text, the less formal the text could be. Nonetheless, it is repeatedly that in speeches the use personal pronoun is relatively dominant to arise in order to give an impression of persuasion. Personal pronouns are also possible to judge the speaker attitudes and character as well as the agenda and the interpersonal approach to the audience.

There are several categories of personal pronouns. Personal pronouns situate for place, ideas, people and things. Traditionally there are subjective (I, You, She, He, They, We, It, Who), objective (Me, You, Him, Her, Them, Us, It, Whom) and possessive (Mine, Yours, His, Hers, Theirs, Ours, Its, whose) personal pronouns. It

usually refers to the first singular and plural (I, we) and the second person singular or plural (you, your) in a conversation or written text. Besides, the text could also be considered to have an exclusive or inclusive interpretation. In terms of exclusive, personal pronouns will convey some restricted and private use for certain people or a group of people, whereas in the inclusive interpretation, it will express the other way round which is rather 'friendly' and give an idea of lowering the distances between the speaker and the audience. Perhaps, as Myers (1994, p. 81) claimed that 'we' is always tricky, because it can be used both in inclusive and exclusive senses, that is, either not including or including the person who is we spoken to'. Therefore, in this assignment, I will only discuss personal pronouns that could created the process of interaction between the speaker and the reader such as 'our', 'us', 'we', 'ourselves', 'you' and 'your' since the other personal pronouns like 'they', 'their', 'themselves', 'she', 'he', 'her', 'his' and all the derivatives does not convey the sense of communicative or interactive between the speaker and the reader and they tend to stand on the neutral position.

III. Materials and Methods

The data of this assignment is taken from two speech excerpts of similar topic, and timing. However the length is not exactly the same, Bush remarks is shorter than Blair remarks. The selected speech extracts that I have chosen are taken from George W. Bush as the incumbent The United States of America president and the British Prime Minister, Tony Blair. Both extracts are addressed to the nation (for the American and the British people) as their forces went into action in Iraq. The former speech from George W. Bush was released in The Oval Office - White House on Wednesday, 19 March, 2003 and the latter was delivered on Thursday, 20 March, 2003. Both remarks are originally available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/03/20030319-17.html> (accessed on 10 November 2006; Appendix I) for George W. Bush words and at http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/2870581.stm (accessed on 8 November 2006; Appendix II) for Tony Blair remarks.

The assignment will particularly analyze items of affect, judgement, appreciation, certainty and uncertainty, and personal pronouns in both extracts. In addition, I will provide the marked-up speech transcripts in appendices I and I to mirror the function of those devices. Below is the explanation of the marked-up extracts with coded fonts to identify each device:

- **Font: judgement**
- *Font: appreciation*
- '*Font*' : affect
- 'Font': strengthening/weakening
- Font: modality
- **Font: exclusive personal pronouns**
- Font: inclusive personal pronouns

In order to ease the reader in analysing the marked-up draft of certainty and uncertainty, I attempt to explain the degree or the level of modality and evaluation into three categories, that is, high, low and medium. Each of these categories will then symbolize the scale of certainty and certainty in the words. Then, as I have stated earlier, in this assignment, I will exclusively discuss 'interactive personal pronouns'

such as ‘our’, ‘us’, ‘we’, ‘ourselves’, ‘you’ and ‘your’ due to the lack of importance of other personal pronouns except those that I have mentioned above in carrying interactive load between the producer and the receiver.

Having provided all the preliminary information and background of the materials that will be discussed, I will now proceed to the next part of this assignment where I will analyze how far these chosen speech transcripts conform to the list of discourse devices that has been deliberately explained before.

IV. Analysis and Discussion

4.1 Evaluative Language

Table I: Bush Evaluative Language

Positive	Sentence	Category	Negative	Sentence	Category
Crucial Support	(4)	Appreciation	Grave danger	(1)	Appreciation
Honour	(5)	Appreciation	Troubled world, An oppressed people	(6)	Affect, affect
Well placed	(7)	Appreciation	Enemy	(10)	Judgement
Honourable and decent spirit	(9)	Judgement	Atrocity	(11)	Judgement
Innocent	(11, 12, 18)	Judgement	Harm	(12)	Appreciation
A united, stable and free	(14)	Appreciation	Difficult	(13)	Appreciation
Great	(15)	Appreciation	Harsh	(13)	Appreciation
Your loved ones	(18)	Affect	Threat	(16, 23)	Appreciation
Gratitude, respect	(19)	Judgement	Outlaw regime	(22)	Judgement
Mercy	(22)	Appreciation	Conflict	(24)	Appreciation
Decisive	(24)	Appreciation	Danger	(26)	Appreciation
Victory	(25)	Appreciation	Peril	(27)	Appreciation
Freedom	(28)	Appreciation			

Table II: Blair Evaluative Language

Positive	Sentence	Category	Negative	Sentence	Category
Be United	(4)	Appreciation	Mass destruction	(3)	Appreciation
Great	(4)	Judgement	Deep divisions	(4)	Appreciation
Blessing	(21)	Appreciation	Threat	(5)	Appreciation
Benefit	(26)	Appreciation	New threat, disorder, chaos, brutal, terrorist	(7)	Appreciation, appreciation, judgement, judgement
Secure and viable	(28)	Appreciation	Hate	(8)	Affect
Courage and Determination	(34)	Judgement	Fear, threat, catastrophe	(9)	Affect, appreciation, appreciation
			Tyrannical, terrorist	(10)	Judgement, judgement
			Threat	(15)	Appreciation
			Vast	(17)	Appreciation
			threat, threats (2x)	(20)	Judgement, appreciation
			Barbarous	(23)	Judgement
			Ravages	(30)	Appreciation
			Dictator	(31)	Judgement
			Terrorist	(32)	Judgement

The dimension of evaluation, as Gunarsson (1997) pointed out, which is usually used to symbolize a moral comment or social norms, is could be pervasive and insidious from time to time. Therefore, we need to be very careful to analyse this kind of discourse tool in order to avoid miss-interpretations. As we can see from the above tables that Mr. Blair tends to use more negative evaluation in his speech rather than Mr. Bush who obviously exploit more positive evaluation in his speech. In terms of judgement evaluation, Mr. Blair also uses this device intensively instead of appreciation and affect, whereas, Mr. Bush seems to employ lesser judgement item of evaluation possibly in order to push forward the idea of neutrality. In this case, The British Prime Minister could be argued to have more direct and emotional appraisal toward Saddam's administration in Iraq. The word 'brutal' in sentence 7, 'terrorist' in sentence 7, 10, and 30, 'tyrannical' in sentence 10, 'barbarous' in sentence 23 and ultimately, 'dictator' in sentence 29 are clearly express a strong emotional evaluation in his speech. These judgement, indeed, are possibly created the sense of 'self-justification' if the real facts do not precisely fit to his claims. On the contrary, the American President looks as if he is wiser and calmer by avoiding too many emotional judgements in his speech. He then, smartly uses 'affect' evaluation in a positive manner in sentence 18 (Appendix I and III) by exploit the word 'your loved ones', even though he uses this evaluation device negatively in sentence 6 (see appendix I and III). Yet again, here Mr Blair utters all of 'affect words' negatively in his speech. The words 'hate' and 'fear' in sentence 8 and 9 are two applicable examples of how he makes an effort to transfer his personal feelings to the audience by exploiting these sorts of words (Appendix II and IV).

However, regardless all of those differences, both leaders are using quite a lot of appreciation words in their speech. By means of this typical device to evaluate 'thing' or inhuman objects, the speakers could perhaps display their positive or negative opinions and attitudes or whether it is desirable/good or undesirable/bad (Bybee and Fleischman 1995). However, Prime Minister Tony Blair once again exposes more negative appreciation when he spoke in compare with President Bush who focuses on the positive appreciation in his talk. Both reactions are somehow very natural in spoken discourse because sometimes the speaker probably could not be tightly controlled by the official text that has been prepared. As a matter of fact, very often in a formal speech or talks delivered by senior politicians, some 'peculiar', spontaneous or impromptu terms, personal comments or words appear in a creative way, including the use of evaluation language.

4.2 Certainty and Uncertainty (Modality and Strengthening/Weakening)

Table III: Bush Statistics of Certainty and Uncertainty

Word	Sentence	Category	Scale
Will	(3)	modality	high
More than	(4)	strengthening	high
Every	(5)	strengthening	high
All	(6)	strengthening	high
Will	(8)	modality	high
Will	(9)	modality	high
Will	(12)	modality	high
More	(13)	strengthening	high
Could	(13)	modality	low

Will	(14)	modality	high
I know that, Will	(17)	Strengthening, modality	high
Will	(20)	modality	high
Sure	(21)	strengthening	high
Will, mass	(22)	Modality, strengthening	High, high
Will	(23)	modality	high
Only way	(24)	strengthening	high
Will	(25)	modality	high
Will	(26)	modality	high
Will	(27)	modality	high
Will	(28)	modality	high
Will	(29)	modality	high

Table IV: Blair Statistics of Certainty and Uncertainty

Word	Sentence	Category	Scale
Will, finest, great, all, I know that	(4)	modality, strengthening, strengthening, strengthening	High, high, high, high, high, high
Can	(4)	Modality	Low
Unlikely	(6)	Weakening	Low
Extreme, either	(7)	Strengthening, modality	High, high
Deeply	(9)	Strengthening	High
All	(11)	Strengthening	High
Even	(13)	Strengthening	High
Should, Most vivid, could	(14)	Modality, strengthening, modality	Medium high, low
Real, entirely	(15)	Strengthening	High
Vast	(17)	Strengthening, strengthening	High, high
Hugely, clear	(18)	Strengthening	High
Might, would	(19)	Modality, modality	Low, low
I Believe	(19)	Strengthening	High
Also, it is true that, best	(20)	Strengthening	High
Will	(21)	Modality	High
Shall	(26)	Modality	High
Neither, only	(27)	Modality, strengthening	High, high
Will	(29)	Modality	High
Often	(34)	Strengthening	Medium

Political speeches, as the statistics represent above, are sometimes understandably supplied by many modality and strengthening words instead of weakening options. The American President, as we can perceived from the tables, admittedly produced lots of strong modality which brings strong and powerful persuasive impression for the audience. Fewer strengthening items are used, such as, ‘more than’, ‘every’ in sentence 5, ‘all’ in sentence 6, ‘more’ in sentence 13, ‘sure’ in sentence 21, ‘mass’ in sentence 22, and ‘only way’ in sentence 24 in compare with strong obligation modality which appear 15 times in his speech. Unlike Mr. Bush, the British Prime Minister generated lesser strong modality in his talk. Apparently, almost of all his modality words come forward in the very last part of his remarks (in sentence 21, 22, 25, 26 and 28). Another clear feature that we can gather from Mr Blair speech is the intensity of strengthening words in the initial piece of his speech,

such as ‘great’ sentence 4, ‘extreme’ in sentence 7, ‘deeply’ in sentence 9 and ‘entirely’ in sentence 15 (Appendix II and VI). From the above explanation it appears to be clear that President Bush seems more definite than Prime Minister Blair. This analysis is derived from the reality in the statistics that Mr. Blair uses slightly more uncertain words in his speech.

The intensity of modality such as will in both extracts may perform the ‘power function’ (Kress and Hodge, 1979, p.122). It will imply that Mr Bush seemingly more confidence, in spite of our ambiguity whether the rich number of ‘will’ in his speech are based on reality or authority or not. If we have a further look at sentence 4, 6 and 19 in Mr Blair extract it must be clear that the word ‘can’, ‘unlikely’ and ‘might’ in those sentences will indicate his hesitation and uncertainty about what he is saying. Perhaps the word ‘unlikely’ in Mr Blair speech, as Halliday (1985a) could be categorized as objective implicit and the word ‘can’ and ‘might’ could be judged as subjective implicit evaluation in non-narrative discourse. Whereas, The American President exploits the word ‘sure’ in sentence 21 could be best assessed as a degree of certainty. President Bush though, is fairly sure and professes more confidence rather than Blair since he only used two hesitation marks that weaken his certainty in sentence 13 (could).

In summary, this ambiguity that appear in either in low-modality words such as might and could or in weakening lexis such as reluctantly or unlikely could be consider as the polite way of reducing the tense of the opponents or the enemy. From this point of view, and especially in this case, it could then be argued that the American President is a straightforward politician in his character, whilst Mr. Prime Minister seems to be more indirect in expressing his opinions. Or, in other words, it may also influence by the cultural and social background of the politicians as well.

4.3 Interaction- Personal Pronouns

Table V: Bush

I/My/Me	6
You/Your	10
We/Our/Us	20
Total Sentence	30
Total Word	580

Table VI: Blair

I/My/Me	11
You/Your	3
We/Our/Us/ourselves	29
Total Sentence	35
Total Words	671

To begin with, I would like to start how the language influences the audiences’ decisions (the American and the British people). The use of interactive personal pronouns such as ‘I’, ‘me’, ‘myself’, ‘you’, ‘your’, ‘yourselves’, ‘we’, ‘our’, ‘us’ and ‘ourselves’ has created a pattern in a political speech that probably could change the audience perspectives after listening to the speeches. Here, the speeches try to persuade, manipulate, justify, validate and reassure that their policy is right and the audience do not have to worry about the long-term impact.

In this assignment, hence, the sense of interaction can simply be recognized by calculating how frequent personal pronouns of 'we', 'our', 'us' or 'you', 'your' or even 'I', 'me', 'myself', and all its derivatives appear in the speech excerpts. If the speakers tends to use more 'we', 'our' or 'us' inclusively, it is considerably because the speaker attempt to build a closer relationship with the audience, so that the audience would likely feel as a part of the administration or has been involved and engaged in the decision making process. Reversely, if the speaker tries to exploit more personal pronouns for instance 'I', 'me', 'myself', 'you', and 'your', it seems that the speaker endeavour to construct a gap or segregate him/herself from the audience. However, on the other hand, it also includes the audience and gives them a role to play in the speech.

Usually the use of 'me', 'myself', refers directly to the speakers, and the use of 'you' and 'yours' refer to the audience. As Brown and Ford (1961, p. 128) suggests that 'when someone speaks or say something to another the selection of certain linguistics is governed by the relation between the speaker and his addressee'. In this case almost all use of 'you' is directly referring to the American and the British people. In Bush remarks, we can see that all the use of 'me', 'myself', is undoubtedly referred directly to himself as the speaker. However, it is fascinating to observe that the use of 'you' or 'your' in his speech does not always refer to the American people or might be to the on scene audience like journalists. For example in sentence 6 (Appendix I and VII), the use of 'you' here is clearly refers to the United States of Armed Forces. The similar usages also occurred in sentence 8, 9, 18, and 19. Perhaps, the uses of 'you' that seems to be clearly directed to the on the family of soldiers who are praying for their loved ones become visible in sentence 20 and 25 (Appendix I and VII).

Similarly, if we look at Blair remarks, the use of 'you' or 'your' also does not always automatically refer to the on scene audience and all the British people. In sentence 23 and 24 (Appendix II and VII), Blair uses 'you' or 'your' in his talking exclusively directed toward the Iraqi people. He gently comforts the Iraqi people that this decision would not harm the civilian at all. From the above explanation, it is inevitably that the speaker (Bush and Blair) uses 'you' and 'your' are not only trying to persuade the on scene audience, but also attempting to convince the Iraqi people that the decision to send the army to Iraq was carefully measured.

Thus, the exclusive use of 'we', 'our', 'us' are intensively emerged in both extracts. Very often, when a politician operates these words, it will directly toward himself and all the audience too and gives an impression of unity. As a matter of fact, all of the 20 uses of 'we, our, us' in Bush remarks are calculated as inclusive. In contrast, in Blair speech, we can observe in sentence 27, the use of 'ourselves' is an applicable example of the exclusive use of 'we', 'our', 'us', 'ourselves'. Blair refers the word 'ourselves' to himself and Bush as the decision makers, whilst Bush in his speech always use 'we', 'our', 'us', 'ourselves' towards himself, the 'on scene audience' and possibly towards every American as well. Bush deliberately strived to create a 'friendship atmosphere' or in other word, attempt to generate the sense of harmony for the audience to agree or to justify his decision to commence a war in Iraq. He, too, implicitly engaged the American to support his decision by exploiting the use inclusive use of 'we' excessively.

It is interesting to distinguish how outwardly Blair applies more personal pronouns like 'I', 'me', and 'myself' in compare with Bush. A tendency to use more first personal pronouns is probably influenced by his effort to try to bring the audience in as well as to give them a role to play in a speech. Also, the minimum use of 'you'

and 'your' that exclusively appear in sentence 23 and 24 could be argued that in the sense of being a leading politician, Blair seems to use odd use of 'you' and 'your' in his speech and yet again, exercise more 'we', 'our', 'ourselves' tactically to replace the lack of 'you' and 'your' that directly referred to the 'on scene audience'.

V. Conclusion

The interactive devices such as personal pronoun, certainty or uncertainty and evaluation for instance judgement, appreciation, and affect as a basic parameter in this assignment has reasonably be an important part in assessing a type of spoken discourse such as speech. Even so, interestingly, it can be inferred that a good political speech could be more attractive by exploiting interactive and evaluative discourse devices and paralanguage elements as well.

This assignment shows that Mr. Blair tends to utter more negative evaluation words, whereas Mr Bush is ostensibly use more empathic and positive evaluation in his remarks. Presumably, compelling and swaying his audience was the target of Mr Bush; he also visibly uses ample words of strong and powerful modality. The British Prime Minister, in contrast, uses quite a lot of strengthening words to convince his audience. It would seem because he tries to be more objective and rationale in supporting the war in Iraq, initialized by President Bush. Evaluation is also critical to express the speaker opinion and also can be used to manipulate the reader. Or more importantly, 'playing the role in adjusting the truth-value or certainty attached to a statement' in a speech or political speech (Lakoff. 1972; Prince et.all.1982; Holmes 1984).

In addition to interactive personal pronoun, Mr. Bush has evidently endeavour to promote his policy by elegantly combine the dominant use of 'inclusive we' in his speech with many boosts of powerful modality like 'will'. On the other hand, Mr. Blair, as we can observe, also uses 'we' exclusively to indicate him as well as Mr. Bush. Such evidence perhaps brought us to a conclusion that Mr. Bush is the first man who put forwards an idea to send the troops to undermine Saddam and Mr. Blair is his strong ally.

It is necessary to keep in our mind that this area of study is very dynamic, tactical, and complex and sometimes could mystify us. Analysing the spoken discourse is not as simple as it seems. It involves a broader social context apart from linguistics' alone. Therefore, we must apply more comprehensive devices to disclose the uniqueness of this study.

Political speeches as one of the most vibrant areas in spoken discourse have attracted many linguists and discourse analysts. Discourse plays a vital role in a political speech. The 'political language' (van Dijk 1994) in discourse analysis has become a very interesting aspects to be analysed. Language, as Schaffner (1996) assured that language has created a huge impact in preparing, evaluating, controlling, determining, guiding and explaining any political actions and so does political speeches, which is also being guided, justified, criticised, evaluated and explained by language. Therefore, there is no doubt that political speeches can be most successful if the speakers utilize a proper choice of language or linguistics structures to determine a political message across to the audience.

Bibliography

- Allen Day, G1990. *Conflict Talk*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bhatia, Vijay K. 1993, *Analyzing Genre*, Essex: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Bloor, T and M, Bloor. 2004. *The Functional Analysis of English* (Second Edition), London: Edward Arnold.
- Brown, R and Ford, M. 'Address in American English', in Laver J and Hutcheson, S, (eds.) 1972. *Communication in face to face Interaction*, Middlesex: Penguin Harmondsworth, p.128
- Brown, R & Gilman, A. 'The pronouns of power and solidarity' in Laver, J and Hutcheson, S. (eds.), *Communication in face to face Interaction*, Middlesex: Penguin Harmondsworth, p. 105.
- Cook, G. 2003. *Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Duranti, A. 1992. *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Firth, A. 1995. *The Discourse of Negotiation*, Oxford: Pergamon
- Garecht, J. 2001, 'Preparing for a political speech', <http://www.localvictory.com/Articles/political-speeches.html>, Local Victory Newsletter, July 31, 2002 Edition, (accessed 3 December 2006).
- Georgakopoulou, A and Goutsos, D, 1997, *Discourse Analysis*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Hoey, M, 2001, *Textual Interaction*, London: Routledge.
- Hunston, S and Thompson, G. 2000. 'Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse', Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- <http://grammar.uoregon.edu/pronouns/personal.html>
- <http://www.grammatics.com/appraisal/AppraisalGuide/Framed/Frame.htm>
- Kress, G and Hodge, R. 1972. *Language as Ideology*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Linde, C, 'Evaluation as linguistic structure and social practice, in Gunarsson, B-L, P. Linek and B, Noudberg, (eds.). 1997 *The Construction of Professional Discourse*, London-Longman, 1997.
- McCCarthy, M, 1991, *Discourse Analysis for Language Teacher*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Michael Billig, M. 1991. *Ideology and Opinions*, London: SAGE publications.
- Myers, G, 1994, *Words in Ads*, London: Longman.
- Muller, Ralph, 2005. 'Creative metaphors in Political discourse. Theoretical consideration on the basis of Swiss speeches', <http://www.metaphorik.de/09/mueller.pdf>, (accessed 2 December 2006).
- Peter, M. 1990. *Pronouns and People*, Oxford: Blackwell

Sapir, E. 'Speech as a personality trait', in Laver J and Hutcheson, S, (eds.) 1972. *Communication in face to face Interaction*, Middlesex: Penguin Harmondsworth, p. 71.

Schaffner, C, 1996. 'Editorial: political speeches and discourse analysis', <http://www.multilingual-matters.net/cils/003/0201/cils0030201.pdf>, on the Online Journal of Current Issues in Language and Society, Multilingual Matters and Channel View Publications, Vol. III, No. 3, (accessed 2 December 2006).

Seidel, G. 'Political discourse analysis', in Van Dijk A, Teun (ed). 1985. *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Vol. 4, Discourse Analysis Society, London: Academic Press Inc.

Thompson, G. 2004. *Introducing Functional Grammar*, (Second Edition), London: Arnold.