SOCIOLINGVISTIKA/ SOCIOLINGUISTICS

Political Speeches: Exertion of Power through Linguistic Means

Irena Urbanavičienė

Abstract. This paper examines two political speeches by Mr. Tony Blair and aims at demonstrating how a close analysis of linguistic features in the texts can contribute to the comprehension of power relations and ideological processes in *discourse*. To bring to light the exertion of power, the analysis concentrates on such linguistic means as nominalization, the use of pronouns, and diverse lexical choices. These means have been chosen as primary tools for the analysis due to the fact that they are closely related to the three functions that language is said to perform, namely ideational, interpersonal, and textual (Halliday, 1975:17, as cited in Malmkjaer, 1991:161).

The approach defined as *critical linguistics* is concerned with the analysis of how underlying ideologies mediated through discourse are embodied in linguistic expressions. The method of critical linguistics was particularly devised in response to such problems as a fixed, invisible ideology permeating language. As posited by Fowler (1991:67), it is the main concern of critical linguists to study 'the minute details of linguistic structure in the light of the social and historical situation of the text, to display to consciousness the patterns of belief and value which are encoded in the language – and which are below the threshold of notice for anyone who accepts the discourse as "natural" '.

Introduction

There is an enormous number of ways in which linguistic exchanges can express relations of power. As competent speakers, people are sensitive to variations in accent, intonation and vocabulary; most of these features locate language users at different positions in social hierarchy. People are aware that a proper use of language enables them to speak with differing degrees of authority, and that their words can be loaded with different degrees of weight. As such, the language can be used as an instrument of coercion and constraint. In short, language is an integral part of social life, and a considerable part of an individual's social life consists of routine exchanges of linguistic expressions which are tacitly adjusted to relations of power.

However, rarely do people discern the close connection between a linguistic choice and a certain ideology; the meaning conveyed by linguistic expressions is taken by them for granted, as natural and unequivocal.

The acknowledgement of power as an implicit and pervasive phenomenon in all communicative situations is a crucial issue for a competent speaker. Not accidentally, there have been a good number of studies devoted to the relationship between language and power. It has to be mentioned, however, that 'these studies have generally set out to *describe* prevailing sociolinguistic conventions in terms of how they distribute power unequally; they have not set out to *explain* these conventions as the product of relations of power and struggles for power' (Fairclough, 1991:1).

Aim and Scope of the Study

The rationale for the present work originates from the acknowledgement that there is a close connection between a linguistic choice and a certain ideology maintained by relations of power, and that the power phenomenon as manifested in a variety of linguistic structures is largely unexplored.

In view of the above, a major concern of this study is to examine how power is exerted in political speeches via linguistic forms. Political speeches are analyzed as a particularly important genre of the power that affects the social construction of reality. It can be claimed with Bourdieu (1994:26) that

> the political field is … the site *par excellence* in which agents seek to form and transform their visions of the world and thereby the world itself: it is the site *par excellence* in which words are actions and the symbolic character of power is at stake. Through the production of slogans, programmes and commentaries of various kinds, agents in the political field are continuously engaged in a labor of representation by which they seek to construct and impose a particular vision of the social world, while at the same time seeking to mobilize the support of those upon whom their power ultimately depends.

It is the intent of this study to analyze the textual mode of political speeches having in mind two perspectives: first, an ideological aspect they carry, and, second, as an

endeavor employed to address and confirm hearers' interests, concerns, and point of view by relations of power. The paper thus aims to specify the system of linguistic forms which are pressed into the service of the expression of power and which, to a very large extent, shape a system of particular values and beliefs.

Hopefully, this research will also provide some insight and practical help in decoding political speeches, in evaluating linguistic aspects of the ideas conveyed, and the way the more powerful employ language in order to impose their ideas on the less powerful members of society.

Methodology

The paper explores the above mentioned issues applying the method of linguistic research which has become to be known in the literature as *critical linguistics*. The development of the method, inaugurated by Kress & Hodge (1979) with the appearance of the book *Language as Ideology*, has proved very influential and as a useful tool has been exploited by such scholars as van Dijk (1987) and Fairlough (1991). This type of research is essentially concerned with dicourse as a social phenomenon; moreover, as Kress (1990:1) posits, 'all social interactions involve displays of power'. Any discourse, therefore, has to be studied in the context of ideologies and relations of power and inequality. The overall approach to language study adopted by critical linguistics is defined by Fowler (1991:5) in the following way:

> Critical linguistics simply means an enquiry into the relations between signs, meanings and the social and historical conditions which govern the semiotic structure of discourse, using a particular kind of linguistic analysis. This activity requires a very specific model of linguistics. The model has not only to identify … certain key linguistic constructions; it has to relate them to context in a special way.

It should be pointed out in this connection that the view of language as *social semiotics* shows the influence of Halliday's (1978) systemic-functional paradigm on critical discourse analysis, and this particular model provides most of the descriptive apparatus employed in the paper.

The discussion of the issues outlined above is incorporated into an analysis of two political speeches by the Prime Minister of the UK Tony Blair, the politician whose influence and power over others are manifested in his political activities. The first text deals with the problems that occurred in National Health Service (NHS), and the second text outlines the issues on terrorism.

Theoretical Prerequisites of the Study

Linguistic theorizing includes a number of diverse approaches. Some approaches to language study view language as a fundamental resource in building up human experience. From this point of view, an individual user of language is seen 'as social agent to be instrumentally and casually involved in the process of language change, in the shaping of language via the constant processes of dialogue' (Kress, 1990:3).

An overall approach taken in this study follows the basic functional paradigm in that it focuses on the writer/speaker grammar, on the one hand, and moves from meaning to form, on the other. One basic direction in a linguistic analysis is to explore each given meaning in terms of how and why writers/speakers go about expressing it. Halliday (1970:141, as cited in Malmkjaer, 1991:159), for example, gives the following functionalist explanation of a linguistic structure relating it to a social structure: 'The nature of language is closely related to the functions it has to serve. The particular form taken by the grammatical system of language is closely related to the social and personal needs that language is required to serve'.

Functionalism in linguistics arises from the concerns of Mathesius (1929) and other linguists who shared his ideas and who became known as the Prague School of linguists. Their belief was that 'the phonological, grammatical and semantic structures of a language are determined by the functions they have to perform in the societies in which they operate' (Lyons, 1981:224). More recently, functionalism has come to be associated with Halliday (1985) and his followers, Kress (1990) among them.

Halliday (1975:17, as cited in Malmkjaer, 1991:161) posits that language as a social and interactive phenomenon performs three functions, namely, ideational, interpersonal, and textual. The ideational function is interpreted as 'a means of *reflecting on things*', whereas the interpersonal function is 'a means of *acting on things*'. The textual function enables the other two functions to operate because this function 'represents the language user's text-forming potential'. Fowler (1991:69) comments on the textual functions as follows:

> A third function … is in turn instrumental to these two [ideational and interpersonal] … it is concerned with the creation of text. … It is through this function that language makes links with itself and with the situation; and discourse becomes possible, because the speaker or writer can produce a text and the listener or reader can recognize one.

With respect to critical linguistic analysis Fowler (1991:70) states that as far as the three functions are concerned, they provide a useful prediction 'of what types of linguistic construction will be particularly revealing for critical linguistics'. Thus, Fowler (1991:70) maintains that 'the ideational and interpersonal functions are especially valuable for our purpose, since critical linguistics is particularly concerned with the ordering of experience [*reflecting on things* in Halliday's terms] and with the mediation of social relationships and values [*acting on things*]'.

The linguistic theory adopted in this study is of systemic nature. Such a theory is itself a social theory, for it proposes (1) that it is in the nature of human behaviour to build reality and/or experience through complex semiotic processes, and (2) that the principal semiotic system available to humans is their language. As Halliday (1985:xxii) writes, the main reason for studying the system is to throw light on discourse – on what people say and write and listen to and read. Both system and text have to be in focus of attention. … And perhaps most important of all, only by starting from the system can we see the text in

its aspect as a process'. In this sense, to study language is to explore some of the most important and pervasive of the processes by which human beings build their world.

To sum, the theory of social semiotic posits that forms of expression within a language are representations of meanings a culture assigns to itself. The forms encode a socially constructed representation of the world, for 'linguistic form is affected systematically by social circumstances' (Fowler, 1991:33), or, more precisely, by institutions or, according to the approach taken by critical linguists, discourses. Discourses affect the writer's choice to produce certain linguistic forms in that they order a particular text, and the writer is supposed to meet their demands by writing it. The construction of linguistic forms derived 'from the meanings of the discourses … [and] associated with the institutions relevant to the production and consumption of the text' (Fowler, 1991:70) is a basic concern of critical linguists.

Forms of Power Manifestation

Power is exercised and enacted in discourse. Fairclough (1991:46) believes that 'power in discourse is to do with powerful participants controlling and constraining the contributions of non-powerful participants'. Each discourse, maintaining its ideology, dictates the conditions of what kind of text to produce, what meanings to highlight, and what perspectives to impose. According to Fairclough (ibid.), there are three types of constraints which derive from the conventions of the discourse type and within which the writer/speaker is positioned when producing texts. Constraints operate on:

- *contents*, i.e. on what is said or done;
- *relations*, i.e. on social relations that people express in discourse;
- *subjects*, or the 'subject positions' people can occupy.

Hence, power is manifested if one is capable to constrain content, that is, to favor certain interpretations and 'wordings' of events, while excluding others. The type of power exercised here is the power to disguise power: the favored interpretations and wordings are those of the power-holders in a society.

Another form of power is related to constraints operating in social relations; it determines to what extent power will be overtly expressed. Interestingly, the power-holders have been recently forced into the less direct ways of exercising and reproducing their power. To quote Fairclough (1991:71), 'more recently, however, there has been a shift towards a system based upon solidarity rather than power'. Thus according to Fairclough (1991:193), an established relationship of solidarity should be treated with caution:

> Versions of the solidarity/authority mix are now conventional for political leaders, but their effects in terms especially of solidarity upon the actual social relationship between politicians and the rest of the population cannot be taken for granted. The solidarity of the politicians is with constructed and fictional 'public'; they do not claim solidarity with all the diverse sections of the actual 'public', nor one imagines would such a claim be reciprocated! There is a spurious and imaginary quality about this 'solidarity'.

Finally, power is associated with the construction of a subject position, the presupposition of an *ideal reader* who will make the 'right' inference from what has been said and, consequently, will accept the attributes that the powerful want them to attach.

It becomes obvious then that 'power relations are always relations of *struggle*' (Fairclough, 1991:34), and the principal domains in which social struggle takes place are social institutions and situation-types which each institution recognizes.

Display of Power in Language

The ways in which particular values and beliefs are shaped through the ideology by those who hold the power, or to what extent power relations are overtly expressed, and how the constructing of an *ideal reader* is achieved are related to the three functions that language is said to perform, namely, ideational, interpersonal, and textual (Halliday, 1975:17, as cited in Malmkjaer, 1991:161). The ideational, interpersonal, and textual functions serve to reflect on content, relations and subject positioning, respectively. **Table 1** below gives a visual summary of the points discussed (adapted from Fairclough, 1991:112).

Table 1. Language functions: ideational, interpersonal and textual

Dimensions of power exertion	Language functions	Structural effects
Contents	Ideational	Knowledge/beliefs
Relations	Interpersonal	Social relations
Subjects	Textual	Social identities

The table illustrates how language in its three functions – ideational, interpersonal and textual – exerts power through content, relations and subjects.

An *ideational* function is a trace of and a cue to the way in which the text producer's experience of the natural or social world is represented. This function has to do with *contents*, on the one hand, and knowledge and beliefs, on the other. An *interpersonal* function is a trace of and a cue to the social relationships which are enacted via the text in the discourse. An interpersonal function has to do with *relations* and social relationships. And, finally, a *textual* function is a trace of and a cue to the producer's evaluation of the bit of the reality it relates to. A textual function has to do with *subjects* and social identities.

There are various linguistic means that fit into the actual manifestation of the three functions. However, within the limitations of this paper, the analysis is restricted only to those means which have deserved special attention by critical linguists. The linguistic tools explored in this work are nominalization, pronominalization, and strategies influencing lexical choices. They will be looked at in more detail in the section below.

The Exertion of Power in Political Speeches through Linguistic Means: a Critical Analysis

Nominalization as Part of the *Ideational* Function

When searching for ideological meanings, critical linguists become particularly concerned with the strategy of transformation as a syntactic variation. One specific transformation that is particularly worth looking at in the critical analysis is *nominals*. Nominals, according to *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English (LGSWE)* (1999:232), are noun phrases, which 'normally play key roles as clause elements … [and] specify who and what the text is about'. Moreover, according to *LGSWE* (1999:318), new nouns can be formed by derivation and compounding. Derived nouns are formed through the addition of derivational affixes, such as prefixes and suffixes. Compound nouns, on the other hand, are formed from two words combined to form a single noun. Via zero derivation, or conversion, adjectives and verbs may be converted to nouns.

However, compared with a full clause, a derived nominal leaves much of information unexpressed. Such a clause, instead of reporting concrete actions in time, is transformed by the speaker into abstract entities or concepts out of time, and mystify all those processes and their participants. On this *LGSWE* (1999:325) writes,

> [d]erived abstract nouns are essential in academic discussions, where frequent reference is made to abstract concepts and where actions and processes are often referred to in general terms rather than in relation to a specific place and time. For such reference, it is convenient to use nominalizations, where the content of a clause (stripped of tense specification and other deictic elements) is compressed into a noun phrase.

Nominalization is, thus, an important linguistic tool which, as claimed by Fowler (1991:80), 'has extensive structural consequences, and offers substantial ideological opportunities'. Hence, nominalization is a form of power relations that constrains content.

The text of Mr. Tony Blair's political speech on the NHS demonstrates a sufficient variety of nominal nouns transformed from predicates. One effect of this grammatical form is that crucial aspects of the process are left unspecified, particularly the issue of causality (i.e. who did what to whom). Causality has to do with an assignation of power to do certain things and to perform certain actions to classes of social agents. In the first sentences of the speech, the following expressions of nominal nouns occur:

(1) We have called this press conference to set out our agenda for <u>investment</u> and <u>reform</u> of the NHS. The NHS is back in the news in the last few days but everything we are doing today is <u>a continuation</u> of the programme of <u>investment</u> and <u>reform</u> that we have been pursuing for the last few years (1-4).

The sentences in example (1) illustrate that nominalized actions are presented without any indication of agents, the causes of the actions are absent from the situation ('who invest', 'who reform'). The forms like these seem to avoid attributing any responsibility directly.

The use of the nominal word *decisions* in example (2) is rather ambiguous:

(2) Our case is that only by taking the <u>decisions</u> now to increase <u>investment</u> in the NHS (5).

By such structuring, it is not clear who really takes the decisions or decides on the action *to increase investment in the NHS*. Only by assuming that the interaction takes place between the Prime Minister and the members of the NHS, and by taking into account the use of the pronoun *Our,* it can be asserted that the implied agent of this process encompasses all the participants of the interaction. This indirect form of the request to take responsibility for the *decisions to increase investment* seems like a subtle involvement of the members of the NHS in the process of taking decisions.

The word *investment* also obfuscates an agent of the action. It suggests that the responsibility for investment is dispersed over all the participants of the interaction. Though it seems that Mr. Tony Blair claims solidarity, he nevertheless asserts his authority.

Totally impersonal constructions expressing absolute power are the ones without any indication of time and forms of speech mode:

(3) All controversial reforms. All with a single purpose: an NHS providing better care for patients (101)
(4) Thousands already benefiting from booked appointments (22)

Here, in the first proposition everything has been reduced, and there is only the noun and its attribute. Other propositions convey similar meanings: no one speaks, no one is constructed as the listener, the proposition's message exists at all times, is unchallengeable and beyond the dialogue.

The power being exercised here is a form of a hidden power; for the favoured interpretations are those of the power holders. Moreover, such encoded syntactic forms without any indication of the doers of the actions exert power through their appeal to a vague, but not ineffective authority, for the invisible power is unchallengeable.

The power difference becomes also visible if one takes a critical look at the forms of address of people who are in the need of health care. The Prime Minister addresses them in the following way:

(5) <u>Thousands</u> benefiting from booked appointments (22)
(6) … a modernisation agency working with hospitals to spread best practice to cut <u>delays</u> ... (78)
(7) ... provide quality healthcare to <u>all not just a few</u> ... (106-7)
(8) The reason they have more doctors or beds or <u>shorter waiting lists</u> is that irrespective of their system they spend more public money than we do (65)

In these sentences, the patients are named *thousands*, *delays*, and *waiting lists* or are referred to *all not just a few*. Through this usage patients are transformed into depersonalized objects, anonymous, and powerless; and the plural forms found in mentioning *thousands*, *delays*, *to all*, and *waiting lists* give the impression that their individuality is effaced.

It is also not difficult to notice that the phrase *shorter waiting lists* in example (8) refers to the patients. Such naming of the patients who need care and protection looks like dehumanising transformation of a human individual into a depersonalised object and characterizes them collectively as quite powerless participants. Once put on the lists, patients lose their individuality, and are subsumed in an aggregate of people. In addition, it is impossible to tell from this phrase what the patients are supposed to be doing or experiencing, for they are given no semantic role in the transitivity structure of this clause. The nominal expression *waiting lists* only echoes the main predicate *wait* associated with the sick people; the noun removes all potential of action and all suggestion of personal control. Mr. Tony Blair's assurance may or may not correctly reflect a reality of the prompt availability of treatment, but at any rate it is unkindly in tone, and sets an official norm according to which patients are anonymous and powerless.

All the examples illustrate that the speaking subject is not given, nor is he readily recoverable. It is clear that there is somebody, and one can make certain guesses about that, but one cannot be certain about his/her identity. Though the propositions do not specify the authority, or the speaking subject, they do signal the power distribution over such claims. The force of impersonal sentences is manifested in that they are unconfrontational.

Rounding off the discussion of nominals, it has to be restated that nominalization has to do with the power to obfuscate and offer only particular ideological interpretations. No doubt, when one possible interpretation is encoded, its meaning is given the appearance of being transparent, and this is an example of ideological power.

Pronominalization as Part of the *Interpersonal* Function

In English, the expression of overt power through the *you/thou* distinction had already disappeared. As Kress (1990:60) suggests, this particular development in terms of going away from the overt power indications may be due to 'the increasing democratisation of English society, that is, a society in which power difference and superiority could no longer be openly asserted'. Nonetheless, pronouns do continue to function in the way in which the choice between them is tied up with the relationships of power or solidarity. The following subsections focus on the power relations which are being implicitly claimed through the use of pronouns.

First person singular and plural pronouns

It is pointed out in *LGSWE* (1999:329-30) that

> The first person singular pronoun (*I*) is usually unambiguous in referring to the speaker/writer, [but] the meaning of the first person plural pronoun is often vague: *we* usually refers to the speaker/writer and the addressee (inclusive *we*), or to the speaker/writer and some other person or persons associated with him/her (exclusive *we*). … Usually, however, it is left to the addressee to infer the exact meaning of *we*. By choosing the plural pronoun *we* rather than *I*, a single author avoids drawing attention to himself/herself, and the writing becomes somewhat more impersonal. On the

other hand, when *we* is used to include the reader, it has a rather different effect and the writing becomes more personal.

The Prime Minister Tony Blair uses a plethora of the so-called 'inclusive' *we* while the 'exclusive' *we* is being used only in the first sentences of the speech:

(1) <u>We</u> have called this press conference to set our agenda for investment and reform of the NHS. The NHS is back in the news in the last few days but everything <u>we</u> are doing today is a continuation of the programme of investment and reform that <u>we</u> have been pursuing for the last few year (1-4).

We in this instance includes the speaker into a larger group and gives him some anonymity and impersonality. In addition, it disperses responsibility; *we* could be the *we* of the government, and it therefore acts as a distancing device.

The type of *we* in the following examples seems to refer to both the Prime Minister and the public:

(9) In 1997 <u>we</u> took a political risk: to get the economy back on a sound footing before <u>we</u> spent extra money on the health service (34)
(10) <u>We</u> are increasing health spending faster than any other major country in Europe (40)
(11) In primary care <u>we</u> are trusting frontline staff to provide new services for local communities (80)
(12) Today <u>we</u> show how <u>we</u> will extend choice further (85)
(13) So <u>we</u> intend to offer heart surgery patients ... (86-7)
(14) <u>We</u> are negotiating new contracts for GPs and consultants (95)
(15) <u>We</u> will be using the new powers to intervene ... (97)
(16) <u>We</u> will be setting up more and more treatment centres for operations (99)

Numerous instances of the use of the 'inclusive' *we* illustrate the predominance of this device. The choice of such address has clear effects. First of all, it represents Mr. Tony Blair, his audience, and everyone else as sharing the same views, beliefs, and perspectives about the states of affairs. Consider: *In 1997 <u>we</u> took a political risk, <u>we</u> are increasing, <u>we</u> are trusting frontline staff, <u>we</u> intend to offer, <u>we</u> are negotiating,* and so forth.

Undoubtedly, by this kind of structuring the speaker inculcates a particular vision of the world, the perspective of his beliefs and values. Hence, the use of the 'inclusive' *we* is manipulative, claiming spurious solidarity, with an intention to convince the people that they are part of them.

Moreover, the 'inclusive' *we* indicates that Mr. Tony Blair is speaking on behalf of himself, the members of the NHS, and all the British citizens. In so doing, he is making an implicit authority claim and it shows that he has the authority to speak for others. The Prime Minister exerts his authority by telling what people are like, what their duties and expectations are, as in the following: *we will extend, we will be using, <u>we</u> will be setting up.* The insistent use of this *we* signals a particular relation to the audience. The audience is here regarded as ready, suited to, and able to be identified with the characteristics imposed on them by the Prime Minister and to be part of their group.

The obvious control of the events or states of affairs by the speaker is established via the use of pronoun *I*:

(17) I see the NHS as founded on a set of values and not a set of rigid structures (69-70)
(18) To those who say this is a step too far, I say the NHS was set up to relieve pain and suffering not to prolong it. (89-90)

Claiming from the point of view of *I* is obviously the exertion of authority, since only the powerful are endowed with the right to 'remind' people of their values, beliefs, and to distribute orders over them.

In addition, Mr. Tony Blair emanates his extreme power when he articulates overt prohibitions or requests, and when he dares to challenge others:

(19) ... I will not let ideology or dogma prevent this government from doing what it knows to be right for patients (90-91)
(20) I want a full debate about the NHS. I challenge those who claim to have an alternative plan to spell out how they will raise the money needed (105)

All the propositions communicated at the end of the speech where the Prime Minister clearly asserts his beliefs about the perspectives (*I believe we can find the resources the NHS needs*, *I believe we can reform the NHS*) and promises *to defend and improve* the NHS sound much more as warranties on behalf of the speaker. The giving of warrants is, however, a prerogative granted only to the powerful.

Second person pronouns

As regards the pronoun *you*, *LGSWE* (1999:330) states: 'The second person pronoun *you* is similar to *we* in being used with different intended referents. In the first place, it is not always clear in the present-day English whether the second person pronoun refers to one or more people. … However, as with *we*, it is usually left to the addressee to infer who is included in the reference of *you*'.

The pronoun *you* in the speech on terrorism has a clear directive force. The beginning of the speech illustrates the point:

(21) And as you crossed the room, you felt the longing and sadness; hands clutching photos of sons and daughters, wives and husbands; imploring you to believe them when they said there was still an outside chance of their loved ones being found alive, when you knew in truth that all hope was gone. And then a middle-aged mother looks you in the eyes and tells you her only son has died, and asks you: why? I tell you: you do not feel like the most powerful person in the country at times like that. (12-18)

The extract from the speech on terrorism illustrates how, by employing the pronoun *you*, the Prime Minister subtly coerces the British people to merge with the Americans and experience their grief and torments as their own. Mr. Tony Blair transmits the sufferings and perceptions he talks about as applicable to the people in general. The use of pronoun *you* thus implies a relationship of solidarity between the Prime Minister (the government) and the people in general. However, by reducing the concerns of the government and the aspirations of the people to the status of common experience, Mr. Tony Blair also constitutes a particular subject position, the consideration of which will be considered in the upcoming section.

Lexis as Part of the *Textual* Function

There are numerous ideologically contrastive schemes embodying different meanings in different discourses, and they are coded in vocabulary. The selection of vocabulary is a major determinant of what meanings and attributes are attached to people and, hence, which subject positions are set up. The extract from the Prime Minister's speech on terrorism is a good illustration of how readers/listeners are constrained to operate within the subject positions set up in political discourse.

First, it is important to note that the subject position set up in such a discourse situation is that of the *ideal listener*. The interaction in the speech on terrorism takes place between the Prime Minister, on the one hand, and the diverse and indeterminable composition of audiences, on the other. The *ideal listener* is assumed by Mr. Tony Blair to be an ordinary person, any member of the British society. The assertion that the Prime Minister makes at the very beginning of the speech already presupposes the British people's stance towards the Americans:

(22) From this nation, goes our deepest sympathy and prayers for the victims and our profound solidarity with the American people. We were with you at the first. We will stay with you to the last. (4-6)

These lines demonstrate how the Prime Minister implicitly claims his authority to tell the British people what they feel with respect to the Americans who had suffered from the attacks of the terrorists. By this, Mr. Tony Blair distances himself from the people and marks himself off as having a special authority, of being the leader.

In the text, Mr. Tony Blair makes many claims with respect to the people, and by indicating his position he invites the audience to act in a particular way:

(23) We will take action at every level, national and international, in the UN, in G8, in the EU, in Nato, in every regional grouping in the world, to strike at international terrorism wherever it exists. (101-103)
(24) Here in this country and in other nations round the world, laws will be changed, not to deny basic liberties but to prevent their abuse and protect the most basic liberty of all: freedom from terror. New extradition laws will be introduced; new rules to ensure asylum is not a front for terrorist entry. (108-112)

Some of the structures in the text explicitly attribute certain positive properties to the British people as is demonstrated in the following lines:

(25) This country is proud of its tradition in giving asylum to those fleeing tyranny. We will always do so. But we have a duty to protect the system from abuse. (111-113)
(26) Today the threat is chaos; because for people with work to do, family life to balance, mortgages to pay, careers to further, pensions to provide, the yearning is for order and stability and if it doesn't exist elsewhere, it is unlikely to exist here. (125-127)
(27) ... surely we have the wit and will to develop economically without despoiling the very environment we depend upon. (167-168)

All these patterns of wording serve to maintain the distance on the part of the speaker and help to assert his authority; it is only those with power that have the right to tell people what they are.

The following examples list qualities which can be identified as desirable for people to possess:

(28) So that people everywhere can see the chance of a betterfuture through the hard work and creative power of the free citizen (28-29)

(29) There is a coming together. The power of community is asserting itself. We are realising how fragile are our frontiers in the face of the world's new challenges. (120-121)

(30) On our side: provide more aid, untied to trade; write off debt; help with good governance and infrastructure; training to the soldiers, with UN blessing, in conflict resolution; encouraging investment; and access to our markets so that we practise the free trade we are so fond of preaching. (149-152)

(31) Our values are the right ones for this age: the power of community, solidarity, the collective ability to further the individual's interests. (255-256)

The features referred to implicitly contribute to the characterization of the audience subject position. The Prime Minister's selection of vocabulary is partly oriented to the listeners. Mr. Tony Blair chooses items which mark a particular set of beliefs and values attached to people.

Taking all these expressions together, Mr. Tony Blair's construal of the people can be summed up as follows. They are sympathetic to the American people, they show solidarity with them, they are ready to *strike at international terrorism*. They are also proud of their *tradition in giving asylum to those fleeing tyranny* and are responsible for their hard work, families, and careers. They respect law and order, have *the wit and will to develop economically*, they are supportive of a strong, good government, soldiers' training, are responsible for the community, *the collective ability to further the individuals' interests* and are involved in *shaping Europe's destiny*.

However, at no point in the speech are the people explicitly said to be precisely the ones of the particular nature mentioned in the speech. The process depends entirely on the reader/listener's capacity to infer connections from the list of attributes. Being compassionate with the American people, concerned about the fight with terrorism, responsible for their own families, provides people a possibility to sustain their safety through *the power of community and solidarity*. The characteristics of the British people scattered throughout the speech suggest that they themselves have to make the 'right' inferences, that is, have the 'right' ideas about what 'good people' mean in practice. All the expressions cumulatively build up a particular world of the British people, and anyone who wishes to fit into that world has to accept the set of values and beliefs about the desirable personal and social behaviour imposed by the more powerful.

By way of summing up this section, it has to be restated that the clusters of values established through the selection of a particular vocabulary emanate the power of the Prime Minister. His power stems from his ability to mediate ideas from a particular perspective, from a particular ideology. In fact, the cumulative values and beliefs make up an ideology which can be regarded as a representation of the country's views about the different positions and characteristics of the people.

Conclusions

The aim of the paper has been to illustrate the possibilities offered by the method of linguistic research termed *critical linguistics*. Recently, a critical study of language production has been treated as one of the most effective ways to examine a diversity of meanings conveyed in the process of people's linguistic interaction. The analysis of the two texts has demonstrated that the meanings which people convey by writing/speaking actually do not correspond to what they claim to be saying. In addition to an apparent representation of a particular set of values, ideas and beliefs they communicate, there emerge other meanings which on the surface are covert to readers/listeners but are fully controlled by efficient writers/speakers. These meanings are 'social meanings which reflect the organization of a society, … its relationship with its environment' (Fowler, 1990:147) and, particularly, demonstrate their complete demand of allegiance to a particular society or an institution.

To interpret the meaning as it was intended requires not only the knowledge of grammar but also the knowledge of the world. To put it another way, it is crucial for an attentive audience to understand the situation in which a sentence occurs. It is this knowledge that is essential for the interpretation of the real meaning that the writer/speaker sets out to convey.

The relevant literature agrees that it is sociolinguistics that has shown, with respect to linguistic variation, that it is 'a product of social differentiation – language varies according to the social identities of people in interactions, their socially defined purposes, social setting and so on' (Fairclough, 1991:21). However, sociolinguists, particularly those working in conversational analysis, 'have been resistant to making connections between such "micro" structures of conversation and the "macro" structures of social institutions and societies' (Fairclough, 19991:12).

In contrast, critical linguists consider determinants of a discourse as crucial in the interpretation of meanings for it is differences in meanings that echo different ideologies of a discourse in which a writer/speaker participates at a certain moment. To use Fowler's (1990:148) words, 'the differences would reflect conventional contrasts of goals, social roles, assumptions about the reader, assumptions about other relevant discourse, etc. Differences of world-view would be relatable to conventionalized, socially based, perceptions of communication'.

This study has set out to illustrate the point that there are many linguistic signals of power exertion, and they are manifested in various ways. The relevant examples that have been adduced and discussed are in no way an exhaustive survey of this wide area of linguistic research, especially in terms of the possible explication of relations of power expressed through language.

To summarize, language viewed through the ideational, interpersonal and textual functions it serves in human interaction is the best indication of how power is exercised through content, interpersonal relationships and subject

positions. For it is language that is used to transmit particular ideas, beliefs and values of the ideological world, it specifies relations between the participants of a social interaction, and shapes particular subject positions that people enact. A crucial point that emerges from the discussion is that language use - discourse - is not just a matter of performing tasks, it is also a matter of expressing and constituting and reproducing social identities and social relations, including relations of power. The linguistic forms produced by a writer/speaker exert pressure on individuals in that they 'describe and prescribe a range of actions, modes of thinking and being, for an individual, compatible with the demands of a discourse' (Kress, 1990:37). In this way, people learn about the system of values, the systems of norms and modes of behaviour, which specify what kind of social being they ought to be in order to become a member of a certain community, or an institution.

However, power relations are not easy to discern. It is only by developing ourselves as critical readers/listeners that we can aquire an awareness of the weight that linguistic expressions obtain from certain ideologies. The critical approach applied to the interpretation of any utterance requires 'using language *effectively*, for *effects* such as conveying meaning' (Fairclough, 1991:237).

Another purpose of this study has been raising people's consciousness about the tacitly adjusted manifestations of power in their everyday communication. Thus, with this intention, the findings of the study can be applied to the investigation of various linguistic markers of power exertion in Lithuanian.

References

1. Bourdieu, P. (1994). *Language and Symbolic power*. Polity Press. Cambridge.
2. Fairclough, N. (1991). *Language and Power*. London and New York: Longman.
3. Fowler, R. (1990). *Linguistic Criticism*. Oxford University Press.
4. Fowler, R. (1991). Language in the News. Discourse and Ideology in the Press. London and New York: Routledge.
5. Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
6. Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
7. Kress, G. and Hodge, R. (1979). *Language as Ideology*. London and New York: Routledge.
8. Kress, G. (1990). Linguistic Processes in Sociocultural Practice. Oxford University Press.
9. Malmkjaer, K. (ed). (1991). *The Linguistics Encyclopedia*. Routledge.
10. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. Longman, 1999.
11. Lyons, J. (1981). *Language and Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
12. van Dijk, Teun. (1987). Communicating Racism: Ethnic Prejudice in Thought and Talk. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
13. http://pearly0000.tripod.com/pearly.html
14. http://www.number-10.gov.uk/output/page4061.asp

Irena Urbanavičienė

Kalbinės *galios* raiškos priemonės politikų kalbose

Santrauka

Šiame straipsnyje analizuojamos dvi politinės Didžiosios Britanijos Ministro pirmininko Tonio Blair'o kalbos. Šio straipsnio tikslas – pademonstruoti, kaip nuodugni kalbinių priemonių analizė gali padėti suvokti *galios* raiškos bruožus ir su jais susijusius ideologinius procesus, vykstančius diskurse. *Galios* raiška diskurse atskleidžiama tokiomis lingvistinėmis priemonėmis kaip nominalizacija, pronominalizacija bei įvairūs leksikiniai junginiai.

Šio straipsnio analizė remiasi *kritiniu lingvistiniu* požiūriu, kai pagrindinis dėmesys yra sutelkiamas į ideologijas diskurse ir į tai, kaip tos ideologijos perduodamos kitiems kalbinių priemonių pagalba. Pasak Fowler'io (1991:67), kritinės lingvistikos pagrindinis tikslas – detaliai tyrinėti „lingvistines struktūras atsižvelgiant į socialinę ir istorinę teksto situaciją, ir jų pagalba akivaizdžiai parodyti vertybių bei įsitikinimų modelius, kurie yra užkoduoti kalboje – ir kurie yra nepastebimi tiems, kurie priima diskursą kaip 'natūralų dalyką'".

The author

Irena Urbanavičienė, assistant at the Centre of Foreign Languages, Faculty of Humanities, Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania.
Academic interests: critical linguistics, ELT material.
Address: Kaunas University of Technology, Faculty of Humanities, Centre of Foreign Languages, Gedimino str. 43, LT-3000 Kaunas, Lithuania.
E-mail: ireurba@ktu.lt