



LUND UNIVERSITY

Centre for Languages and Literature

Appraisal in Political Speech

—

A Comparative Discursive Study of Winston Churchill and
Tony Blair

Richard Helander

ENGK01
Bachelor's Degree Essay
Spring 2014
English Studies
Supervisor: Francis M. Hult

Abstract

This study investigated alignments in speeches held by two historically prominent politicians: Sir Winston Churchill and Tony Blair. The speeches that comprised the data of this study were a speech from 3 September, 1939, for the former, and a speech held on 18 March, 2003, for the latter. The study made use of Martin & White's (2005) account of appraisal theory.

Firstly, the use of *positive* and *negative judgement* (Martin & White, 2005, pp. 52-56) was investigated. Secondly, the speakers' use of *heteroglossic engagement*, strategies that *contracted* and *expanded* the dialogic space (Martin & White, 2005, p. 102 ff.), i.e. the possibility to, indirectly, question statements, was investigated and compared. In connection to the concepts of *judgement* and *heteroglossic engagement*, both the speakers' alignments to their intended audiences (and others), as well as the context they build (Gee, 2014b, pp. 90-91; Blommaert, 2005, pp. 43-44) with their separate audiences were examined. For the alignment and context-building aspects to be worthy of investigation, a notion that any communication (whether it be between two or more people, or between a speaker and an audience) is dialogic, was necessary to adopt (Martin & White, 2005, p. 92; Du Bois, 2007; Blommaert, 2005, p. 43 ff.). The results of the speakers' different alignments, that is, the grouping of *us* contra *them*, positive self- and negative other presentation, and strategies of legitimisation, were also examined.

The analysis revealed that both speakers use *positive judgement*. Furthermore, the results evinced that Blair utilises *negative judgement*, whereas Churchill's speech only contained one instance of this concept, from which no broad conclusions can be drawn. The *positive judgements* and *negative* ones (especially for Blair) were used in relation to themselves, their country, as well as others. Thereby, the speakers aligned themselves and created different groupings in society. The results also highlighted the fact that both speakers use both *contracting* and *expanding* types of *heteroglossic engagement*, by which they aligned themselves with their audiences, as well as with others. Furthermore, the results pointed to the fact that the devices employed resulted in an implicit division in the world, and that these strategies were used to legitimise the speakers' opinions and intentions.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Previous discourse analytic studies of political speeches.....	2
2.1 <i>Us and them</i>	2
2.2 <i>Positive self- and negative other presentation</i>	4
2.3 <i>The strategy of legitimisation and de-legitimisation</i>	5
3. Data collection and methodology	7
3.1 <i>Data collection and delimitation</i>	8
3.2 <i>Theory and method</i>	9
4. A comparison in judgement and engagement.....	13
4.1 <i>Positive judgement</i>	13
4.2 <i>Negative judgement</i>	16
4.3 <i>Engagement – Contraction of dialogicality</i>	19
4.4 <i>Engagement – Expansion of dialogicality</i>	20
5. Conclusion.....	23
References	25

1. Introduction

Political discourse is, arguably, one of the most prevalent fields of research within Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). In particular, research carried out within this field retains a focus on political discourse relating to war and intervention (e.g. Crespo-Fernández, 2013; Mazid, 2007; Van Dijk, 2005; Oddo, 2011; Reyes, 2011; Fairclough, 2005). This prevalence seems to stem from a need to unmask politicians' elusive rhetoric, and to "intervene" in the social debate where the discourse is found (Gee, 2014a, p. 9).

The purpose of the present study is to add to the field of CDA through investigating and comparing the rhetoric of two prominent politicians, Winston Churchill and Tony Blair. The analysis will centre on the speakers' alignments with their intended audience, as well as with others. Furthermore, the results of the speakers' alignments, i.e. what kind of context the speaker creates with his audience (Blommaert, 2005, pp. 43-44; Gee, 2014b, pp. 90-91) and the creation of *us* and *them*-dyads, positive self- and negative other presentation, and legitimisation/de-legitimisation are discussed.

Drawing from the appraisal framework, which consists of three major categories: attitude, meaning how speakers'/writers' language shows their attitude towards people and objects; engagement, meaning how speakers/writers align with their audiences; and graduation, meaning the intensifying or downgrading of feelings (Martin & White, 2005, p. 34 ff.), this study, more specifically, investigates the speakers' utilising *positive* contra *negative judgement*, a sub-category of attitude (Martin & White, 2005, pp. 53-56). Furthermore, Du Bois (2007) notes that "stance is ... achieved dialogically" (p. 163; see also, Martin & White, 2005, pp. 92-93; Blommaert, 2005, pp. 43-44). This dialogic aspect is also applicable to apparently monologic situations (Martin & White, 2005, p. 92), such as magazine editorials (Martin, 2004), business reports (Fuoli, 2012), and political speeches (e.g. Crespo-Fernández, 2013). With this notion in mind, this essay also investigates how the speakers use *heteroglossic engagement*, that is, how the speakers *expand* and *contract* the possibility of dialogic communication in the speeches (Martin & White, 2005, p. 102). It is interesting to investigate speaker alignments because it further sheds light on what kind of strategies politicians use in their speeches to justify their intentions, especially relating to something as devastating as war.

The results show that both politicians utilise similar *positive judgement* strategies, and that Blair utilises its negative counterpart. Churchill's speech only contained one instance of

negative judgement, and serves as no basis for drawing conclusions. The results also evince that both speakers used similar *engagement* strategies. Furthermore, these strategies result in both speakers creating a context in which their audiences, as well as other populations and individuals, are divided into those who agree with the speakers and those who do not, consequently creating *us-them* dyads. The results also reveal that the speakers present the former group positively and the latter negatively. Further implications concerning legitimisation and de-legitimisation can also be made. From a historical perspective, these similarities might be due to the underlying schooling of politicians (Craig, 2013, p. 489).

Although many studies have analysed political speeches, the speech by Blair, used in this study, has not been analysed in any detail (see, Fairclough, 2005; Van Dijk, 2006), and Churchill's has not been analysed previously, as far as I know. Thus, the detailed analysis presented in this study is a valuable addition to the field of research. The structure of the essay is as follows: section 2 presents previous studies of political speeches. Next, section 3 details the data and the methodology used. Then, the fourth section presents, firstly, a comparison in the two speakers' use of *judgement*, and, secondly, their use of *heteroglossic engagement*. Finally, the last section summarises the findings and presents thoughts on future research.

2. Previous discourse analytic studies of political speeches

This section presents previous studies of political speeches. The section includes three major topics: *us* and *them*-rhetoric (2.1), positive self- and negative other presentation (2.2), and the strategy of legitimisation and de-legitimisation (2.3).

2.1 Us and them

A number of studies have investigated metaphors in connection to political speech. Many of these have shown that metaphors relating to fear have been used by speakers to create a divided world between "us" and "them" (Biria & Mohammadi, 2012; Ferrari, 2007; Bhatia, 2009; Crespo-Fernández, 2013). For example, Crespo-Fernández (2013) investigates dysphemisms (words and phrasings that associate the object or person referred to with negative aspects and traits) in a number of Churchill's wartime speeches. The results point to the fact that Churchill uses several kinds of dysphemistic metaphors, such as portraying

Germans as animals (pp. 317-322), “to attack Nazi Germans” (p. 328), and thereby create a dichotomy. This study is particularly interesting since it utilises partly the same framework as the present one: *judgement*.

There are also several studies that have analysed presuppositional devices in political speech: presuppositions (Mazid 2007; Bartolucci, 2012), allusions (Wodak, 2007), and implicatures (Van Dijk, 2005; Wieczorek, 2008). Presuppositions, allusions, and implicatures are strategies whereby a speaker infers and presupposes certain things as being true. For example, Wodak (2007) argues that Dr. Jörg Haider (the then leader of a right-wing party in Austria) created a division between “those with a ‘true Viennese heart’ (US), and those who [are] ... influenced by ... apparently powerful Jewish lobbies in New York (THEM),” through inferring that people are members of different groups, by employing “membership categorisation devices” (p. 218; see also Leudar, Marsland, & Nekvapil (2004) on membership categorisation). Another study showed that through proximation (how distant others are, both physically and mentally), and the use of “person deixis” (personal pronouns), a Spanish PM, José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero, “implies a grand ideological gap between the two parties” in Spain (Wieczorek, 2008, p. 45; see also Maalej, 2012; Reyes-Rodríguez, 2008; Biria & Mohammadi, 2012; and Pujante & Morales-López, 2008, who all discuss pronoun use; especially Maalej, 2012).

A few studies have also analysed how politicians try to create new hegemonies in their speeches (Fairclough, 2005; Lazar & Lazar, 2008). Lazar & Lazar’s (2008) study clearly indicates that a binary conflict is created in the discourse of not only George W. Bush, but also in the rhetoric of his father, George H. W. Bush, as well as in that of a member of their political opposition, Bill Clinton. The authors also point to the fact that the group labelled *them* is welcomed to become part of *us* through a “process of assimilation,” (p. 239) signalled by, e.g., the word *rejoin*, in Bush Jr.’s discourse (p. 239). Moreover, Fairclough (2005) investigates Blair’s creation of a new hegemony concerning international community and security. The results show that this creation of doctrine is realised partly through “a bifurcation of the world into protagonists and antagonists” (p. 48).

Furthermore, two studies mention the concept of *us* and *them* in relation to legitimisation (discussed further in section 2.3) (Reyes, 2011; Oddo, 2011). Oddo (2011) sheds light on the fact that both George W. Bush and World War II president, Franklin D. Roosevelt, utilise similar strategies of differentiating the two sides on both a moral and a temporal basis (pp. 294-303). Furthermore, the analysis evinces that the group boundaries are not fixed, which means that new people can be included in each. Moreover, Reyes (2011) points out that both

George W. Bush and Barack Obama utilise the emotion of fear through a “demonization of the enemy” (p. 790), to create a polarisation and thereby legitimise their decisions.

2.2 Positive self- and negative other presentation

Several articles mention that along with the polarisation strategy, discussed above, speakers utilise a strategy of positive self- and negative other presentation, where one side is portrayed positively and those opposed (the other) are presented negatively. This can manifest itself metaphorically through euphemisation (positive representation) of *us* and attributing negative concepts with *them* (Biria & Mohammadi, 2012, p. 1297; Ferrari, 2007, p. 617; Crespo-Fernández, 2013). Furthermore, the strategy discussed in this section can be realised through the complete victimisation of a whole country. Such a realisation is discussed in Wodak & de Cillia’s (2007) study (see also Gruber, 2004). The authors point to a nation-wide victimisation in connection to the metaphorical rebirth of the Second Austrian Republic, where a rebirth narrative distances the nation from the war crimes committed during WWII, and thus “constructs positive self-presentation” (p. 355). In another study, Segara Navera (2011) mentions that the Philippine president Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo utilises “favourable self-representations” (p. 336), in her discourse on war as a cure; this serves to portray the speaker as “the working president” (p. 336)¹.

Positive self- and negative other presentation can also be realised through presuppositions in connection to attributing negative properties to *them* (Mazid, 2007, p. 366) and positively evaluate *us* (p. 369). Wodak (2007) points to the fact that Haider uses presuppositions to present his opposition negatively (pp. 216-217). Additionally, Van Dijk’s (2005) study of former Spanish PM José María Aznar’s discourse evinces that the speaker uses implicatures to present himself as a good leader who “is doing his job” (p. 73). Van Dijk also argues convincingly that the PM presents those opposed to his policies negatively, through connecting them with Saddam Hussein (p. 81).

Positive self- and negative other presentation is also discussed in relation to elaborating new political hegemonies. Pujante & Morales-López (2008) mention that since Spanish PM José María Aznar uses the phrase “Spain is working,” for example, he “highlights [the government’s] active and effective role” (p. 84). Similar ways of speakers presenting

¹ Interestingly, Segara Navera’s study is one of few that investigate the rhetoric of a female politician. The focus of the present study is on the speeches by Churchill and Blair because of the historical similarity between the two social situations they occurred in. It would indeed be useful for future studies to consider ways in which statements from female politicians can be included in an analysis.

themselves as hardworking are discussed in the analyses by Wieczorek (2008), Maalej (2012), and Craig (2013). Additionally, Fairclough (2005) discusses the fact that Tony Blair presents a discourse in which “the malignity of the antagonists is ... explicit [and] the benign character of the protagonists is ... presupposed” (p. 47). This is a clear case of Blair utilising the strategy discussed.

Worth mentioning in relation to the strategy of positive self- and negative other presentation is Claudia Ortu’s (2009) study. The author argues that the then British Prime Minister Gordon Brown tries to “criticise his opposition” (p. 168) by referring to negative events and actions of the previous government, especially in connection to David Cameron “who according to Brown was economic advisor of the government at the time of [a] crisis” (Ortu, 2009, p. 168). Van Dijk’s (2006) study is also worth mentioning here. In it, the author discusses discourse and strategies of manipulation. He argues that politicians utilise several strategies of manipulation (e.g. *us-them* polarisation and positive self- and negative other presentation) (p. 373). To serve as an example, the author uses two extracts from a speech by Tony Blair (the very speech investigated in this essay) and provides evidence of Blair’s usage of such strategies.

2.3 The strategy of legitimisation and de-legitimisation

The two strategies discussed in the previous subsections relate to – and are used for – a third discursive strategy: the legitimisation of a speaker’s own policies, and the consequent de-legitimisation of oppositional voices, and their policies. These strategies can be realised through metaphors relating to positive self-presentation (Wodak & de Cillia, 2007; Segara Navera, 2011), negative other presentation (Crespo-Fernández, 2013; Reyes, 2011), as well as metaphors relating to polarisations of the world (Crespo-Fernández, 2013; Biria & Mohammadi, 2012; Oddo, 2011; Reyes, 2011). Moreover, Koteyko & Ryazanova-Clarke (2009) argue that Vladimir Putin’s use of path and building metaphors serve to de-legitimise the government immediately preceding his own (p. 119). The analysis further evinces that Putin legitimises his own political agenda through “positive evaluation of his own leadership” (p. 118).

Legitimisation strategies have also been analysed in connection to presuppositional devices in political discourse. Throughout his study of the former Spanish PM José María Aznar’s discourse, Van Dijk (2005) argues that the speaker continually tries to legitimise his own

policies and intentions (relating to the Iraq intervention), and, in doing so, de-legitimises oppositional voices (Pujante & Morales-López (2008, pp. 82, 90) offer a similar analysis of Aznar's discourse). Furthermore, Wicczorek (2008) points to a similar trend in the discourse of another Spanish PM (Rodríguez Zapatero). The author argues that the construction of the PM's speech serves the function of, among other things, "[legitimising] the acceptance of [a] bill" concerning same-sex marriage (p. 42). Similarly, Mazid (2007) concludes that Bush's discourse contains numerous strategic functions, among which "(de)legitimation" (p. 370) is one. A similar strategy is mentioned by Bartolucci (2012), who states that "[a]lthough Bush is mostly oriented to locally legitimise his own policies, they are ... international in scope" (p. 571).

In studies relating to the establishment of new hegemonies, there is an implicit tone, which suggests that speakers utilise a given speech situation to legitimise their policies. A perfect example of this is Gales's (2009) study (which made use of appraisal theory) of American politicians. The analysis reveals that the language of members of congress and the senate is clearly visible in the ensuing documents produced, concerning immigration and diversity legislations. Furthermore, Lazar & Lazar (2008) discuss the fact that George H. W. Bush, George W. Bush, and Bill Clinton all articulated and formulated a "New World Order." Thus, one can make the assumption that this is what they aimed at legitimising. Moreover, Fairclough's (2005) study points to the fact that, through creating a correlation between globalisation and security, in combination with, among other things, an *us-them* distinction, Blair tries to legitimise the war on terrorism (and in Iraq).

As was stated in section 2.1, both Oddo (2011) and Reyes (2011) discuss legitimisation in connection to the creation of a dichotomy in the world. Whereas Oddo's focus is almost exclusively on this dyad-creation, Reyes presents other strategies of legitimisation as well. Examples of other strategies include: the framing of a situation in connection to a "hypothetical future" (pp. 793-797), the framing of a decision as "the 'right' thing to do" (p. 797), through referring to expert sources, and through altruistic formulations (pp. 800-803). Throughout the article, the author uses extracts from George W. Bush's and Obama's discourse, and proves that all these different strategies can be found.

Two studies that have been mentioned briefly before are worth discussing here. Firstly, in their study concerning "Membership Categorisation", Leudar, Marsland, & Nekvapil (2004) point to the *us-them* categorisation in the discourses of George W. Bush, Tony Blair, and the then leader of the terrorist organisation Al Qaeda, Usama bin Laden; the authors further argue that this strategy is utilised to "[prepare] ground for future activities," such as violence and

war (p. 263). Secondly, Ortu's (2009) analysis of Gordon Brown's discourse reveals that the former British PM continually tries to legitimise his policies of altering (or re-framing) the role of Trade Unions in modern society.

Two other studies are necessary to mention also. Firstly, Lionel Wee (2012) has investigated the discourse of the Singaporean Prime Minister, Lee Hsien Loong, and what stances this speaker adopts in relation to the legalisation of casinos in Singapore. The analysis sheds light on the speaker's trying to legitimise the state's decision to legalise casinos, through framing them as "integrated resorts," (p. 22) where a casino is but "one among many other 'amenities'" (p. 23). Secondly, Salama's (2012) study of a speech held by Barack Obama in Cairo is worth mentioning. In the analysis, the author discusses Obama's references to the Qur'an, among other things. These references serve to legitimise "pluralisation", putting aside conflicts to bring the world together (e.g., p. 227).

3. Data collection and methodology

As the previous section demonstrates, numerous discursive studies have analysed political speeches. As is evident, there are widely different approaches to analysing political speech; however, a general trend, it seems, is that the findings suggest that regardless of what strategies are used by a speaker, the implications of speakers' rhetoric usually include *us-them*-dyads, positive self- and negative other presentation, as well as (de)legitimation.

The aim of this study is to add to this vast field of research by analysing speeches of two historically distinguished politicians, Winston Churchill and Tony Blair. Specifically, this study was conducted based on two research questions. The first question that is under investigation is how the speakers align with their respective audience (as well as others). The second concerns the results of the speakers' alignments, i.e. what kind of context the speaker creates with his audience (Blommaert, 2005, pp. 43-44; Gee, 2014b, pp. 90-91), as well as what implications, such as *us* and *them*-groupings, positive self- and negative other presentation and legitimisation strategies, are discernable. Furthermore, this essay analyses Churchill and Blair's alignments through the lens of appraisal theory (Martin & White, 2005). As stated in the introduction, this theory consists of three major categories: attitude, meaning how certain phrasings that speakers/writers use reflect their attitude towards people and objects; engagement, meaning speakers'/writers' aligning with their audiences; and graduation, the intensifying or downgrading of feelings (Martin & White, 2005, p. 34 ff.)

Only a few prior studies have utilised appraisal theory in analyses of political speech² (worthy of mention, apart from Crespo-Fernández (2013) and Gales (2009), are Ponton (2010), and Becker (2009), which both concern political interviews, in some way; however, these did not concern any of the implications discussed in section 2). This section presents the following: firstly, the collection and delimitation of the data used, and, secondly, the theoretical framework and the method of analysis in the ensuing section.

3.1 Data collection and delimitation

The data used in this study consisted of two speeches. Firstly, a speech held by Sir Winston Churchill on 3 September, 1939, the very day on which war against Germany had been declared by the then Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain. Tensions in Europe had been increasing after Britain and Chamberlain approved Germany's annexation of Czechoslovakia in 1938 (McDowall, 1989, p. 166). These tensions further increased with Germany's subsequent annexation of Austria and Poland in 1939. I collected this speech, through the directions of a Minister of Parliament, from a website administered by the Parliament of the United Kingdom. This website is part of the Parliamentary Hansard (the official records of Parliamentary debates etc.); it is, more precisely, the Historic Hansard³, comprising records from around 1800 until today.

Secondly, the other speech was held by Tony Blair on 18 March, 2003⁴. At this point in time, the US and its allies, e.g. Spain and Britain, were preparing for intervention in Iraq, and this is the Prime Minister's "Address to the Nation" (to use Fairclough's (2005) term). At the time when Blair gave his speech, the attacks on World Trade Center and the Pentagon, in

² A thorough search was conducted in the Linguistics & Language Behaviour Abstracts database, using the following search terms (all searches were limited to peer reviewed materials): Appraisal AND politics; Appraisal AND political speech; Appraisal AND speech; Appraisal framework AND politics; Appraisal framework AND political speech; Appraisal framework AND speech; Appraisal theory AND speech; Appraisal theory AND politics; Appraisal theory AND political speech. This yielded around 180 results, but only a few (other than those mentioned in section 2) were directly related to political speech (these are mentioned in the running text). However, the appraisal framework has been used for numerous studies on topics other than political speech: e.g. magazine editorials (Martin, 2004), newspaper reports (Coffin & O'Halloran, 2006), social reports issued by businesses (Fuoli, 2012), the British National Corpus (Bednarek, 2009), the discourse of non-governmental organisations (Agustín, 2012), and focus group discussions concerning collective responsibility and identity, in relation to Italy's role in WWII (Leone & Curigliano, 2009), to name a few.

³ The exact speech can be found here: http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1939/sep/03/prime-ministers-announcement#S5CV0351P0_19390903_HOC_38

⁴ This is the full speech, as released by 10 Downing Street. It was located at The Guardian's homepage and can be accessed here: <http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/mar/18/foreignpolicy.iraq1>. For the sake of analysis, both speeches were copied into a word processing program and subsequently printed. It is worth mentioning that Churchill's speech consists of 549 words, and Blair's of 4926 words.

2001, as well as more recent terrorist attacks, were still fresh in people's minds. However, the war on terror was rapidly losing support, and, contrary to many European countries' opinions about intervention, George W. Bush decided to end diplomatic relations with Iraq and start a war.

Both speeches were given in a rather similar context: war had either been declared, or it was imminent. The venue where either speech was held was the House of Commons, and both speeches addressed MPs in the House of Commons. These two speakers were chosen as the basis of analysis to shed light on the fact that politicians generally use the same strategies in promoting intervention and war. Hence, a historical comparison of this kind is worthwhile because it clearly illustrates that the strategies of war-rhetoric permeate political speeches, regardless of the historical setting (cf. Oddo, 2011). Furthermore, these exact speeches were chosen because their goal was virtually identical: urging a nation to intervention and war. Additionally, as was mentioned in the introduction, Churchill's speech has never been analysed discursively, and Blair's has only been discussed briefly (Fairclough 2005; Van Dijk, 2006); hence, these speeches are worthy of further analysis (for a discussion on gender, see note 1).

3.2 Theory and method

As mentioned above, this study utilised Martin & White's (2005) appraisal theory, which is described in their book *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. The theory itself stems from Michael Halliday's theories concerning Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) (Martin & White, 2005, p. 1). SFL has, as its foundation, three concepts that are part of language: the *ideational*: how people "[construe] experience," *interpersonal*: "negotiating social relations," and *textual*: how information is conveyed (Martin & White, 2005, p. 7).

As noted, appraisal, in turn, consists of three major categories: attitude, engagement, and graduation (Martin & White, 2005, p. 38; see also Martin, 2004, p. 325). More specifically, this study utilised the concept of *positive* and *negative judgement*, which can be described as how we "[construe] our attitudes to people and the way they behave" (Martin & White, 2005, p. 52). For example, when Churchill, in example (1), section 4, says *the greatness of our country*, he passes judgement, and conveys a positive attitude in relation to his own country. Additionally, an example of *negative judgement* would be when Blair refers to *Saddam's lies, deception and obstruction* in example 10, section 4. Here, Blair negatively judges Saddam

Hussein, and his behaviour. The concept of *judgement* (positive and negative) is a sub-category of attitude.

Furthermore, certain aspects of engagement were employed. Engagement devices include ways in which a speaker interacts with his audience and “positions” himself in relation to other speakers, as well as in relation to her/his audience (Martin & White, 2005, p. 94). In connection to engagement, the present study investigated and analysed ways in which each speaker *contracted* and *expanded* the dialogic space, i.e. whether or not there was implicit room for other opinions in relation to the speakers’ utterances. Both concepts are part of *heteroglossic engagement*, which forms a part of the macro-category engagement (Martin & White, 2005, p. 102).

For the *contracting* devices, i.e. those that create little room for the audience to question the speaker’s statements, the present study focussed on verbs and adverbials that asserted the speaker’s utterance, and negated others, thereby leaving little room for dialogic interaction (Martin & White, 2005, p. 117; cf. Table 2). For example, when Churchill says that World War II *is not a question of fighting for Danzig or Poland* in example (14), section 4, he leaves little room for other opinions on the matter.

Furthermore, for the *expanding* strategies (where a speaker acknowledges the existence of other opinions), this study investigated *attribution*, where a speaker refers to “some external source”, such as another speaker (Martin & White, 2005, p. 111; cf. Table 2). A clear example is when Winston Churchill refers to Neville Chamberlain’s previous utterance in example (18) below and says *The Prime Minister said*, since Churchill leaves room for Chamberlain’s utterance, and thus leaves room for other opinions. Additionally, *epistemic modals* were also part of the investigation. For example, in example (17), section 4, Churchill uses the words *perhaps* and the phrase *might seem*. Thereby, Churchill acknowledges that this might be an opinion that some hold, and *expands* the dialogicality of the speech, by leaving room for (*entertaining*; Martin & White, 2005, p. 98) these opinions. The concepts of *judgement* (a sub-category of attitude) and *heteroglossic engagement* (a sub-category of engagement) were chosen because they encompassed the speakers’ alignments in relation to the audience, as well as others, in the most comprehensive way (Sipe & Ghiso, 2004, p. 474).

In investigating the alignments of Winston Churchill and Tony Blair, through the lens of appraisal theory, the notion that each communication is dialogic was necessary to adopt (Martin & White, 2005, p. 92, based on Bakhtin and Voloshinov’s theories, see pp. 92-93; see also, Blommaert, 2005, p. 43 ff.; Du Bois, 2007). Du Bois (2007) describes the dialogic nature of stance in the following way:

Stance is a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means, of simultaneously evaluating objects, positioning subjects (self and others), and aligning with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field. (p. 163)

Hereby, a speaker's stance-taking becomes a dialogic event, where an audience is an active part of a seemingly monologic situation, because the speaker aligns himself in relation to his listeners, and, implicitly, positions them in relation to his utterances and alignments.

Since this study investigates elements of political speeches and the results of certain aspects of these, it can be said to fall within the field of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (Blommaert, 2005, p. 26; Gee, 2014a, p. 9). The basic definition of discourse analysis in general is "language above the sentence" (Stubbs, 1983, p. 1, cited in Schiffrin, 1994, p. 23), and "language in use" (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 31 ff.; Blommaert, 2005, p. 2; Gee, 2014a, p. 8). What distinguishes CDA as a separate subfield of Discourse Analysis is the fact that the discourse that is investigated is done so with the intention to "intervene" in the world where the discourse exists (Gee, 2014a, p. 9), to investigate power relations especially (Blommaert, 2005, p. 24). Furthermore, Discourse Analysis (and, perhaps, even more so, CDA) concerns how language has an effect on others (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 415), and how each discourse serves to create and maintain a certain context (Gee, 2014b, pp 90-91; Blommaert, 2005, pp. 43-44). This means that a discourse analytic study (such as the present one) investigates language as it actually occurs, as well as the implications and effects it might have (Blommaert, 2005, pp. 1-2). Moreover, discourse analysis, and thus also CDA, presents "in detail only a small part of the full picture" (Gee, 2014a, p. 140); this is also the case for the present study. This study, moreover, is an example of a purely qualitative one, where a small data sample was thoroughly investigated for given concepts, and each instance was recorded and analysed (Patton, 1990, p. 169, cited in Kuzel, 1999, pp. 33-34). This contrasts to studies with a quantitative approach, where the data is of larger quantity, and focus is on higher numbers of occurrences (Patton, 1990, p. 169, cited in Kuzel, 1999, pp. 33-34; Schiffrin, 1994, p. 317). When analysing the data, it was crucial to relate a given word, or phrase, of interest to the immediate, textual, context where it occurred (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 363; 1987, pp. 3-4; Gee, 2014b, p. 132; Du Bois, 2007; Blommaert, 2005, pp. 40-41).

The process of analysis included inductive procedures, where the categories of the data "emerge" by themselves (Sipe & Ghiso, 2004, p. 473; Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006, p. 4), also termed "crystallisation/immersion" (Borkan, 1999, p. 179 ff.). The process also included "deductive" ones (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006, p. 11), where a pre-defined set of

categories are used to classify the data, sometimes termed “a template organizing style” (Crabtree & Miller, 1999, p. 166 ff.).

First, I analysed the two speeches thoroughly, to determine which categories of the appraisal framework were discernible. This allowed the categories to “emerge”; however, this was also a case of deductive coding, since the categories were already known to me. Thus, my previous knowledge primed me to what I found in the texts (cf. Sipe & Ghiso, 2004, p. 483). Initially, when I had finished this first analysis, I decided to only focus on *judgement*. However, I realised that *judgement*, in combination with the concept of *heteroglossic engagement*, would capture the alignment aspect in the speeches more fully. Hence, as was stated earlier, these categories were decided upon because they would encompass what was investigated. Next, I analysed the two speeches once more, with the specific categories in mind (thus performing deductive coding). Throughout the analytic process, the texts and the instances of interest were cross-referenced with examples of *judgement* and *heteroglossic engagement* in Martin & White (2005); Table 1 presents examples of *judgement*, and Table 2 presents examples of *contracting* and *expanding engagement*. The procedure of analysis corroborates what Erickson (1986) states: “induction and deduction are in constant dialogue” (p. 121, cited in Sipe & Ghiso, 2004, p. 473).

Judgement	
<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>
Strength	Incompetent
Caring	Ignorant
Powerful	Unsuccessful
Committed	Deceiving
Compromise	No to any ultimatum
Greatness	Tyranny
We know	Lying

Table 1. Examples of *judgement* (based on Martin & White (2005), and examples from this essay, section 4).

Engagement			
Contracting		Expanding	
<i>Disclaim</i>	<i>Proclaim</i>	<i>Epistemic</i> (“ <i>Entertain</i> ”)	<i>Attribution</i>
Not	Of course	Might just have	The Prime Minister said
Nothing	It became clear	Seem	People claim
No	Will now	Perhaps	According to
Although	We are sure	Probably	X’s claim that

Table 2. Examples of terms relating to *engagement* (based on Martin & White, 2005; Thue Vold, 2006; and examples in this essay, section 4).

4. A comparison in judgement and engagement

The following section presents the analysis of Churchill and Blair’s speeches. The first and second section discusses and compares the speakers’ use of *positive* and *negative judgement*, respectively. Next, the two ensuing sections bring the discussion to the concept of *heteroglossic engagement*; firstly, such *engagement* that *contracts* the dialogic nature of the speeches is discussed, and, secondly, the final section concerns devices relating to *expansion* of dialogicality in them.

4.1 Positive judgement

When it comes to *positive judgement* (how a speaker, in this case, evaluates a person and their actions positively), a comparison evinces that both Churchill and Blair use this strategy, not only in connection to their own country, but also when assessing other countries and their actions. (In every example, the relevant part is boldfaced for clarity.)

- (1) [T]here is a generation of Britons here now ready to prove itself not unworthy of the days of yore and not unworthy of those great men, the fathers of our land, who laid the foundations of our laws and shaped **the greatness of our country** (Churchill)
- (2) We must not underrate the gravity of the task which lies before us or the temerity of the ordeal, **to which we shall not be found unequal** (Churchill)

In the examples above, Churchill expresses *positive judgement* relating to the *capacity* of his own country, Britain (Martin & White, 2005, pp. 53-55; cf. Table 1. above). Through the use of phrasings such as *the greatness of our country*, and *to which we shall not be found unequal*, in example (1), Churchill puts his own country in a favourable light. This creates a context with his audience (Gee, 2014b, pp. 90-91; Blommaert, 2005, pp. 43-44) upon which they can agree (since the audience are MPs in Britain). Furthermore, Churchill aligns himself with the audience through his positive attitude towards Britain's historical and present goodness.

- (3) [W]e may be sure that the task which we have freely accepted is one **not beyond the compass and the strength of the British Empire and the French Republic** (Churchill)

In example (3), Churchill again judges Britain in a positive way, relating to their *capacity* (Martin & White, 2005, p. 53 ff.; cf. Table 1). Additionally, in this extract, he includes *the French Republic*, and judges them to be of the same calibre as Britain. Hence, he aligns himself, not only with his intended audience, but also with their allied country, France. Thereby, Churchill creates a context in which France and Britain stand united. Examples (1)-(3) illustrate the fact that, through evaluating Britain and the French Republic positively, Churchill uses positive self-presentation. Furthermore, Churchill's rhetoric results in his indirectly creating a polarisation in the world between those who are portrayed positively, and, implicitly, those who are not. These strategies are parallel to those mentioned in, for example, Van Dijk's (2005) analysis of the Spanish PM José María Aznar's rhetoric.

Similarly, Tony Blair uses *judgement* to positively evaluate his and his allies' position in the Iraq-conflict. In examples (4) and (5), Blair directly evaluates (or uses *inscribed judgement*, to use a term from Martin & White, 2005, p. 61) the actions of his own government, as well as other governments and institutions working alongside the US in their war on terrorism.

- (4) We then worked on a further **compromise** (Blair)

- (5) But the only relevant point of analogy is that **with history, we know what happened** (Blair)

The verb *compromise* in (4) shows Blair and his allies to be good people, since they are not ignoring other possible solutions. This can be interpreted as a case of *judgement of social sanction*, because it presents Blair as "caring" about other opinions (Martin & White, 2005,

pp. 52-53). Furthermore, this is a clear example of Blair presenting himself (and those aligned with him) as hardworking (see, e.g., Wieczorek, 2008; Van Dijk, 2005; Pujante & Morales-López, 2008; Craig, 2013; Segara Navera, 2011). Furthermore, the phrase in boldface in example (5) portrays Blair, and his allies, as knowledgeable and wise, which is related to the *capacity* they possess (Martin & White, 2005, p. 52); hence, these two are clear cases of *positive judgement*, as well as positive self-presentation (cf. Van Dijk, 2005, 2006; Wieczorek, 2008; Ferrari, 2007).

- (6) Then, a week later, Saddam's son-in-law, Hussein Kamal, **defected** to Jordan. He disclosed a far more extensive BW (biological weapons) programme and for the first time said Iraq had weaponised the programme; **something Saddam had always strenuously denied** (Blair)

- (7) **But the US is now committed**, and, I believe genuinely, to the roadmap for peace, designed in consultation with the UN (Blair)

Tony Blair also evaluates the behaviour and actions of others. In example (6), Blair indirectly evaluates (or uses *invoked judgement*; Martin & White, 2005, p. 62) the fact that Saddam Hussein's nephew has *defected*, as well as the fact that he provided *more extensive* information about weapons that Saddam Hussein *had always ... denied* having. Furthermore, in example (7), Blair utilises a strategy that is parallel to the one described in connection to Churchill; he positively judges the US and the fact that it *is now committed ... to the roadmap of peace*. Thus, in examples (6) and (7), Blair judges both Saddam's nephew, as well as the US, as capable and dependable (Martin & White, 2005, p. 53).

In all of the examples extracted from Blair's speech above, Blair aligns himself with his intended audience, when evaluating Britain's humanity, capacity, and wisdom. Furthermore, when evaluating Saddam Hussein's nephew positively, through *judgement* of his actions, Blair creates a context in which the nephew should be seen as an ally. Additionally, Blair aligns himself with the actions and intentions of the US (since they are *committed*, they are deemed to be a sound ally). Hence, Blair also creates a context in which he himself, the audience, and the whole country stand next to the US in their war on terrorism. The results of these alignments and evaluations are similar to those discussed in relation to Churchill; Blair evaluates his own country, and those who count themselves as allies to his cause, positively, as dependable and capable (Martin & White, 2005, p. 53). This is a clear case of both positive self-presentation, as well as the creation of an *us*-group. Blair's utilising these strategies is direct corroboration of what Van Dijk (2006) argued in his brief analysis of this very speech,

as well as what Fairclough (2005, p. 48) pointed to in Blair's rhetoric. Furthermore, these strategies, and the inferable alignments resulting from Blair's rhetoric are also parallel to those discussed by e.g. Van Dijk (2005), and Leudar, Marsland, & Nekvapil (2004).

4.2 Negative judgement

Churchill's speech is relatively short (549 words), and it only contains one instance of *negative judgement* (i.e. when a speaker evaluates a person and their actions negatively), presented in (8). This lack of *negative judgement* contrasts to Crespo-Fernández's (2013) results, which clearly evince that Churchill exploits this concept in later speeches. The reason why the speech contains more examples of *positive judgement* (exemplified in section 4.1) might simply be because Churchill wanted to instil confidence in his audience, and emphasise the positive aspects of the people, the country, and their allies in Europe, to make listeners more susceptible to later rhetoric.

- (8) This is not a question of fighting for Danzig or fighting for Poland. We are fighting to save the whole world from **the pestilence of Nazi tyranny** (Churchill)

In using the phrase *the pestilence of Nazi tyranny*, Churchill negatively evaluates Germany's government, and their actions in the European community. This is especially evident in the use of the word *tyranny*, making the country's leader, and government, into reprehensible people. Thus, (8) is a perfect example of *judgement* relating to *propriety* and *social sanction* (Martin & White, 2005, pp. 53-54), since Germany is judged from a perspective that puts its human values in question. Hereby, Churchill elicits a context where every nation that opposes Germany's actions stands together with Britain; hence, he aligns himself with his audience, since they are presumably in the same mind-set. Furthermore, he aligns himself, and his audience, with the other parts of Europe that share this view. Furthermore, the *them*-group, only implicitly suggested, when evaluating Britain and its allies positively (cf. above), is explicit in example (8), through the negative presentation of the Nazis (exemplifying negative other presentation); as Crespo-Fernández (2013) notes, "the adjective Nazi is overtly biased" (p. 326). Thus, it contributes to the negative evaluation in example (8).

Conversely, Blair's speech is longer (4926 words), and it contains several examples of *negative judgement*. Examples (9-12) are merely a few of many that can be extracted from the text.

- (9) The declaration when it came **was false - a blanket denial of the programme** (Blair)
- (10) In December the inspectors left. Their final report is a withering indictment of **Saddam's lies, deception and obstruction**, with large quantities of WMD remained unaccounted for (Blair)
- (11) What is perfectly clear is that **Saddam is playing the same old games in the same old way ... [No] fundamental change of heart or mind** (Blair)

In examples (9) through (11), Blair implicitly (example 9) and explicitly (10 and 11) judges Saddam Hussein and his actions negatively (Martin & White, 2005, pp. 61-62). In example (9), Blair evaluates a declaration, provided by the Iraq regime, as *false*, and continues with *a blanket denial of the program* (instances of *appreciation*, where an object, rather than a person, is evaluated (Martin & White, 2005, p. 56)). Such formulations indirectly work as negative evaluation of Saddam Hussein and his regime; since they delivered something that is allegedly false, and completely deny all accusations, they are judged to be liars and deceivers. This representation is explicitly stated in example (10), where Blair bluntly calls Saddam Hussein a liar and deceiver (through the related word-forms). The picture of Saddam Hussein as a deceiver is further strengthened in example (11), where Blair points to the fact that Iraq's leader has not changed, but instead behaves *in the same old way* as before, i.e. lying and deceiving. These three examples are cases of *negative judgement of veracity* (Martin & White, 2005, pp. 53-54). In phrasing his utterances thus, Blair dis-aligns with Saddam Hussein and frames him as an enemy, which is a prerequisite in war rhetoric (Mazid, 2007, p. 366), and aligns with the other countries opposed to the regime. Blair also aligns with the members of Parliament who agree with him (cf. Van Dijk, 2005).

- (12) But **they** [France] **remain utterly opposed to anything which lays down an ultimatum** authorising action in the event of non-compliance by Saddam. [section omitted] **That is their position. No to any ultimatum; no to any resolution** that stipulates that failure to comply will lead to military action (Blair)

Example (12) also exemplifies Blair's usage of *negative judgement*. However, this time, it does not concern the Iraqi regime. Instead, this extract relates to France's taking a stand against the countries, among which Britain is one, that are trying to force Saddam Hussein to provide further information. With formulations such as *utterly opposed* and *[n]o to any*

ultimatum; no to any resolution, Blair implicitly evaluates (Martin & White, 2005, p. 62) the stand-point of France negatively. This is also reflected through the clause [*t*]hat is their position. Thus, (12) is a clear example of *negative judgement* relating to the dependability (*tenacity*) of France (Martin & White, 2005, p. 54).

In example (12), Blair dis-aligns with France. Furthermore, he also aligns with those in favour of his suggestion, and distances himself from opposition. The result of his rhetoric is again parallel to that of Churchill's. Blair negatively evaluates Saddam Hussein, his regime, and their actions; thus, he also puts them outside his own sphere, creating an explicit *them*-group. Furthermore, France is placed outside Blair's *us*-group, since they are opposed to his line of action. Thus, these alignments and groupings mirror those discussed by Oddo (2011), and Lazar & Lazar (2008): the groups are not absolute. Moreover, these examples illustrate negative other presentation, which also plays a part in creating a world dichotomy. Thus, although Fairclough (2005) only mentioned this speech in passing, it is evident that Blair further creates a divided world in it, although he might not be "[elaborating] a new doctrine" (p. 53). Furthermore, the detailed analysis confirms what Van Dijk (2006) mooted, in his brief exemplification of Blair's usage of *us-them* polarisations and positive self- and negative other devices.

Clearly, both speakers use *positive judgement*. Furthermore, Blair utilises *negative judgement* also. Churchill, on the other hand, cannot be said to utilise this strategy, since (8) is the only example gathered from this speech. It is also evident that both speakers create an *us-them* distinction, both implicitly and explicitly (cf. Bhatia, 2009; Leudar, Marsland, & Nekvapil, 2004; Wodak, 2007). This is inferable from both speakers' use of *positive judgement*, and is made explicit in Blair's use of *negative judgement*, and in example (8), from Churchill's speech. Furthermore, it is obvious that both speakers use positive self-presentation, and that Blair utilises negative other presentation explicitly, whereas Churchill does so in (8), above, as well as implicitly in his use of *positive judgement* (cf. Van Dijk, 2006, 2005; Ferrari, 2007; Wodak, 2007; Wieczorek, 2008). By extension, such strategies are ways for each speaker to legitimise his own actions, and de-legitimise others'. Through the overt positive evaluation of their own country and allies, both Blair and Churchill present their line of action as the correct one; it is the *us* group who are making the right decisions whereas *they* are faltering and wrong. Thus, implicit in the positive evaluation, and explicit in the *negative judgements* (more so for Blair than for Churchill), is the de-legitimation of other standpoints than the speakers' and their respective allies'. These kinds of legitimisation strategies are parallel to those discussed by, for example, Oddo (2011) and Reyes (2011).

4.3 Engagement – Contraction of dialogicality

After the discussion of *judgement*, the essay now moves to discussing the concept of *heteroglossic engagement*. Both Churchill and Blair utilise strategies to *contract* the dialogic aspects of the speech. This means that the speakers limit the opportunity to (indirectly) question their statements, or express differing opinions (Martin & White, 2005, p. 117).

- (13) In these last few days the House of Commons has been voting dozens of Bills which hand over to the executive our most dearly valued traditional liberties. We **are sure** that these liberties **will be** in hands which will not abuse them, which **will use them** for no class or party interests, which **will cherish and guard** them (Churchill)
- (14) **This is not a question of fighting for Danzig or fighting for Poland.** We are fighting to save the whole world from the pestilence of Nazi tyranny (Churchill)

Example (13) shows that Churchill *contracts* the dialogic nature of the speech situation. Through the use of assertive expressions and verbs such as *are sure*, Churchill limits the possibility to question what he is saying, through *pronouncing* his own utterance (Martin & White, 2005, p. 127; cf. Table 2). Since he is using assertive expressions, he is showing his certainty about the situation. Furthermore, although Martin & White (2005) state that expressions relating to future events are usually part of the *expanding engagement* strategies (p. 249; see also Becker, 2009, p. 9), the use of *will* in example (13) is not a case of expansion. Since no epistemic elements accompany the verb *will* (cf. Martin & White, 2005, p. 249), these cases can be understood as factual statements. Therefore, Churchill *contracts* the dialogic space. Additionally, the fact that Churchill uses the pronoun [w]e indicates that he includes himself with the decision-takers, as well as the audience (effectively being mostly the same people) (cf. Maalej, 2012). This use of the second person pronoun in an inclusive way, indirectly serves to present Churchill (and the decision makers) as hardworking, in the same way as Blair did (cf. above).

Furthermore, (14) is also an example of Churchill *contracting* the dialogicality. Through overt negation of the claim in boldface, Churchill limits the dialogic space, through *disclaiming* such claims (Martin & White, 2005, p. 118; cf. Table 2). These two examples further represent Churchill's aligning with his audience in the following ways: through the statement in example (13), he aligns with those of the coalition who have been involved in granting the [*handing*] over [*of*] ... *liberties*. This is clear since Churchill includes himself in

the group of decision-makers, through the pronoun [*w*]*e*, as mentioned. Furthermore, he aligns with those among the MPs in the audience who stand by him and these decisions, and dis-aligns with those opposed. Additionally, through the negation of the statement in (14), Churchill aligns with those who agree with his subsequent proposition, and dis-aligns with those who do not. These alignments also serve to create a dichotomy, but, here, it is more locally established: within the Parliament itself (cf., e.g., Van Dijk, 2005; Wieczorek, 2008).

(15) Because the outcome of this issue **will now determine** more than the fate of the Iraqi regime and more than the future of the Iraqi people, for so long brutalised by Saddam (Blair)

(16) **It became clear** after the Gulf war that the WMD ambitions of Iraq were far more extensive than hitherto thought (Blair)

Similarly, Blair uses strategies of assertion (i.e. asserting certain statements as the truth) to *contract* the dialogic possibilities in his speech. In example (15), he uses the assertive expression *will now determine*. The use of *will* here is similar to Churchill's in example (13); although this utterance has future reference, the fact that Blair uses *will*, combined with the time adverbial *now*, and without any epistemic elements, his utterance is a case of dialogic *contraction* (cf. Martin & White, 2005, p. 249).

Example (16) shows Blair's use of the expression [*i*]*t became clear*. This expression serves to convey the speaker's "proposition as highly warrantable" (Martin & White, 2005, p. 98), thus *contracting* the dialogic space for other opinions to interfere. Thereby, Blair creates a context where any decision made will be of utmost importance for the people of Iraq, and, indirectly, for the whole world. The expression further implies that more people than Blair are of this opinion. Thus, he aligns with these implied people, among which some might be present in the audience, and dis-aligns with those opposed. Consequently, a more local dichotomy is created (cf. Van Dijk, 2005; Bartolucci, 2012; Wieczorek, 2008); however, here, the scope might be slightly wider than in Churchill's case.

4.4 Engagement – Expansion of dialogicality

In addition to using strategies of *contracting* the dialogic space, both speakers utilise strategies that *expand* it. Dialogic *expansion* – when a speaker acknowledges that other opinions on certain matters may exist – can be realised through *attribution*, where the speaker

refers to “some external source” (Martin & White, 2005, p. 111), to acknowledge differing opinions (e.g. example 18). *Expansion* of the dialogic space can also be realised through *epistemic modality*, where the use of expressions such as *perhaps* (17) makes room for other opinions, since the speaker then acknowledges the fact that other opinions might exist.

(17) **Perhaps it might seem** a paradox that a war undertaken in the name of liberty and right should require, as a necessary part of its processes, the surrender for the time being of so many of the dearly valued liberties and rights (Churchill)

(18) **The Prime Minister said it was a sad day, and that is indeed true, but** at the present time there is another note which may be present, and that is a feeling of thankfulness (Churchill)

In example (17), Churchill’s use of the *epistemic modal* device [*p*]erhaps, as well as the phrase *might seem*, reflects the speaker’s opening of the dialogic space, since Churchill does not dismiss other opinions (e.g. that a war for peace is paradoxical). Thus, the speaker *entertains* (Martin & White, 2005, p. 98) the possibility of other opinions. Furthermore, in example (18), Churchill utilises *attribution*. He directly refers to Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain’s earlier utterance; thereby, he makes room for other opinions (Martin & White, 2005, pp. 111-112). Although Churchill seems to agree with the PM (or *acknowledge* the PM’s utterance (Martin & White, 2005, pp. 98, 112)), he makes explicit, through the use of *but*, that he distances himself from the attributed utterance (and *counters* it (Martin & White, 2005, pp. 122, 124), thereby actually *contracting* the dialogicality slightly). Thus, he also distances himself from the PM’s view, as well as from those in the audience who share it, placing those people in a local *them*-group (cf., e.g., Lazar & Lazar, 2008; Oddo, 2011). Instead, he aligns with those in the audience sharing his opinion (*us*) (e.g., Van Dijk, 2005).

(19) And let the oil revenues - **which people falsely claim we want to seize** - be put in a trust fund for the Iraqi people administered through the UN (Blair)

(20) The tragedy is that had such a resolution issued, **he might just have complied**. Because the only route to peace with someone like Saddam Hussein is diplomacy backed by force.

Tony Blair uses similar strategies of *expanding* the dialogicality of the speech situation. Example (19) represents a case of *attribution* (Martin & White, 2005, p. 111; cf. Table 2). Tony Blair attributes a claim to the unidentified noun *people*. In saying that these *people*

falsely claim, he aligns himself against those people, through *negative judgement of veracity* (Martin & White, 2005, p. 53). Thus, he creates a dyad where he and those of his opinion are on one side, and those who claim that oil is the primary reason for the war in Iraq are on the other. Hence, a local dichotomy is created (cf. Bartolucci, 2012; Van Dijk, 2005; Wieczorek, 2008).

Furthermore, example (20) shows Blair's use of *epistemic modality*. Instead of saying *he would have complied*, which is more assertive, the use of *might*, in combination with the adverbial *just*, signals insecurity and wariness. Thus, Blair acknowledges the fact that it is equally likely that Saddam Hussein might not have complied, thereby leaving room for other opinions on the matter. Although example (20) might not be as obvious as Churchill's instance of *epistemic modality* above, it is still possible to draw these inferences.

These strategies of *expanding* and *contracting* the dialogic aspects of each speech not only result in a polarisation, they also serve as tools to legitimise each speaker's decisions. Through asserting certain claims as facts, or through negating other claims (*contracting* the dialogic space), both Churchill and Blair accentuate that their way of tackling the present problematic situation (war) is the best way forward (cf. Reyes, 2011). Thus, they both de-legitimise other opinions. Furthermore, the *expanding* of dialogicality serves a similar purpose. Standing in front of the House of Commons, not taking other opinions into consideration would probably have undermined the speakers' intentions. Hence, the fact that both speakers use *attributions* as well as *epistemic* elements creates a context where a thoughtful leader mediates alternatives (exemplifying positive self-presentation). Through this positive presentation, the implication is that since the speakers are good people, their line of action should be deemed the most trustworthy and logical (cf. Reyes, 2011). Thus, they both legitimise their own opinions and intentions, and de-legitimise other views on the matter.

As for the historical aspect, it is clear, from the analysis above, that the strategies either speaker employs are rather similar (cf. Oddo, 2011). These evident similarities might be due to what Bourdieu (1991) mentions about a political habitus: "a 'sort of initiation'" (p. 176) is needed, into, among other things, "certain ... ways of speaking" (cited in Craig, 2013, p. 489). Hence, the strategies of these two politicians can be said to not only create the context of the speech situation, but also, that it maintains the "world" of political speeches, and the rhetorical devices of war (Blommaert, 2005, pp. 43-44; Gee, 2014b, pp. 90-91).

5. Conclusion

This essay provided a comparative discursive analysis of two prominent politicians' rhetoric. Drawing primarily on the appraisal framework, the study investigated each speaker's use of *positive* and *negative judgement* (how they evaluate people and their actions), as well as their respective use of *heteroglossic engagement* – words and phrasings resulting in the *contraction* or *expansion* of the dialogic space. The analysis clearly evinces that both Tony Blair and Winston Churchill use *positive judgement*. The results also reveal that Blair utilised the negative counterpart, whereas only one instance of this concept was found in Churchill's speech, which serves as no basis for drawing conclusions. Furthermore, through the use of *positive judgement*, as well as *negative judgement* (more in Blair's case than in Churchill's), the speakers aligned themselves with certain individuals and policies, and dis-aligned with oppositional forces. This, in turn, created a context (Blommaert, 2005, pp. 43-44; Gee, 2014b, pp. 90-91) of a polarised world, globally and locally, between the speakers and their respective allies forming an *us*-group, and those opposed forming a *them*-group. Hence, the results confirm what Fairclough (2005) pointed out concerning other speeches by Tony Blair: that Blair, among other things, creates an *us-them*-dyad. This essay complements Fairclough's study since it further corroborates Blair's use of this strategy in a speech only mentioned in passing by Fairclough.

In addition, the present study serves to complement Crespo-Fernández's (2013) analysis of *judgement* in relation to metaphorical dysphemisms in Churchill's later speeches, since the present analysis clearly indicates that Churchill exploited *positive judgement* strategies (and *negative judgement* once) even before having become Prime Minister, to instil confidence in the British MPs, at the beginning of World War II. It would be useful for future research to investigate *judgement* in a wider range of Churchill's speeches to ascertain which of the two (positive or negative) is most prevalent. Moreover, the present study corroborates the findings presented by Crespo-Fernández concerning the fact that Churchill utilised *judgement* in non-metaphorical phrasings.

The analysis further reveals that both speakers, through aligning and dis-aligning with others when passing judgement, present themselves, and those they associate with, positively, and the others negatively. This negative other presentation was explicit in the *negative judgements* and implicit in the *positive* ones. Thus, this essay also confirms what Van Dijk (2006) suggests in his analysis, with examples drawn from the same speech by Blair, i.e. that Blair uses *us-them*-rhetoric, as well as positive self- and negative other presentation.

Moreover, this essay points to the fact that these implications of the *positive judgements* in the speeches, and the negative ones in Blair's speech to a larger extent than the single instance in Churchill's, served to legitimise the speakers' own actions and policies and to de-legitimise those performed and held by oppositional voices (cf. Oddo, 2011; Reyes, 2011).

Additionally, this essay provides evidence of the fact that both speakers exploited devices of *heteroglossic engagement*. These devices served to *expand* and *contract* the dialogic space in the speech situation. The speakers used such strategies to align themselves with those who agreed with them and dis-align with opposition, which, in turn, established a more local *us-them* distinction, and served to legitimise the speakers' own intentions. The *expanding* elements also served to present each speaker in a positive way, since it showed that they took other opinions into consideration, thus making them seem trustworthy.

Speaking more broadly, this essay has presented similar results compared with the studies discussed in section 2; political speakers use an abundance of rhetorical devices to create an *us-them* dyad, as well as present the self and other in radically different ways. All of these devices serve to legitimise the decisions of the speaker. From a historical aspect, these similarities might be a result of the inherent schooling of politicians in general, i.e. that each political speaker is taught how to speak (Craig, 2013, p. 489). Consequently, these two speeches can be said to not only create a context within each speech situation, but also that each re-creates and maintains the discourse of political speech and war rhetoric (Gee, 2014b, pp. 90-91).

Due to space and time constraints, the present study only investigated one speech from each speaker. Future research could focus on a wider range of speeches from the two speakers, thereby making broader interpretations possible (see also, note 1). Concomitant with this widening of the spectrum, appraisal theory could be used more extensively, incorporating additional categories of the system, since researchers are prone to, unconsciously, limit the scope of analysis, due to prior knowledge (Sipe & Ghiso, 2004, p. 483). The appraisal framework should also be used in connection to other theories, to make different approaches more justice. Furthermore, a more detailed study of these two speakers (and perhaps others, as well as the audiences' retorts) in connection to interdiscursivity and voice (e.g. Reyes-Rodríguez, 2008; Badran, 2010; Hodges, 2008; Capone, 2010; Leudar, Marsland, & Nekvapil, 2004) would certainly yield interesting results. Finally, a more detailed analysis of the extra-linguistic parameters (e.g. prosodic and/or non-discursive elements, cf. Reyes-Rodríguez, 2008) could be analysed, to incorporate other aspects than the text-bound elements of a speech.

References

- Agustín, O. G. (2012). Enhancing solidarity: Discourses of voluntary organizations on immigration and integration in multicultural societies. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 7(1), 81-97, DOI: 10.1080/17447143.2011.570344.
- Badran, D. (August, 2010). Hybrid genres and then cognitive positioning of audiences in the political discourse of Hizbollah. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 7(3), 191-201, DOI: 10.1080/17405904.2010.491222.
- Bartolucci, V. (2012). Terrorism rhetoric under the Bush administration: Discourses and effects. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 11(4), 562-582.
- Becker, A. (2009). Modality and engagement in British and German political interviews. *Languages in Contrast*, 9(1), 5-22, DOI: 10.1075/lic.9.1.02bec.
- Bednarek, M. (2009). Language patterns and attitude. *Functions of Language*, 16(2), 165-192, DOI: 10.1075/fol.16.2.01bed.
- Bhatia, A. (2009). The discourses of terrorism. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41, 279-289.
- Biria, R., & Mohammadi, A. (2012). The socio pragmatic functions of inaugural speech: A critical discourse analysis approach. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44, 1290-1302.
- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Borkan, J. (1999). Immersion/crystallization. In B. Crabtree, & W. Miller (Eds.), *Doing qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 179-194.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Oxford: Polity.
- Capone, A. (2010). Barack Obama's South Carolina speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 2964-2977, DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2010.06.011.
- Coffin, C., & O'Halloran, K. (2006). The role of appraisal and corpora in detecting covert evaluation. *Functions of Language*, 13(1), 77-110.
- Crabtree, B., & Miller, W. (1999). Using codes and code manuals: A template organizing style of interpretation. In B. Crabtree & W. Miller (Eds.), *Doing qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 163-177.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Craig, G. (2013). How does a Prime Minister speak?: Kevin Rudd's discourse, habitus, and negotiation of the journalistic and political fields, *Journal of Language and Politics*, 12(4), 485-507, DOI: 10.1075/jlp.12.4.01cra.
- Crespo-Fernández, E. (2013). Words as weapons of mass persuasion: Dysphemism in Churchill's wartime speeches. *Text & Talk*, 33(3), 311-330, DOI: 10.1515/text-2013-0014.

- Du Bois, J. (2007). The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction* (pp. 139-182.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.) (pp. 119-160). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Fairclough, N. (2005). Blair's contribution to elaborating a new 'doctrine of international community'. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 4(1), 41-63.
- Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (March, 2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(1), 1-11.
- Ferrari, F. (2007). Metaphor at work in the analysis of political discourse: Investigating a 'preventive war' persuasion strategy. *Discourse and Society*, 18(5), 603-625, DOI: 10.1177/0957926507079737.
- Fuoli, M. (2012). Assessing social responsibility: A quantitative analysis of appraisal in BP's and IKEA's social reports. *Discourse and Communication*, 6(1), 55-81, DOI: 10.1177/1750481311427788.
- Gales, T. (2009). 'Diversity' as enacted in US immigration politics and law: A corpus-based approach. *Discourse and Society*, 20(2), 223-240, DOI: 10.1177/0957926508099003.
- Gee, J.P. (2014a). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (4th ed.). Oxon: Routledge.
- Gee, J.P. (2014b). *How to do discourse analysis: A toolkit* (2nd ed.). Oxon: Routledge.
- Gruber, H. (2004). The 'conversation on Austria': A televised representation of Austria's internal condition after the national-conservative 'Wende.' *Journal of Language and Politics*, 3(2), 267-292.
- Hodges, A. (June, 2008). The dialogic emergence of 'truth' in politics: Reproduction and subversion of the 'war on terror' discourse. *Colorado Research in Linguistics*, 21, 1-12.
- Koteyko, N., & Ryazanova-Clarke, L. (November, 2009). The path and building metaphors in the speeches of Vladimir Putin: Back to the future?. *Slavonica*, 15(2), 112-127, DOI: 10.1179/136174209X12507596634810.
- Kuzel, A. J. (1999). Sampling in qualitative inquiry. In B. Crabtree & W. Miller (Eds.), *Doing qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 33-45.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lazar, A., & Lazar, M. M. (2008). Discourse of global governance: American hegemony in the post-Cold War era. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 7(2), 228-246, DOI: 10.1075/jlp.7.3.03laz.

- Leone, G., & Curigliano, G. (2009). Coping with collective responsibilities: An explorative study on Italian historical identity across three generations. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 8(2), 305-326, DOI: 10.1075/jlp.8.2.07leo.
- Leudar, I., Marsland, V., & Nekvapil, J. (2004). On membership categorization: 'Us', 'them' and 'doing violence' in political discourse. *Discourse and Society*, 15(2-3), 243-266, DOI: 10.1177/0957926504041019.
- Maalej, Z.A. (2012). The 'Jasmine Revolt' has made the 'Arab Spring': A critical discourse analysis of the last three political speeches of the ousted president of Tunisia. *Discourse and Society*, 23(6), 679-700, DOI: 10.1177/0957926512452973.
- Martin, J.R. (2004). Mourning: How we get aligned. *Discourse and Society*, 15(2-3), 321-344, DOI: 10.1177/0957926504041022.
- Martin, J.R., & White, P.R.R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Mazid, B.M. (2007). Presuppositions and strategic functions in Bush's 20/9/2001 speech: A critical discourse analysis. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 6(3), 351-375.
- McDowall, D. (1989). *An illustrated history of Britain*. Harlow: Longman.
- Oddo, J. (2011). War legitimization discourse: Representing 'us' and 'them' in four US presidential addresses. *Discourse and Society*, 22(3), 287-314, DOI: 10.1177/0957926510395442.
- Ortu, C. (2009). Draining off trade unions' role: Gordon Brown's speech to the TUC conference 2007. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines (CADAAD)*, 3(2), 162-175.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ponton, P.M. (2010). The female political leader: A study of gender-identity in the case of Margaret Thatcher. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 9(2), 195-218, DOI: 10.1075/jlp.9.2.02pon.
- Pujante, D., & Morales-López, E. (2008). A political action against popular opinion: Aznar's final speech before the Spanish Parliament justifying the war in Iraq (December, 2003). *Journal of Language and Politics*, 7(1), 71-98, DOI: 10.1075/jlp.7.1.04puj.
- Reyes, A. (2011). Strategies of legitimization in political discourse: From words to actions. *Discourse and Society*, 22(6), 781-807, DOI: 10.1177/0957926511419927.
- Reyes-Rodríguez, A. (May, 2008). Discursive strategies in Chavez's political discourse: Voicing, distancing, and shifting. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 5(2), 133-152, DOI: 10.1080/17405900801990074.

- Salama, A. H. Y. (August, 2012). The rhetoric of collocational, intertextual and institutional pluralization in Obama's Cairo speech: A discourse-analytical approach. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 9(3), 211-229, DOI: 10.1080/17405904.2012.688296.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Segara Navera, G. (2011). "War on terror" is a curative: Recontextualization and political myth-making in Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo's 2002-2004 state of the nation addresses. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 8(4), 313-343, DOI: 10.1080/15427587.2011.615610.
- Sipe, L. R., & Ghiso, M. P. (2004). Developing conceptual categories in classroom descriptive research: Some problems and possibilities. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 35(4), 472-485.
- Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Thue Vold, E. (2006). Epistemic modality markers in research articles: A cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 16(1), 61-87.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2005). War rhetoric of a little ally: Political implicatures and Aznar's legitimatization of the war in Iraq. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 4(1), 65-91.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse and Society*, 17(3), 359-383, DOI: 10.1177/0957926506060250.
- Wee, L. (February, 2012). Neoliberalism and the regulation of consumers: Legalizing casinos in Singapore. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 9(1), 15-27, DOI: 10.1080/17405904.2011.632137.
- Wieczorek, A.E. (2008). Proximitation, common ground, and assertion-based patterns for legitimisation in political discourse. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines (CADAAD)*, 2(1), 31-48.
- Wodak, R. (2007). Pragmatics and critical discourse analysis: A cross-disciplinary inquiry. *Pragmatics & Cognition*, 15(1), 203-225.
- Wodak, R., & de Cillia, R. (2007). Commemorating the past: The discursive construction of official narratives about the 'rebirth of the second Austrian republic'. *Discourse and Communication*, 1(3), 337-363, DOI: 10.1177/1750481307079206.