

LATVIJAS UNIVERSITĀTE

BAKALaura DARBS

RĪGA 2008

UNIVERSITY OF LATVIA
FACULTY OF MODERN LANGUAGES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH STUDIES

POLITICAL DISCOURSE IN ENGLISH AND LATVIAN

ANĢĻU UN LATVIEŠU VALODAS POLITISKAIS DISKURSS

BACHELOR THESIS

Author: Ilze Lepiksone

Matriculation Card: AngF 030134

Adviser: assoc. prof./ Dr.philol. Biruta Uzija

RIGA 2008

ANOTĀCIJA

Šajā darbā aplūkotā tēma ir diskurss un diskursa analīze, bet precīzāk, politiskais diskurss. Tēma ir sašaurināta līdz politiskās runas žanram pamatojoties uz faktu, ka politiskā runa ir tāds politiskā diskursa žanrs, kas sevī visspilgtāk atspoguļo valodas izvēles nozīmi un lietojumu politisko mērķu sasniegšanai. Politiskās runas žanrs sevī iekļauj visus aktuālos diskursa studijas jautājumus, proti, leksikas un gramatikas pielietojumu, politiskās runas konteksta lomu un iespējamās teksta interpretēšanas un skaidrošanas variantus. Darbā pētīta pieejamā teorija par diskursa un diskursa kopienas jēdzieniem, kā arī vispārīgās politiskā diskursa iezīmes, cita starpā, aktuālās problēmas, kas saistītas ar politiskā diskursa definēšanu. Tāpat darba autors pēta diskursa analīzes stratēģijas un posmus, kas vēlāk ir pielietoti pasaules un Latvijas politisko līderu uzrunu analīzē. Politiskās runas analīzes rezultāti pierāda, ka prakse sasaucas ar teorētiskajiem pieņēmumiem, un, ka politiskā runa nav tikai lingvistiska izpausme un vienkāršs faktu atspoguļojums, bet tā ir apzināta valodas līdzekļu izvēle ar mērķi ietekmēt auditoriju.

ABSTRACT

This paper deals with the study and analysis of the concept of discourse and discourse analysis, particularly, political discourse. The discussion is restricted to the genre of political speech that is chosen because of its capabilities to reveal the most striking examples of how language is used to reach political ends. The genre of political speech implies all the phenomena topical in discourse studies, namely, the use of lexical and grammatical means; the role of context in which a particular speech occurs, and the ways a speech might be interpreted and explained. The paper introduces and compares available theory on the concept of discourse, discourse communities, as well as, general characteristics of political discourse, which also imply discussion of current problems of defining political discourse. Additionally, the author of the paper investigates strategies and the stages of discourse analysis, which are later applied to the analysis of political speeches delivered by world and Latvian political leaders. The results of the analysis show that the practice relates to theoretical assumptions and that political speech is not just a linguistic utterance and reflection of plain facts, but it is a deliberative choice of language means in order to affect audiences.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
1. The Concept of Discourse	3
1.1. Approach to Discourse Analysis	5
1.2. The Role of Discourse Communities	7
1.3. Political Discourse	9
1.4. Political Speech	12
2. Strategies of Political Discourse Analysis	15
2.1. Stages of Political Discourse Analysis: Theoretical Background	17
2.1.1. The Stage of Description	17
2.1.2. The Stage of Interpretation	20
2.1.3. The Stage of Explanation	21
3. Political Speech as a Target of Discourse Analysis	22
3.1. Text Description in Political Speech Analysis	22
3.1.1. Vocabulary	23
3.1.2. Grammatical Phenomena	29
3.1.3. Textual Structures	39
3.2. Text Interpretation in Political Speech Analysis	39
3.3. Explanation in Political Speech Analysis	43
3.4. Peculiarities of Latvian Political Discourse	44
Conclusion	47
Theses	49
References	51
Appendix 1 Speech by Pope Benedict XVI	54
Appendix 2 Speech by G. W. Bush	57
Appendix 3 Speech by G. W. Bush (NATO)	63
Appendix 4 Speech by W. Churchill	70
Appendix 5 Speech by Al Gore	73
Appendix 6 S. Hussein's Letter	76
Appendix 7 Speech by S. Hussein	78
Appendix 8 Speech by H. Ickes	79
Appendix 9 Speech by Pope John Paul II	82
Appendix 10 Speech by B. Obama	85
Appendix 11 Speech by Z. Ozolina	87
Appendix 12 Speech by A. Pabriks	89

INTRODUCTION

Different social groups or communities use different language or discourse. Legal communities are known by specific terminology and highly complex syntax; religious communities are recognized by bulk of archaisms while business entities make and use a lot of neologisms. Respectively every community who share similar thoughts and ideas form its own discourse; politicians included. But what does term *discourse* encompass? Does it confines only to lexical phenomena or implies the study of other linguistic disciplines, as well? Theoretical framework offers an extensive and diverse view towards the concept of discourse and the study of the use of lexical means is only a part of the whole picture. In this paper the subject of debate is political discourse and particularly, political speech. Similarly as the concept of discourse, also the concept of political language is a subject of a debate. A widespread assumption is that political language concerns those means of linguistic communication trough which leading political figures spread their ideologies and which occur in such communicative events as political debates, plenary sessions and oratorical performances, namely, political speeches. This is where the focus of this paper is laid, namely, on the ways political speech is made up to manipulate and affect audiences.

To reach the aim of the paper the following enabling objectives have been set:

- 1) to study the available theory on the concept of discourse and discourse analysis;
- 2) to set the strategy and stages of political discourse analysis;
- 3) to do discourse analysis of the selected political speeches;
- 4) to draw relevant conclusions.

Political discourse, particularly, political speech, both, in English and Latvian, is a distinct area of language and communication that is characterised by the use of distinct lexical, grammatical, as well as contextual means to spread ideologies and manipulate audiences.

In order to reveal the ways and manners of how political aims are reached the author of the paper uses both, theoretical, as well as, practical methods.

The former serve for a study of different theories of discourse and discourse analysis, as well as political discourse thus to draw analogies and made generalisations of the essence of the concepts mentioned. The same means are used to analyse different discourse strategies and to find the most appropriate approach for analysing political speeches. At this stage the author proceeds with practical research methods selecting and analysing numerous political speeches delivered by the speakers of different ideological belonging and standpoint. Information acquired and the results of research are structured in three chapters each of which deals with a particular aspect in political discourse studies.

Chapter I introduce theory of discourse, its communities and approach to discourse analysis, as well as theoretical background of political discourse, but particularly, political speech.

Chapter II deals with the strategies of discourse analysis and gives concrete stages to be conducted in analysing discourse.

Chapter III is devoted to practical part of the analysis of political discourse, particularly, with the analysis of political speeches. It also gives a brief insight in theoretical framework and political discourse practise in Latvia.

The most significant findings as to the whole research project are gathered under the title Theses.

CHAPTER 1. THE CONCEPT OF DISCOURSE

Discourse and *discourse analysis* in linguistic studies are quite recent terms, but they have earned a lot of popularity among language specialists. In the vocabulary of the humanities and the social sciences *discourse* is introduced as one of the key terms. What is the origin of discourse studies and what do terms *discourse* and *discourse analysis* encompass?

Historically the term first appeared in 1952 in publication by Zellig Harris. The author introduced a new way of analysing connected speech and writing, concentrating on how language features are distributed within texts and the ways in which they are combined in particular kinds and styles of texts (Paltridge, 2006: 2). Yet it did not offer a systematic analysis of linguistic structures beyond the sentence level.

The concept of discourse as we know it today, as a new cross discipline, it began to develop in the late 1960s and 1970s in most of the humanities and social sciences, more or less at the same time, and in relation with other new inter-disciplines and/or sub-disciplines, such as semiotics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and pragmatics. This was a period when such concepts as *critical linguistics* or *critical study of discourse* appeared first. According to Brenton Faber, associate professor in communication and media, (2007: 13) it was “a method for studying functional language, namely, language as it occurs in day-to-day operations. It was a study about the development of specialized forms of language in social situations like political discourse, media coverage and professional advocacy in medicine or law.” This is what is called “the social activity of making meanings with language and other symbolic systems in some particular kind of situation or setting (Faber, 2007: 15). The point is that for researchers working within this area, language is not separate from its social function. Many authors (Fairclough, 1989; van Dijk, 1997; Paltridge, 2006; Faber, 2007) employ linguist M.A.K. Halliday’s version of language as a resource for making meanings rather than a system of set rules. In linguistic literature this version is called *Systematic Functional Linguistics* (SFL). Halliday (1991: 23) in his book *Language: Context, and Text, aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective* lists the basic of language functions: He refers to Malinowski’s pragmatic, namely, practical use of language; and magical functions associated with ceremonial or religious activities in the culture; also to Bühler’s expressive, (oriented towards the speaker, the self), conative (language that is oriented towards the addressee) and representational (oriented towards the rest of reality – anything other than speaker or addressee) language functions.

Professor of linguistics and one of the founders of critical discourse analysis Norman Fairclough (1989: vii) says:

“Language is a social practice and not a phenomenon external to society to be adventitiously correlated with it, and that language seen as discourse rather than as accomplished text compels us to take account not only of the artefacts of language, the products that we hear and see, but also the conditions of production and interpretation of texts, in sum the process of communicating of which the text is only a part.”

Still, as it has been taken up in so many disciplines the concept of *discourse* provokes heated discussions. As language specialist Linda Krumina (2004: 322) characterises: “Discourse today is a buzzword that has long since been brought out of the realm of linguistics only and is being applied to a variety of social interaction forms. “ Different fields introduce different perspectives according to which the concept of discourse is discussed. Professor Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, and the scholar in the fields of text linguistics, discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis Teun A. Van Dijk (1997b: 2) claims: “The notion of discourse is essentially fuzzy.” That means the concept is not unambiguous and may be interpreted in various ways. Nevertheless, for further studies and investigation of the theme of this paper the term *discourse* needs setting within a particular framework. The most general explanation by van Dijk (1997b: 2) is that discourse is a form of language use. Still, *language use* does not concern only physical utterance of sounds. The use of language concerns much more. It is a way human beings exchange beliefs, ideas and emotions. It is a way people interact. For discourse studies the main question is how the language is used, who uses language, why and when it is done? (van Dijk;1997b: 2)

Halliday (1991: 23) says:

“There has been a lot of misunderstanding of the concept of the function of language. It has often been assumed that each sentence has just one, or at least one, primary, function... But life in general is not like that, and language, certainly not like that. [...] The meanings are woven together in a very dense fabric in such way that, to understand them, we do not look separately at its different parts; rather, we look at the whole thing simultaneously from different angles, each perspective contributing towards the total interpretation.”

Halliday thus points that for today’s specialists no texts are discussed without contexts. And the concept of *discourse* is that *dense fabric* holding connection between text and the context. Krūmiņa (2004: 322) states, that “no discourse may be evaluated or analysed outside its particular context.” Furthermore, particular context develops on the basis of socially determined situations and relationships and since there are different social situations and social relationships thus there develops different contexts and texts. Halliday (1991: 5) adds:

“Similarity between the spelling of the terms *contex* and *text*, serves as a reminder that these are aspects of the same process. There is a text and there is other text that accompanies it: text that is “with” namely the con-text. This notion of what is “with the text”, however, goes beyond what is said and written: it includes other non-verbal goings-on-the total environment in which a text unfolds. So it serves to make a bridge between the text and the situation in which the text actually occurs.”

Various linguists define the concept in various ways. Linguist van Dijk (1997b: 4) distributes among three explanations of *discourse*:

- 1) Discourse is the use of language, both, spoken and written;
- 2) Discourse is the communication of beliefs or in other words *cognition*;
- 3) Discourse is interaction.

Meanwhile, his colleague Fairclough puts it in a nutshell and claims that discourse is the use of language as a form of social practice. This explanation is the most favoured also on behalf of the author of this paper.

Finally, to avoid ambiguity in using the term it is useful to mention that *discourse* itself may appear as a count noun and thus refer to a single, particular conversation or news report, or it may be used as a specific type or social domain of language, e.g., legal discourse or political discourse etc. (van Dijk, 1997b: 4) . In order to avoid miscomprehension in this paper the latter concept is used, thus, the term is applied to the whole domain of the social activity instead of one particular communicative event.

1.1. Approach to Discourse Analysis

The first paragraph of this chapter introduced the origin and the concept of discourse. The subject of this paragraph is approach to discourse analyses and the most important considerations about this discipline.

“When we consider what realities there are that lie above and beyond language, which language serve to express, there are many directions in which we can move outside language in order to explain what language means, “claims Halliday (1991:4). In discourse analysis this is highly topical, because it is possible to conduct analysis from numerous aspects. George Yule (1996; 83-84)., the author of the book *Pragmatics*, says: “Discourse analysis covers an extremely wide range of activities from the narrowly focused investigation of how such words as “oh” or “well” are used in casual talk, to the study of the dominant ideology in the culture represented.”

Member of international advisory board of Discourse & Society, Christina Schaffner (1996: 201) specifies:

“Based on these criteria, a discourse analysis can look into all levels and aspects of language, into pragmatics (i.e. the interaction amongst speakers and hearers), semantics (i.e. meanings, the structure of the lexicon), syntax (i.e. the internal organisation of sentences), phonology/phonetics (i.e. intonation, stress patterns, pauses).”

Each linguist has his or her own approach and has set priorities as to the hierarchy and importance of the elements of discourse analyses. However, a number of things are common in a majority of linguistic discussions of discourse analysis. Those things deal primarily with the context of discourse, discourse participants and general characteristics of the language they use.

Paul Gee (1999: 110), the author of the book *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis Theory and Method*, writes:

“Actual analysis, of course, usually develops in detail only a small part of full picture. However, any discourse analysis needs, at least, to give some consideration, if only as background, to the whole picture. Essentially, a discourse analysis involves asking questions about how language, at a given time and place, is used to construe the aspects of the situation network as realized at that time and place and how the aspects of the situation network simultaneously give meaning to that language.”

It derives from what is mentioned that the set of facts and circumstances that surround particular communicative event is an initial aspect of discussion. Furthermore, it is a separate stage in a discourse analysis implying numerous aspects to be considered. Halliday (1991: 8) offers the following issues to be considered in terms of description of the context of situation:

- 1) the participants in the situation, namely, persons and/or personalities, corresponding more or less to what sociologists would regard as the statuses and roles of the participants;
- 2) the action of the participants, namely, what they are doing, including both – their verbal action and their non-verbal action;
- 3) other relevant features of the situation, namely, the surrounding objects and events, in so far they have some bearings on what is going on;
- 4) the effects of the verbal action, but particularly, what changes were brought about by what the participants in the situation had to say.

Still, the context is only a part of the “whole picture” and further analysis requires extending discussion to the whole structure of discourse. Different linguists have arranged the analysis

in different ways. Halliday (1991: 24) distinguishes among three dimensions or levels of discourse analysis, namely:

- 1) the field of discourse or what it is on about;
- 2) the tenor of discourse determining the participants and personal relationships involved;
- 3) the mode of the discourse denoting the particular part that the language is playing in the interactive process; whether the text is spoken or written; whether it is spontaneous or composed and which genre does it belong to etc.

Meanwhile Faber (2007: 16) looks at discourse structure from another perspective:

He offers discourse levels as three integrated functions:

- 1) the textual function that articulates the grammatical or organizational function of language. It determines the construction of relations between elements of the discourse itself. The function interprets the structure, texture, cohesion and the forms by which the information is organized within specific clauses in the text. Textual information is obtained through an analysis of the grammatical constituents of the clause and then correlated with interpersonal and ideational functions;
- 2) the interpersonal function - articulates how the text orients and positions its audience, its originator and the relationships between these actors. This function examines the social relations and social identities enacted within and across the constructions generated by the text and its references;
- 3) the ideational function – articulates the propositional content of the text. Through its ideational function, the text articulates an interpretation of the world – the practices of social life and it constructs how things are through its explicit descriptions and intertextual frames.

This is a comprehensive approach, similarly as Halliday's; but as it was already mentioned no particular discourse aspect may be evaluated without considering general characteristics of the field. A more detailed discussion of discourse is going to be given in Chapter II and Chapter III that both deal with strategies and steps of doing a discourse analysis.

1.2. The Role of Discourse Communities

It was already stated that the use of language a basic mean of communication. It is the mean to express viewpoints and ideas, the mean to interact. People do that both, as individual persons and as social group members.

According to Brian Paltridge (2006: 24), the author of the book *Discourse analysis*:

“A discourse community is a group of people who share some kind of activity such as members of club or association who have regular meetings, or a group of students who go to classes at the same university. Members of discourse community have particular ways of communicating with each other. They generally have shared goals and may have shared values and beliefs.”

People who share similar opinion, who have the same goals form social groups, for instance, academics, lawyers and others. Each social group is characterised by the use of particular means of language or, in other words, by a specific discourse. Participation in discourse and discourse community is regarded to be an essential need for humans to express belonging and share beliefs.

In terms of speech or discourse communities there can also speak on Spolsky's (1998: 35) *solidarity* or *common group membership* - an important social force that has major impact on language. Spolsky (ibid.: 35) writes:

“The solidarity relations, the claim of belonging to the same group, underlie the notion of accommodation mentioned above. When we are talking to someone, most of us unconsciously move our speech closer to theirs, which explains why our accents change after we have lived in a new place for along time. Similarly, by choosing the form of language associated with a specific group, we are making a claim to be counted as a member of that group.”

In his book *Sociolinguistics* the author (ibid.: 93) argues that “some of the differences in the way people speak are idiosyncratic or eccentric, but others are systematically associated with particular groups of people or social identities and thus serve an emblematic function. Spolsky (ibid.: 93) also adds that in many societies some of the sociolinguistic divisions are associated with differences in social prestige, wealth and power. However, the majority of citizens performs several social roles and belongs to several social groups and discourse communities. Furthermore, each speaker has his or her own speaking style that depends upon a person's level of intelligence, upbringing, education and other related factors. Taking all aspects into consideration we can agree with Paltridge (2006: 25) who says:

“People do, however, have also different degrees of membership of discourse communities or may have there different roles, e.g., in university – teachers and students. That is, discourse communities may consist of close-knit networks of members such as writers of poetry and their readers, or loose-knit groups of members such as advertising producers, consumers and contributors to online discussion boards. Discourse communities may also be made up of several overlapping groups of people.”

Thus on the basis of ideological diversities one particular discourse community may create another one. “Therefore, the notion of discourse community is not however, as straightforward concept as it might seem,” assumes Paltridge (2006: 25).

Discourse is flexible to the degree to which a discourse community allows such. As long as some members of the community accept new discourse it forms a part of the community and thus exists without a time line (Online 21).

1.3. Political Discourse

Politics is one of the most fundamental domains in the social system and also one of the most discussed. Aristotle has once claimed that all people are political animals.

And Aristotle has been right, because politics refers not only to those professionally involved but also to the rest of society subjected to political decisions and strategies realized by government in order to ensure social and economic policy in a country. People speak about political issues from different perspectives ranging from legislation matters to those concerning activities performed by leading political figures. In the following chapter political phenomena are going to be discussed from the point of view of language means that occur within the domain and that are crucial in achieving political goals and imposing political ideologies. When speaking in terms of politics, integral issues to be discussed are the concepts of power and ideology. Desire for mending one’s fences and having a hold over the masses is the very essence of the field. “Politics is a power, particularly, a struggle for power, the aim of which is to secure specific ideas and interests and put them into practice,” says Schaffner (1996: 201). To reach the aim political leaders in different times have had different approaches. Ancient leaders imposed their will on people under compulsion that frequently bordered physical coercion. With the consolidation of democracy on the basis of which the world was introduced with the idea of equality, drastic means of persuasion gradually disappeared. Still, political goals and intentions have never changed thus making leading figures to think of new “persuasive” techniques, of new ways to impose ideologies, which meet today’s conventions and social norms. According to Fairclough (1989: 33):

“There are two ways in which those who have power can exercise it and keep it: through coercing others to go along with them, with the ultimate sanctions of physical violence or death, or through winning others consent to, or at least acquiescence in, their possession and exercise of power.”

Fairclough (1989:2) and Spolsky (1998: 58) both claim that language is regularly used in the exercise of political power and language has perhaps become the primary medium of social control. Fairclough (1989: 2) continues that ideologies are closely linked to language, because

using language is the commonest form of social behaviour and the form of social behaviour where we rely most on common-sense assumptions.” “In fact, any political action is prepared, accompanied, controlled and influenced by language, “admits Schaffner (1996: 201). However, ideologies differ and “those who hold power at a particular moment have constantly reassert their power and those who do not hold power are always liable to make a bid for power [...] Power at all these levels are won, exercised, sustained and lost in the course of social struggle (Fairclough, 1989: 68).” The author George Orwell (1957: 157) is even more radical asserting that “political parties, from Conservatives to Anarchists – is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectful and to give an appearance of solidity to pure wind.” However it would be, discourse in political struggle and mass persuasion is a fundamental tool.

Fairclough (1989: 68) writes about two ways language and power interacts, namely, there exist power “in discourse” and power “behind the discourse”. Power exists “in discourse” if politicians express their viewpoints and strategies openly. As soon as power lies “behind the discourse” for non-specialists it is hardly possible to notice the language means behind which ideological assumptions lie. “Ideology is most effective when its workings are least visible [...] and invisibility is achieved when ideologies are brought to discourse not as explicit elements of the text, but as the background assumptions...” (Fairclough, 1989: 85)

Paltridge writes (2006: 45):

“Texts are neither ideology-free nor objective. Nor can they be separated from the social realities and processes they contribute to maintaining. [...] A spoken and written genre is never just the reformulation of a linguistic model, but always a performance of a politically and historically significant process.”

This is rather general viewpoint. More concrete formulation of political language is suggested by Schaffner. She (1996: 202) defines the concept of political discourse as follows:

“ In linguistic literature, political language has been used either to denote the use of language in the context of politics, i.e., specific language used with purpose of achieving a specific, politically motivated function, or it has been used to denote the specific political vocabulary, i.e. words and phrases that refer to extra linguistic phenomena in the domain of politics.”

Nevertheless, there are authors (Schaffner, 1996; van Dijk 1997a) who assume that political discourse and political language are vague terms. They argue that in the late twentieth century due to development of print and electronic media always more people are involved in discourse that is political in nature.

Van Dijk (1997a: 206) says: “The opportunity for the reception, interpretation and critique of political texts and talk has vastly increased.” Thus in the discourse emerge language means that are not purely political, for instance, the language used in Internet forums commenting upon political events and publications. As to this Fairclough (1989: 31) explains: “Although we must have conventions in order to be able to engage in discourse, the latter is not simply a realization or implementing of the former. In fact, a particular discourse may well draw upon two or more discourse types, and the possible ways in which types may in principle be combined are innumerable.” It is a closed circle - discourse types determine discourse practise, which reproduces discourse types (Fairclough, 1989: 39). Thus the idea of political language to be an unclear concept may be substituted with the idea that due to social, technological and other changes also political discourse is changing time to time causing ambiguity about the extent to which specialists and discourse participants are ready to accept those changes. Furthermore, politics is closely linked with different social areas, for instance, business, law etc. and thus political texts incorporate vocabulary and language means characteristic of other domains. From such perspective the concept of political language might seem vague. In order to establish clarity Schaffner (1996: 202) offers the following classification system of political communication:

- 1) internal political communication;
- 2) external political communication.

Schaffner (1996: 202) explains:

“Internal political communication would refer to all forms of discourse that concern first of all the functioning of politics within political institutions, i.e. government bodies, parties or other organisations. The texts in this context discuss political ideas, beliefs, and practices of a society or some part of it. External political communication, on the other hand, is first of all aimed at the general public, i.e. non-politicians. These two types of communication are realised by a variety of text types, or genres, which may sometimes function both as internal and external communication. In addition, political discourse includes both inner-state and inter-state discourse and it may take various forms. Examples are bilateral and multilateral treaties, speeches made during an election campaign or at a congress of a political party, a contribution of a member of parliament to a parliamentary debate, editorials or commentaries in newspapers, a press conference with a politician, or a politician’s memoirs.”

On the basis of those assumptions political language is accepted as a distinct field of language worth further discussion.

Furthermore, the study of rhetoric that today is thought as a linguistic discipline by Greek and Roman writers was thought as political science based on the act of verbal persuasion (van Dijk, 1997a: 206). Thus not only specialists today find it challenging and important to speak of political discourse as a separate field, but also the scholars acting thousands of years ago.

1.4. Political Speech

As it was mentioned earlier political discourse is used within different communicative situations and events. It occurs not only within legislative and governmental matters, but also in terms of mass persuasion, an essential tool of which is oratory or political speech. Oratory developed already in ancient Greek times and up to now is practised in order to spread ideologies and affect the way society thinks and behaves. A great orator is highly tolerated both, among the citizens and political figures. Joe Garecht (2002), the editor of the Internet resource for political strategy “Local Victory”, claims “as long as man has been engaged in politics, he has been confronted with the task of delivering political speeches. [...] History’s greatest leaders Julius Caesar, Charlemagne, Abraham Lincoln, have been renowned for the ability to stir a crowd’s emotions through a spoken word.”

Political parties are well aware of the influence of a good speech therefore the genre of political speech is a well-considered and developed field of political discourse. Faber (2007: 43), in his book *Discourse, Technology and Change*, introduces a concept of technologization of discourse that means “specific forms of language that are consciously designed to create strategic, efficient and rational solutions to problems. Such discourses have emerged from and are grounded in forms of social science research and experimental design, for instance, usability research, audience analyses, focus group research, sociolinguistics, and they are often products of institutional and professional training and education.” The genre of political speech completely complies with this theory. Hardly any speech is given spontaneously or without reasoned purpose. Each speech is an elaborately planned performance where ideological assumptions emerge linguistic structures thus to turn a speech into a political tool. Paulette Dale and James C. Wolf in their book *Speech Communication made Simple; A Multicultural perspective* (2000: 32-33) give a brief insight into the process of speech making. They start with simple assertions that every speech needs a topic and a purpose and every speech has to have three parts – introduction, body and conclusion. Furthermore, the authors introduce different speech types, one of which is persuasive speaking. They claim that “any speech is persuasive if its purpose is to convince others to change their feelings, beliefs or behaviour. A salesperson is trying to convince someone to buy a product, a political leader is trying to get someone to vote a certain way etc. (ibid.: 89)”

However, politicians are interested in mass persuasion not only during elections. It is their daily routine, to make people agree with their decisions and past or future activities thus to establish political positions. For this reason political speech has become a topic of interest not only for political figures but also for those developing oratorical strategies and studying the means to compose the most effective persuasive speeches. Dale and Wolf (2000: 90) distribute among several steps to prepare an effective persuasive speech, namely:

- 1) Determining specific purpose, for instance, to change audience's belief, opinion, behaviour;
- 2) Choosing topic;
- 3) Analyzing audience;
- 4) Gathering information;
- 5) Preparing visual aids;
- 6) Organizing one's speech.

Dales and Wolf (ibid.: 95-96) emphasize: "Audience analyses is especially important in persuasive speaking. It is necessary to learn as much as possible about the audience's feelings and opinions towards the topic. It is important to know how listeners feel and why they feel a certain way in order to prepare an effective persuasive speech." This is, of course, only a small part of the whole speech making process. Additionally, persuasive or political speeches are not a homogeneous genre (Schaffner, 1996: 203). Instead, there is a range of subtypes determined by the particular communicative situation, including the characterisation of the communicative partners (i.e. who is speaking to whom? when? where? why?) (ibid.: 203).

For political speech there are characteristic two communicative situations or two sub-genres, namely, there are political speeches, which occur as:

- 1) internal political communication:

The speakers are normally leading politicians, and they can speak either to members of the same political or ideological group (e.g. a leader addressing delegates at the annual party conference), which would be an example of internal political communication.

- 2) external political communication:

Other settings are a politician addressing the whole nation (e.g. the annual New Year's Eve address of a head of state, or the American president's televised reports on the state of the nation), which would be examples of external political communication. An example would be also a leading politician addressing politicians or members of the public during a visit abroad (ibid. 202).

All those aspects have to be taken into consideration not only when preparing for speeches, but also when analysing political addresses. Political speech is highly multilateral and thus also linguistic means and concomitant circumstances that embrace a particular speech event. The language means, as well as, situational aspects that form a particular speech are the subjects for further discussion.

CHAPTER 2. STRATEGIES OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

From the earlier discussion one can see that different linguistic practises speak about discourse from different angles. Same way different linguistic practises use different strategies of analysing discourse. However, particular discourse analysis needs one approach to be employed. The way to decide upon the most appropriate approach and how to determine research question is the subject of this chapter.

Paltridge (2006: 200) says:

“There are a number of issues that need to be considered when planning a discourse analysis project. The first of these is the actual research question. The key to any good research project is a well-focused research question. [...] One important characteristic of a good research project is that it contains a good idea that the project is about something that is worth finding out about.”

The main theme of this paper concerns the field of politics thus a research question is going to concentrate on linguistic means with the help of which politicians manipulate with audiences. N.Fairclough (1989: 19) asserts, that “the way people interpret features of texts depends upon which social – more specifically, discursal – conventions they are assuming to hold.” And Schaffner (1996: 201) admits that:

“Political scientists on the one hand, and linguists, or discourse analysts, on the other hand, focus on different aspects when they discuss the relationship between language and politics, and they also apply different theories and methods in doing so. Political scientists are mainly concerned with the consequences of political decisions and actions for (the history of) society and they must be interested in the political realities which are constructed in and through discourse. Linguists, on the other hand, have always been particularly interested in the linguistic structures used to get politically relevant messages across to the addresses in order to fulfil a specific function.”

The task of political discourse analysis is to relate the fine grain of linguistic behaviour to what we understand by politics or political behaviour (van Dijk, 1997a: 211). Surely, political manipulations and characteristics of the fields are as important as linguistic means with the help of which political intentions are realized, however, the latter, namely, linguistic aspects remain primary importance throughout this paper.

Political discourse analysis requires two basic matters to be taken into consideration. The first according to van Dijk (1997a: 212) is to determine whether the text is political, but as it was earlier in the paper established, there is no absolute truth and what is political depends on the standpoint of the analyst. However, this paper and the analysis of political discourse is limited

to a political speech thus the problem is generally solved. As to the second aspect to be considered van Dijk (1997a: 212) states the following: “The multiplicity of acts that are performed through language can be interpreted as serving many different purposes – not only political, but also heuristic, ludic, informative etc. In order to answer and explain the second question van Dijk (1997a: 212-213) introduces the theory of strategic functions, the notion of which “enables analysts of text and talk to focus on details that contribute to the phenomena which people intuitively understand as political, rather than on other functions, namely, the ludic etc. Those functions are as follows:

- 1) Coercion. According to Oxford Advanced Learners’ Dictionary (OALD, 2005: 287) the term *coercion* refers to “the action of making somebody do something that they do not want to do, using force or threatening.” In terms of political discourse coercion manifests itself through “speech acts backed by sanctions, legal, as well as physical, for example: commands, laws, edicts etc. [...] or controlling others’ use of language pointing to various degrees of censorship and access control (ibid.: 213)
- 2) Resistance, oppositions and protests. Van Dijk (ibid.: 213) comments: “Many of discourse strategies used by the powerful for coercion may be counter-deployed by those who regard themselves as opposing power. However, there may be specific forms of discourse characteristics of the relatively powerless, for instance, graffiti, specific linguistic structures, namely, slogans, chants, petitions, appeals, rallies etc.
- 3) Dissimulation. The concept of dissimulation involves a phenomenon when political control restricts the access to information thus holding control of discourse. It may be quantitative or qualitative. An instance of quantitative dissimulation is secrecy, while qualitative dissimulation is “simply lying, in its most extreme variation (ibid.: 213).”
- 4) Legitimization and delegitimization. This function is closely linked to coercion, because it establishes the right to be obeyed, that is, legitimacy. [...] Reasons for being obeyed have to be communicated linguistically, whether by overstatement or by implication. The techniques used include arguments about voters’ wants, general ideological principles, charismatic leadership projection, boasting about performance, and positive self-representation. Delegitimization is the essential counterpart: others, that is, foreigners, enemies, institutional opposition, unofficial opposition, have to be presented negatively, and the techniques include the use of ideas of differences and boundaries, and speech acts of blaming, accusing, insulting (ibid.: 213).

This is a way van Dijk looks at discourse analysis and Christina Schaffner (1996: 202-203) here adds that this kind of analyses can be done from two perspectives, namely, it can be started from the linguistic micro-level and thus analyse strategic functions language use serve

to fulfil. Or, it can be started from the macro-level identifying communicative situation and the function of a text and then look which linguistic structures fulfil this function. It was also earlier mentioned that specialists concerned primarily with political issues might choose approach based on linguistic macro-level and concentrate, first of all, on the message a speech implies. Meanwhile, those, concerned basically with investigation of linguistic matters, first of all, will look at language and then turn to the message used language reveals. The linguistic micro-level as starting point for discourse analyses is accepted as more appropriate also for this paper. Opinions among specialists vary; therefore any discourse analysis is a little bit of a challenge; a little bit subjective, as well as, experimental; but this, of course, makes the task only more gripping. The various ways ideology is embedded in the texts is going to be analysed grounding on the approach suggested by a specialist in critical discourse analysis Norman Fairclough. Since the relationships between language and power lie in the ground of his approach and the author favours to start with linguistic micro-level to reveal the “whole picture” of particular speech event, his approach will be the most appropriate also for this paper.

2.1. Stages of Political Discourse Analysis: Theoretical Background

Fairclough (1989: 109) introduces three components of discourse analyses according to which he has developed the following analyses. Those three components are: text, interaction and social context. Correspondingly, a discourse analysis consists of three stages, which are:

- 1) description of text;
- 2) interpretation of the relationship between text and interaction;
- 3) explanation of the relationship between interaction and social context.

2.1.1. The Stage of Description

Since a text is composed by lexical, syntactical and structural linguistic means, Fairclough distinguishes among three sub-stages: the analyses of vocabulary, the analyses of grammatical means and finally, the analyses of textual structures.

- 1) The analysis of vocabulary:

Words within discourse can express viewpoints. They enter into many sorts of relationship – relationships of similarity, contrast, overlap and inclusion. [...] And the meaning of a single word depends very much on relationship of that word to others. So instead of the vocabulary

of a language consisting of an unordered list of isolated words each with its own meaning, it consists of clusters of words associated with meaning systems (Fairclough, 1989: 94) Thus, for instance, words *black power*. At first glance it may lead to various interpretations and has definitely rather negative emotional shade. The explanation is given in the dictionary of politics (McLean, 1996: 37) is – a movement calling for fuller rights and more resources for black people, especially in United States.

A deliberative choice of vocabulary in politics is depicted and criticised by Orwell (1957: 153), who says:

“Political speech and writing are largely the defence of the indefensible. Things like continuance of British rule in India, the Russia purges and deportations, the dropping of the atom bombs on Japan, can indeed be defended, but only by arguments which are too brutal for most people to face, and which do not square with the professed aims of political parties. Thus political language has to consist largely of euphemism, question-begging and sheer cloudy vagueness. Defenceless villages are bombarded from the air, the inhabitants driven out into the countryside, the cattle machine-gunned, the huts set on fire with incendiary bullets; this is called “pacification”. Millions of peasants are robbed of their farms and sent trudging along the roads with no more than they can carry: this is called “transfer of population” or “rectification of frontiers”. People are imprisoned for years without trial; or shot in the back of the neck or sent to die of scurvy in Arctic limber camps; this is called “elimination of unreliable elements”. Such phraseology is needed if one wants to name things without calling up mental pictures of them.”

He (ibid.: 153-154) adds: “A mass of Latin words falls upon the facts like soft snow, blurring outlines and covering up all the details. The great enemy of clear language is insincerity. [...] When there is a gap between one’s real and one’s declared aims one turns as it were instinctively to long words and exhausted idioms.

In order to create our own critical look towards vocabulary in political discourse, we return to Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analyses. In the sub-stage of vocabulary analyses he distinguishes among three aspects to be analysed:

- 1.1) Experiential values of words, particularly, how ideological differences between texts in their representations of the world are coded in vocabulary. (Fairclough, 1989: 112) For example, there are words, which belong to concrete ideological movement, e.g. Marxism etc., and the occurrence of either one will tend to ideologically “place” a text (ibid.: 113). This is about

ideologically different formulations of precisely the same actions on the part of the speaker (ibid.: 117).

- 1.2) Relation values of words, particularly, how a text's choice of wordings depends on and helps to create social relationships among participants. For example, if one is using racist vocabulary in his speech, it not only marks the discourse, but also points to one's standpoint and thus affects relationships with other participants of a particular speech event (Fairclough, 1989: 116).
- 1.3) Expressive values of words. This aspect is closely linked to the fourth step in text description, namely, the one concerning the use of stylistic devices, especially metaphor.
- 1.4) The use of metaphors and other stylistic devices. Although Fairclough concentrates only to this particular stylistic device, the author of the paper has intended to look also to other stylistic devices since they all serve for persuasive ends.

Metaphor in linguistic disciplines is known as one of the most widespread stylistic devices, which always more occur not only in literary texts, but also in social speech events and discourse types characteristic for areas concerned with business, law and politics. Bryan Meadows (2008), the author of publication *Distancing and Showing Solidarity via metaphor and metonymy in Political Discourse*, characterises metaphors as an incredible tool in hands of political leaders. He also adds that metaphor, as well as, metonymy, are not just poetic expressions, but they actually play a primary role in shaping our understanding of the world around us. Metaphoric thought delves deep into our conceptual level of consciousness and, in turn, influences our speech at the textual level (ibid.:2).

2) The next step Fairclough considers in critical discourse analysis is grammatical phenomena, but particularly:

- 2.1) Experiential values of grammatical features, namely, the ways in which the grammatical forms of language code happenings or relationships in the world, the people or animals or things involved in those happenings or relationships, and their spatial and temporal circumstances, manner of occurrence, etc. (Fairclough, 1989: 120). The main focus lies on participants, processes and agents occurring within syntactical structures.
- 2.2) Relational values of grammatical features, particularly, the use of modes, relational modality and pronouns *we* and *you*;

- 2.3) Expressive values of grammatical features, particularly, features of expressive modality;
- 2.4) Sentence patterns, particularly, the way simple sentences are linked, what logical connectors are used and how sentence clauses or subordinated and what means are used to refer to inside and outside the text.

3) The analysis of textual structures:

According to Fairclough (1989: 111 -112) this sub-stage deals with the interactional conventions and turn-taking system. Since political speech occurs as a monologue then those issues are on secondary importance. What is important as to textual aspects in political speech analysis is the discussion of large-scale structures the speech has. It examines how the texts are made up of predictable elements in predictable order: For example reports generally involve the main elements we have in this instance: what happened, what caused it, what was done to deal with it, what more immediate effects it had, what long-term outcomes or consequences it had (Fairclough, 1989: 137).

2.1.2. The Stage of Interpretation

The second stage in discourse analysis after text description is the stage of text interpretation and Fairclough (1989: 142) lists six major domains of interpretation, namely:

- 1) Situational context;
- 2) Intertextual context;
- 3) Surface of utterance;
- 4) Meaning of utterance;
- 5) Local coherence;
- 6) Text structure and “point”.

The first two refers to the interpretation of context, while the following four deal with the interpretation of the text. The surface of utterance refers to process by which interpreters convert strings of sounds and marks into recognizable words, phrases and sentences. (ibid.: 143) Meanwhile meaning of utterance is a matter of assigning meanings to the constituent parts of a text (ibid.: 143). As to the local coherence – it establishes meaning connections between utterances, producing coherent interpretations of pairs and sequences of them (ibid.:143) and the aspect of “text structure and the point” – it is a matter of how a whole text hangs together, a text’s global coherence. This involves matching the text with one of the

repertoire of schemata, or representations of characteristic patterns of organization associated with different types of discourse (ibid.: 144). In other words – it is a stage at which one recognizes and identifies a text as belonging to concrete field of discourse.

As to the interpretation of a context it is discussed from two perspectives. The first is investigation of a situational context identifying features of physical situation – activity, topic, purpose, as well as, properties of participants, what has previously been said etc. (ibid.:144 - 145). The second is intertextual context - the stage at which the analyst looks whether a text or series of a text fits within a discourse and thus can be taken as a common ground for discourse participants (ibid.: 152).

2.1.3. The Stage of Explanation

The third stage in a critical discourse analyses is the stage of explanation. The objective of this stage is to portray discourse as a part of a social process, as a social practice, showing how it is determined by social structures, and what reproductive effects discourses can cumulatively have on those structures, sustaining them or changing them (Fairclough, 1989: 63). At this stage the analyst speaks about the ways a particular speech may or has affected audiences. Whether there are noticeable results after the speech has been delivered, whether it has raised clamour. Thus explanation is a matter of seeing a discourse as a part of processes of social struggle, within a matrix of relations of power (ibid.: 163).

CHAPTER 3. POLITICAL SPEECH AS A TARGET OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

The next chapter deals with the analysis of political speech in practice.

All in all the author of the paper has taken thirteen speeches (see Appendix 1-13) delivered by political leaders and other authorities, each of whom shares various ideological beliefs and attitudes towards the most topical phenomena as decades ago thus today, namely, phenomena of the struggle for peace, influence, ideologies and the rule over the world. Nine of them are delivered by democratic leaders: The President of the U.S.A George W. Bush, the former Vice President of the U.S.A Al Gore, the former Secretary of the Interior of the U.S.A. Harold Ickes, the former Prime Minister of the U.K. Winston Churchill, the U.S.A. Senator Barack Obama, the former President of Latvia Vaira Vike Freiberga, professor of University of Latvia Zaneta Ozolina and former Minister of Foreign Affairs Artis Pabriks. Three latter speeches are in English, but apart from the six former are delivered by non-native English speakers. Two speeches are given by the leader of Eastern authoritative regime – Saddam Hussein and they are translated from Arabic into English. And the rest two – by Pope Benedict XVI and his predecessor Pope John Paul II - as speeches representing a neutral viewpoint as to the problems mentioned. The Speech by Pope Benedict XVI is a translation from German into English, and the speech by Pope John Paul II is translated from Italian into English.

In order to see the peculiarities of Latvian political discourse particular attention is going to be paid to the speech by Vaira Vike Freiberga, as well as to the speeches delivered by ex-Minister of foreign affairs Artis Pabriks and University of Latvia professor Zaneta Ozolina. Their speeches will serve as an example of Latvian political discourse, peculiarities of which will be discussed under a separate sub-chapter.

The analysis is going to be conducted on the basis of the information and theory described in the Chapter II.

3.1. Text Description in Political Speech Analysis

The first stage in Critical Discourse Analysis is the stage of description, which includes the first sub-stage of the analysis of vocabulary.

3.1.1. Vocabulary

The stage of vocabulary analysis includes discussion of several aspects: experiential, relational, as well as, expressive values of words. Each of those aspects implies particular nuances of vocabulary to be considered, thus the first aspect considered under the sub-stage of vocabulary analyses is the experiential values of lexical means and the initial nuance deals with the way words or word phrases are classified.

1) Experiential values of words:

1.1.) Classification schemes:

The instances of classification and grouping phenomena into whether similar or opposite groups occur in the most persuasive and ideologically marked speeches, those under discussion included. The speech by Saddam Hussein (see Appendix 7) introduces the most striking examples. He draws parallels between moral and constitutional duty, thus to “hide” his individual ideology and intentions behind the constitution of Iraq.

“... I address you from time to time, as my moral and constitutional duty, and as God called upon his prophet...”

Furthermore, referring to God Hussein manipulates not only with crucial secular power, but divine, as well. Taking into consideration Iraqi’s certitude in Islam, the use of religious vocabulary is a highly powerful tool to establish people’s conviction in the rightness of what is being said. Similar case of classification appears also later in his speech, where he refers to Muslim suicides serving as live weapons in terror acts, September 11th included. S. Hussein says the following:

“...there are believers, who are willing to sacrifice their lives for God and the nation...”

In the phrase S. Hussein again groups two phenomena together - “*the God*” and “*the nation*”. Both phenomena are general concepts, which do not refer to actual reasons, due to which trusting Muslim people are going to kill themselves. However, they serve as a good veil to consolidate Hussein’s ideology and power.

Classification is also present in the speeches given by democratic leaders. The most widespread is “*power*” classification into good one, particularly, NATO, the United States of America etc., and evil one – terrorists, dictatorship and the like. To illustrate, the extract from G.W. Bush’s speech (see Appendix 2):

“If the Middle East continues to simmer in anger and resentment and hopelessness, caught in a cycle of repression and radicalism, it will produce terrorism of even greater audacity and destructive power.”

And for comparison, an extract from his NATO speech (see Appendix 3):

“...our alliance is rising to meet the great challenges and responsibilities of this young century by making NATO the world’s most effective united force of freedom.”

Similar classification schemes appear regularly in order to establish parallels or oppositions, which all in all serve to support ideological assumptions. The same effect is also achieved with the help of the next linguistic mean, namely, ideologically contested words.

1.2) The instances of ideologically contested words:

The above mentioned concept “*believer*” introduced by S. Hussein (see Appendix 7) in the understanding of Western people is “*terrorists – suicides*”. Those two ways of defining one phenomenon reveal how words ideologically contest. The same refers to words “*evil invaders*”, “*criminal invaders*”, “*the losers*” used by S. Hussein (see Appendix 6, 7) and words “*terrorists*” and “*tyrants*” used by democratic leaders G.W. Bush (see Appendix 2, 3), B. Obama (see Appendix 10), Al Gore (see Appendix 5), A. Pabriks (see Appendix 12) and decades ago also H. Ickes (see Appendix 8). The speeches frequently introduce contesting words, names and expressions according to the speaker’s belief thus placing the text into corresponding ideological framework.

1.3) The instances of rewording or overwording:

According to Fairclough (1989: 115) *rewording* means “an existing, dominant, and naturalized wording as being systematically replaced by another one in conscious opposition to it”, and *overwording* - “preoccupation with some aspect of reality using a bulk of words, which are near synonymous.”

The case of rewording is well seen comparing the speeches by S. Hussein (see Appendix 7) and B. Obama (see Appendix 10):

Hussein claims:

“The enemy will not be able to storm Baghdad, because there are believers who are willing to sacrifice their lives for God and the nation, so every Iraqi family be assured and have no fear.”

Meanwhile B. Obama refers to the same as follows:

I suffer no illusions about Saddam Hussein. He is a brutal man. A ruthless man. A man who butchers his own people to secure his own power.

Thus it can be seen how different wordings of the same fact reveals speakers attitude and belonging to a certain ideological framework.

The instance of overwording occurs at the end of S. Hussein's speech (see Appendix 7):

“God is great; Glory for God; glory for the mujahideen of Iraq and disgrace and shame for the enemies of God and humanity. Long live Iraq; Long live our glorious nation; Long live Palestine. Long live Iraq. Long live Iraq; Allahu Akbar (God is great); Allahu Akbar (God is great); and let losers be disgraced.”

What can be said in one sentence in his speech is consciously extended to a paragraph for the sake of greater emphasis. As to Iraqi people S. Hussein says – *sons and daughters of Iraq*, which also is a case of overwording since simply *Iraqi* can be used. Similar way of addressing or describing audiences occurs also in the speeches by democratic leaders, where they tend to say: *“...men and women...”* (see Appendix 3, 8) instead of *people* or *citizen*.

1.4) Reflection of ideologically significant relations represented by synonymy, hyponymy and antonymy:

“Antonymy is an important phenomenon in political discourse, enabling speakers to communicate oppositions and draw boundaries,” says van Dijk (1997a: 221). As to the instances of synonymy and antonymy also Meadows (2008) introduces certain ideas, namely: “Language as a distinction –making machine can create both distance and solidarity between two entities.” He calls it the *us/them* relational pair. It refers to the way language is used to create exaggerated, even false, dichotomies which in turn force human beings to be categorized into one of the opposing poles (Meadows; 2008: 4). Common dichotomies presented in terms of *us vs. them* are as follows: *evil/good; dirty/clean; irrational/rational*. This is highly topical after September 11, 2001 when the terror act in New York ideologically divided the world into East and West, into evil and good; irrational and rational. This is what today prevails in political speeches, especially those concerned with terrorism, security, NATO, EU and others of the kind.

As to hyponymy Fairclough (1989:116) offers the following: “Hyponymy is the case where the meaning of one word is included within the meaning of another word; e.g. the meaning of totalitarianism tends to include the meanings of communism, Marxism, facism etc.” Or as it is explained in Oxford Advanced learner's Dictionary (OALD, 2005: 766): “Hyponym is a word with a particular meaning that is included in the meaning of a more general word, for instance, “cat” and “dog” are hyponyms of an “animal”.

The speeches under discussion introduce all the phenomena mentioned, for instance:

The case of hyponymy is observable in NATO speeches (see Appendix 2, 3, 11, 12, 13), where there appears such words as *tyranny*, which refers to the political regime in Iraq and is hyponym of a word totalitarianism. As to the case of synonymy examples are available in every speech under discussion, but those that are the most ideologically marked, appear in Hussein's speech, where he refers to Western countries with synonyms like: *the enemy, criminal invaders, evil invaders* (see Appendix 6, 7).

2) The second stage in a critical discourse analysis is the investigation of relational values of words.

In the speeches under discussion relational values of words reveal particularly in the speeches by S. Hussein. He uses a bulk of religious allusions, words and phrases thus establishing relationship not only with divine power, but with highly religious Iraqi people, as well as. Meanwhile in the speeches delivered by democratic leaders there prevails purely political and social vocabulary that points to their pragmatic and worldly attitudes and belief in the power of people more than in power of God. Thus Western politicians use more formal vocabulary since the genre of speech requires rather high formality and accordingly it demands formality of social relations, as well.

2.1) The use of euphemistic expressions:

Euphemisms are indirect words or phrases that people often refer to something embarrassing or unpleasant; sometimes to make it seem more acceptable than it really is (OALD, 2005: 521). This linguistic phenomenon is one of the most widespread tools of manipulations in political speeches, these under discussion included.

Apart from democratic speakers like G.W. Bush and V.V. Freiberga, S. Hussein in his speeches is more direct. He does not avoid words like *attack, battle, soldiers, and army*. Meanwhile democratic leaders call military organization *a power of freedom* and use other euphemistic expressions on order to avoid negative associations. For instance, G.W. Bush says in his NATO speech (see Appendix 3):

“NATO has recognized this threat. And three years ago NATO took an unprecedented step when it sent allied forces to defend a young democracy.”

The example shows the way *an attack* is substituted with “*to defend a young democracy*” in order to avoid condemnation of NATO as an attacker, as well as, to hide actual economical and political reasons of the war in Iraq initiated after a resolution by Bush, who himself “hides” behind *NATO* and *allied forces*.

2.2) The use of markedly formal words:

It was already mentioned that the genre of political speech demands formality, therefore formal words occur constantly. For instance, V.V. Freiberga in her speech in NATO summit (see Appendix 13) uses such words as *gratify*, *adapt*, *conviction* etc. A lot of formal words occur also in Al Gore's speech (see Appendix 5). He uses such concepts like *persecution*, *resolution*, *precedent*, *national and international cohesion* and the like. However, this is connected more with political code and less with hidden motives. The same refers to the use of formal addresses in the beginning and sometimes in the course of a speech. For instance, the speech by G.W. Bush in NATO summit is initiated with the following address on behalf of unidentified participant (see Appendix 3):

“Ladies and gentlemen, the Co-chairman of the German Marshall Fund of the United States, Marc Leland. Ladies and gentlemen, the President of the Republic of Latvia, Her Excellency, Vaira Vike-Freiberga. Ladies and gentlemen, the President of the United States. “

The same has been observed also in Pope's Benedict XVI's speech (see Appendix 1), where he himself starts with:

“Your Eminences, Your Magnificences, Your Excellencies, Distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen...”

In order to manipulate audiences always more politicians, e.g. B. Obama, G.W. Bush, deviate from a highly formal vocabulary and adapt more straightforward lexicon thus markedly formal words gradually vanish from political speeches and remain present only in internal political communication.

3) The third aspect in vocabulary analysis is the investigation of expressive values of words. The oratorical performances, though formal, regularly introduce personal attitudes expressed through different lexical means. For instance, B. Obama (see Appendix 10) in his speech calls S. Hussein a *butcher* thus showing his viewpoint to the most wanted man in the world. Same way B. Obama expresses his viewpoint to war in Iraq saying that he does not oppose a war; what he opposes is *a rash war*, *a dumb war*. The choice of the linguistic means of the kind is a way the speaker gives an expressive value to what he has said and reveals his standpoint. Expressive value is generally achieved through striking epithets, metaphors and the like, the investigation of which is the subject of the next step in a discourse analysis, namely, the use of stylistic devices.

4) The use of stylistic devices:

Although Fairclough concentrates on a metaphor as an ideological tool in political discourse, the analysis shows that a metaphor is not the only mean to express hidden and sometimes ambiguous messages. The speeches are characterised by a plenty of similes, epithets and other stylistic devices, as well. In his NATO speech G.W. Bush (see Appendix 3) favours such bright epithets like: *ugly wall* referring to Berlin wall during Cold War period, and *hateful ideology* referring to the Eastern rule. Meanwhile S. Hussein calls his country - *precious land of Iraq* (see Appendix 7). As to the use of metaphors the following examples have been selected:

S. Hussein (see Appendix 7) speaks about American invasion in his speech as follows:

“With God’s help, their stomachs may grill in hell forever and our martyrs will attain the paradise.”

Thus S. Hussein implicitly denotes that he is going to revenge and that Americans will suffer.

Striking metaphors appear also in the speech delivered by H. Ickes (see Appendix 8):

Some amongst us have fallen for this calculated poison. Some amongst us have begun to preach that the “Wave of the future” has passed over us and lefts us a wet, dead fish.”

He also speaks in images about tendencies in democratic rule:

“...the tide of the democratic future...”

The instances of metaphorical expressions are present also in the speech delivered by Al Gore (see Appendix 5):

“... but I believe that puts a burden on the shoulders of President Bush”

Thus Gore appeals to Bush’s conscience and turns audience’s attention to the transparency of president’s decisions and activities. Meanwhile Churchill propagates other things and with the help of stylistic device emphasizes America’s strong positions (see Appendix 4):

“The United States stands at this time at the pinnacle of world power.”

Metaphors are various, but in political speeches they all serve mainly to avoid explicit statements or they give an extra emphasis on particular phenomena.

In terms of cultural diversities American orators are particularly lavish in metaphorical expressions, while, for instance, Latvian speakers do not use much stylistic means. Looking back to the speeches by H. Ickes and W. Churchill it is seen that in America it is an old tradition and the use of figurative expressions has entrenched in the genre of political speech. Despite the fact that political speech requires formality political leaders do not feel inconvenient giving emotional shades to what they are saying.

3.1.2. Grammatical Phenomena

The next sub-stage in text description is the analysis of grammar phenomena that similarly to vocabulary description implies numerous aspects to be considered. Those aspects are experiential, relational and expressive grammatical values, as well as sentence patterns and they all are going to be discussed one by one.

1) Experiential values of grammatical features, particularly:

1.1) Dominating types of processes and participants, the selection of which can be ideologically significant (Fairclough, 1989: 120).

A peculiarity of political speech is that speakers usually do not represent their individual ideologies and viewpoints or at least they should not. Politicians act on behalf of larger groups, larger ideological and political communities elected by the corresponding country, by the nation they are aimed to serve. For this reason the types and processes prevailing in sentence clauses are nationally oriented, thus for instance, in G.W. Bush's speeches (see Appendix 2, 3) the United States are the leading participant, while his opponent S. Hussein generally refers to Iraq, Iraqi people, as well as God (See Appendix 6, 7). This is the difference between Western and Eastern oratory, the latter of which is characterised by an abundant use of religious figures. As to processes it should be taken into consideration that the speeches under analysis are consciously selected from those introducing the processes concerning the struggle between different ideologies, the struggle for peace, the struggle between democracy and authoritative regime. Thus the processes in the speeches by democratic leaders concern all in all the ways of spreading and establishing democracy. Accordingly, in the speeches by ideologically opposite figures the processes are characterised by a riot against Western ideologies.

1.2) The type of agent:

Van Dijk (1997b: 223) claims: Much of syntactic organizations has to do with concepts and communicative functions that are not directly encoded in the content words of language's vocabulary, and is therefore less easy to bring to awareness. And Paul Gee (1999: 223) suggests:

"It is often relevant to the analyst to investigate two aspects of sentence organization in political discourse: "thematic roles" and "topicalization". The first have to do with, for example, who (agent) is doing what (process of moving, affecting, causing etc.) to whom (patient), where (location), why (cause, purpose, by what means (instrument).

The way people assign such roles can be interpretively linked with particular representations of the political universe, or to claims concerning causation, agency and responsibility.”

Since political leaders frequently avoid calling concrete persons involved in processes, a lot of sentences in their speeches occur with unclear or no agency, thus for instance, B. Obama says (see Appendix 10):

“Let’s finish the fight with Bin Laden and al-Qaeda...”

We can conclude from the context that he addresses his countrymen, particularly Bush’s administration, still due to unclear agent listeners may accept different variants as he himself may later deviate from what has been said, particularly, whom he has addresses this suggestion.

Also Pope John Paul (see Appendix 9) uses statements where no concrete agents lay behind:

“...The attainment of peace is the summing-up and crowning of all our aspirations.”

The idea is clear, but from the linguistic aspect the agent is absent, because the peace is not attained by itself, but there are people or groups of people who secure it. Also his follower Pope Benedict XVI (see Appendix 1) uses the same manner to describe particular events:

“That even in the face of such radical scepticism it is still necessary and reasonable to raise the question of God through the use of reason, and to do so in the context of the tradition of the Christian faith: this, within the university as a whole, was accepted without question.”

As to Latvian speakers A. Pabriks favours unclear agents in his speech (see Appendix 12):

“...while by the 1990’s many people in the world believed that NATO was no longer needed...”

The subject and the possible agent is “many people”, but who those many people are? It remains the subject of interpretation.

1.3) Explicitness of processes:

This grammatical nuance is very close to what was discussed above under item 1.1. The difference is in the way the processes are depicted. For instance, the Pope’s John Paul’s II (see Appendix 9) declares:

“... Paul VI walked with you along the difficult paths towards peace.”

Thus Pope makes a general statement and evidence of Paul’s VI participation in certain events, but he does not specify what those events are. Therefore processes remain unclear and the listeners themselves are supposed to “fill-in”.

1.4) The use of nominalizations:

According to Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (2005: 1031) *nominalize* means to form a noun from a verb or adjective. Faber (2007: 23) says: „Nominalizations may conceal the fact that decisions are made without staff input.” Since leading figures favour generalisation and frequently avoid concrete names and facts, nominalization is a widespread tool in their speeches. There are following examples:

Pope John Paul II (see Appendix 9):

“The attainment of peace is the summing-up and crowning of all our aspiration.”

Pope Benedict XVI (see Appendix 1):

“Without descending to details, such as the difference in treatment accorded to those who have the "Book" and the "infidels", he addresses his interlocutor with a startling brusqueness on the central question about the relationship between religion and violence in general, saying...”

or:

“Is the conviction that acting unreasonably contradicts God's nature merely a Greek idea, or is it always and intrinsically true?”

The same linguistic phenomenon is present also in Latvian political discourse: Z.Ozolina (see Appendix 11):

“Transformation is not the final goal, but a process”; “This is the democratic world’s acknowledgment to Latvia, as well as Estonia and Lithuania, of its great and successful transformation from totalitarianism to democracy.”; “Latvia’s accession to NATO would not be possible without the strong support of its friends.”

The use of nominalization allows describing things not mentioning the agents. It is on importance if the speaker is not willing to specify concrete persons, social groups or countries, or he or she does not want to do it. However, politicians know very well how to pass information without mentioning additional facts and nominalizations play an important part in these processes.

1.5) The use of passive and/or active sentences:

The analysis of the speeches reveals that as soon as political leaders wish to make people act, their speech implies more active sentences, like in Hussein's letter (see Appendix 6):

“They did not conquer you – you who reject the occupation and humiliation, you who have Arabism and Islam in your hearts and minds...”

But as soon as action is of secondary importance, the speeches present the opposite variant - the use of passive voice. Thus, for instance, Pope John Paul II says (see Appendix 9):

“To achieve peace between countries, many attempts are made...”

Here the passive voice appears in the reproduction of past events or it may occur when a speaker is unwilling to point to the persons involved. Most probably Pope’s intention was not to avoid calling concrete persons for certain political or ideological reasons or to relieve somebody of responsibility; but he used a linguistic mean of the kind to avoid naming all the participants of those events since there can be very many of them and their names are of secondary importance.

Also Pope John Paul’s follower Pope Benedict XVI does similarly (see Appendix 1):

“I was reminded of all this recently, when I read the edition by Professor Theodore Khoury of part of the dialogue carried on - perhaps in 1391 in the winter barracks near Ankara - by the erudite Byzantine emperor Manuel II Paleologus and an educated Persian on the subject of Christianity and Islam, and the truth of both...”

Thus the Pope puts forward the fact of him being reminded and the rest of the information only supports his statement.

Faber (2007:38) says the following about the use of passive voice:

“Passivization combined with nominalizations discusses background decisions that had not yet been finalized and which removed agency from these pending decisions. Those discursive strategies of using the passive voice elide agency, treat new information as given, create grammatically coherent links between dissimilar concepts or construct an ultimatum to achieve consensus and present an audience with false choices. “

1.6) The use of positive and negative sentences.

The sentences in the speeches under discussion are mainly positive except the speeches by Saddam Hussein that serve as a striking sample of the use of negative sentences.

For instance, when speaking about American invasion in Iraq his “letter” consists basically of negative utterances thus announcing to the audiences: “No, Americans have NOT won us!”

Excerpt from his letter (see Appendix 6):

1) *Indeed, it is not a victory while there is still resistance in your souls. What we used to say now become reality, for we do not live in peace and security while the deformed Zionist entity is in our Arab land; therefore there is no rift in the unity of the Arab struggle.*

2) Relational values of grammatical features, particularly:

2.1.) The use of modes: declarative, interrogative, imperative:

All of the sentence modes mentioned are present in the speeches under discussion. Declarative, imperative and interrogative sentences – politicians use them all. Thus, for instance, the anti-war speech by B.Obama (see Appendix 10) introduces striking examples of how question, particularly, a rhetorical question serves to incite emotions. He asks repeatedly:

“You want a fight President Bush?”

The answer, of course, here is of no importance. Thus B.Obama establishes his anti-war positions and through such a rhetorical device introduces his viewpoint of what is really worth and needs fighting.

Another question pattern occurs also in H.Icke’s speech (see Appendix 8), where he turns the attention of listeners with question:

“Do you know why?”

Also this question does not ask for an answer, but, instead, it opens the topic and intrigues about what is going to be said.

As to declarative sentences, they construct the majority of speeches, especially those that serve more like oratorical performances and reconstructions of past events or future plans, for instance, speeches in NATO summit, presidential visits or addresses by the heads of Church.

“The Baltic States had no role in starting World War II. The battle came here because of a secret pact between dictators. And when the war came, many in this region showed their courage. After a puppet government ordered the Latvian fleet to return to port, sailors on eight freighters chose to remain at sea under the flag of free Latvia, assisting the United States Merchant Marine in carrying supplies across the Atlantic. A newspaper in the state of South Carolina described the Latvian crew this way: “They all have beards and dressed so differently... They are ... exhausted, but full of fighting spirit.”

This is how speaks Bush (see Appendix 2) in the Small Guild Hall, in Riga. Since this piece of speech does not imply any important message for the future and does not serve as much for manipulations with audiences, but is just telling the story, Bush does not use rhetorical questions with emotional shade, or imperative sentences thus to stimulate audiences for certain action.

Meanwhile, S.Hussein does not hesitate to use imperative sentences and he commands his people (see Appendix 7):

“Fight them brothers, hit them day and night and let the land of Muslims be a scorching fire for their feet and their faces wherever they pass.”

The more radical are ideologies, the more radical are the ways of expressing them and this extract from Hussein's speech serves as a good sample.

2.2) The use of grammatical features of relational modality:

Fairclough (1989: 126-127) asserts: "Relational modality is to do with speaker or writer authority [...] and it is usually expressed by auxiliary verbs like *may, might, must, should, can* etc. [...] It is precisely implicit authority claims and implicit power relations on the basis of which discourse participants whether withhold permission or impose obligations. In Hussein's address (see Appendix 6) several instances of relational modality occur, for instance:

"They had made a covenant with God that they would not turn back in flight, and a covenant with God must be answered for."

Although he generally refers to God as to the authority, the use of modal verbs implicitly points to him as actual leader.

Other speakers under discussion avoid using such an explicit authority claims and modal verbs in their speeches are characterised mainly by expressive values that are going to be discussed further.

2.3.) The use of pronouns *we* and *you*:

In speech or other communicative event the usage of *we*, especially by governmental authorities are intended to express the identification with the state and people as equal. "It serves to corporatise ideologies, which stress the unity of a people at the expense of recognition of divisions of interest." (Fairclough, 1989: 129).

The pronoun *we* is a frequent occurrence also in the analysed speeches. All the leaders, whether democratic, religious or totalitarian in their speeches claim again and again:

"I tell you that after we have relied on God the great and after He inspired us with faith and courage, we will emerge victorious over our criminal invaders and we will be victorious on all battlefronts after we emerged victorious within ourselves with our faith and love for our nation." (S. Hussein's speech; see Appendix 7).

This is mainly done for the sake of establishing togetherness of a nation or community. It is seen also by the speech of H. Ickes (see Appendix 8) where he applies:

“We Americans know that freedom, like peace, is indivisible. We cannot retain our liberty if three-fourths of the world is enslaved. Brutality, injustice and slavery... in the long run would destroy us as surely as a fire raging in our neighbour’s house would burn ours if we did not help to put out his.”

The same phenomenon is present also in Latvian political discourse. The extract from the speech by Professor Z. Ozolina in NATO summit (see Appendix 11):

“To put the world right in order, we must first put the nation in order; to put the nation in order, we must first put the family in order; to put the family in order, we must first cultivate our personal life; we must first set our hearts right.”

The use of *you* seems to appear as soon as the orator points to concrete actions or concrete facts that listeners should take into consideration and where the responsibility is laid only upon them:

“They did not conquer you – you who reject the occupation and humiliation, you who have Arabism and Islam in your hearts and minds...” (Hussein’s letter; see Appendix 6).

Or W. Churchill (see Appendix 4):

“As you look around you, you must feel not only the sense of duty done, but also you must feel anxiety lest you fall below the level of achievement.”

Thus the orators make distinction between their duties and those that should be done on behalf of audiences.

3) Expressive values of grammatical features, particularly:

3.1) Features of expressive modality:

It was already discussed that political speeches introduce a lot of modal verbs, especially *must* for obligations; similarly also *should*; or *may* for concession etc. thus determining the relationships between and among participants. It is relational modality. Expressive modality looks at the same thing from a different angle, namely how modal verbs express attitudes towards different figures and/or phenomena.

Z. Ozolina in NATO summit speaks this way (see Appendix 11):

“To put the world right in order, we must first put the nation in order; to put the nation in order, we must first put the family in order; to put the family in order, we must first cultivate our personal life; we must first set our hearts right.”

In this case the modal verb *must* is not used to give a command, but expresses moral obligation to the nations, governments all together and each separately.

W. Churchill speaks in the same way (see Appendix 3):

“It is necessary that constancy of mind, persistency of purpose, and the grand simplicity of decision shall rule and guide the conduct of English-speaking peoples in piece as they did in war. We must, and I believe we shall, prove ourselves equal to this severe requirement.”

And Al Gore in his speech says this way (see Appendix 5):

“All Americans should acknowledge that Iraq does indeed pose a serious threat to the stability of the Persian Gulf region, and we should be about the business of organization an international coalition to eliminate his access to weapons of mass destruction. Iraq’s search for weapons of mass destruction has proven impossible to completely deter and we should assume that it will continue for as long as Saddam is in power.”

Thus Al Gore shows his attitude and impels the audiences to agree with him. He repeats again and again that *we should* all consider the problem. In this sample those words occur several times linking together different parts of the sentences. The ways other speakers ensure coherence within sentences is the subject of the next step.

4) The way (simple) sentences are linked together, particularly:

4.1) The use of logical connectors:

The ways the speakers cue different parts in the sentences reveal not only their linguistic skills, but also establish relationship between different processes, participants and obstacles. Some samples are as follows:

Al Gore (see Appendix 5):

“It is impossible to succeed against terrorism unless we have secured the continuing, sustained cooperation of many nations.”

Conjunction *unless* here serves as “catalyst” denoting to the fact that the former, namely, combating of terrorism is impossible without the latter, namely, cooperation of many nations.

A. Pabriks (see Appendix 12):

“When we regained our independence, we here in Latvia viewed NATO as the main guarantor of the long-term security of our country, while by the 1990’s many people in the world believed that NATO was no longer needed.”

When and *while* here serve to point not so much to the timing, but are used to compare the attitudes. The idea is that Latvia was the one that believed in NATO while other did not anymore.

V.V. Freiberga (see Appendix 13):

“There’s a country that in spite of its wealth and influence has never forgotten the principle’s set forth by its founding fathers.”

According to Oxford Dictionary (OALD, 2005: 1476) *in spite of* means that a certain fact did not prevented somebody of doing something. Thus the idiom itself contains a message that in the speech by V.V. Freiberga is supplemented with necessary participants and processes and as a result the speaker has not only stated facts, but also established relationship between those things.

4.2) The way simple sentences are coordinated and/or subordinated:

The way the sentences are ordinate may also reveal the attitude towards the things, their importance, how they are treated on behalf of the speaker and what is stressed. According to Paul Gee (1999, 190) the main clause is foregrounded, “asserted”, information and the subordinate clause is background, “assumed”, information. When one clause is subordinated to another, one can use small grammatical words to indicate the logical connection, e.g. because. The ways in which the speakers relate clauses to each other constitutes a part of how

speakers and writers signal what is seen as the logical connections between different pieces of information.

This relates very much to what was discussed above, namely, the ways different parts of the sentences are cued thus revealing relationship between and among different phenomena. However, one thing is not yet discussed and it deals with the parallel constructions in political speeches. The speeches under discussion introduce a lot of parallelisms. Repeated words and phrases occur not only within a sentence level, but textual, as well. Thus politicians constantly draw parallels between different ideas and phenomena. This has been an unchanging manner throughout the years. This tendency has been widespread already in 1941 when H. Ickes gave his “What is an American?” speech (see Appendix 8):

“Some amongst us have fallen for this carefully pickled tripe. Some amongst us have fallen for this calculated poison. Some amongst us have begun to preach that the “Wave of the future” has passed over us and lefts us a wet, dead fish.”

Nothing has changed also after more than 60 years. Thus, for instance, B. Obama (see Appendix 10) uses the same “parallel” way of linking sentences and parts of the text in his 2002 speech:

“I don’t oppose all wars. What I am opposed to is a dumb war. What I am opposed to is a rush war. What I am opposed to is the cynical attempt by Richard Perle...”

And:

“Those are the battles that wee need to fight. Those are the battles that we willingly join. The battles against ignorance and intolerance. Corruption and greed. Poverty and despair.”

Such repetitions are present throughout the speeches and the speakers time by time returns to the same words, same sentence and text constructions, the latter of which is the subject of the next sub-stage in political speech analysis.

3.1.3. Textual Structures

The third level in the stage of description is investigational of textual structures. This stage deals with larger-scale structures of the text.

Every text has a certain structure, speeches included. All the speeches are characterised by three main larger-scale structures: The first is introduction, and then follows the body and finally the conclusion. In political speeches the introductory part implies formal address to the audience and a person who has introduced the speaker. On highly formal occasions it implies a brief insight into the situational context and gratitude for having an opportunity to take a part in a particular event. This is well seen in NATO speeches (see Appendix 2, 4, 5, 11, 12). The introduction implies also a brief insight into the problem thus establishing a cue to the next part – the body of the speech. The content of it varies depending upon the speaker, the situation and the like. Usually there is more than one matter or several aspects politicians are speaking about. In order to preserve the structure and coherence they divide each idea into separate paragraphs cueing them through parallel constructions, which are the most widespread mean of establishing coherence and structure. The final part of the speech is conclusion, where the speaker summarizes his ideas and through general statements and clichés last time the speaker addresses the listeners. In the speeches under discussion the conclusion does not play an important role. Since speakers address audiences repeatedly throughout their speeches the conclusion part is not as important as in other genres. Thus, for example, President Bush usually ends his speeches with a few sentences summing up his ideas and the sacral phrase - God bless! Or - God bless America! (see Appendix 2,3).

3.2. Text Interpretation in Political Speech Analysis

The next stage in discourse analysis is the stage of interpretation. Although already during the stage of description the author of the paper has introduced interpretation of language means present, still there remain crucial things to be discussed under this stage. If previously the discussion concerned only the text itself, then at this stage the analysis involves also the investigation of the context, particularly of:

- 1) Situational context;
- 2) Intertextual context;
- 3) Surface of utterance;
- 4) Meaning of utterance;

- 5) Local coherence
- 6) Text structure and the point.

The four latter stages theoretically do appear in critical discourse analysis, but in terms of this paper do not have crucial significance. Thus, for example, the discussion of the surface and meaning of utterance deals with the way how people identify the sounds uttered and then constitute words. Then follows the stage of local coherence that concerns how listeners link the meanings of different parts of the texts, particularly, the sentences and finally how they understand the text as a whole that is the subject of discussion of text structure and the point. The two latter, especially text structure and point is the level at which attention may be turned also in terms of political discourse analyses, particularly, the analyses of political speeches. Some speakers, like Saddam Hussein, use a lot of religious allusions thus sometimes deviating from the main point. If the listener lacks the necessary background language or ability to link seemingly unrelated things, he or she might have difficulties in perceiving the whole message. Similarly also democratic leaders, for example, G.W. Bush in his speeches deviate from the current issues and current question giving a more or less brief insight into past events, into the history etc. Usually, thus they draw parallels and compare or illustrate something and if the ideas are cued with the help of logical connectors and subordination there do not arouse any problems as to the interpretation. However, this is a matter depending not so much on the speaker than on the listener and his or her competence in the world's history, current events and the like.

More crucial matters are those concerning interpretation of situational and intertextual context, the former of which include analysis of the following aspects:

- 1) The activity, topic and purpose:

As to the specification of the topic van Dijk (1997b: 84) suggests the following: "To understand the idea of the theme or topic requires that one deals with a number of interrelated matters. First, there is the theoretical definition of the theme or topic, which is generally articulated in terms of "starting point" or "aboutness". Secondly, there is its manifestation through syntactic form, most generally discussed in terms of constituent order or syntactic subject, or other morpho-syntactic cues."

The topic and purpose in political speeches under discussion depend upon a particular case. In NATO speeches the most crucial questions are discussed in secrecy and what is discussed openly is more like performance, spreading ideology and convincing the masses that, for

example, attack on Baghdad is liberation of Iraqi people. As to the activity this aspect is already determined by the chosen genre of political discourse analysis, namely, political speech. The activity it involves is addressing audiences, but particularly, introducing ideologies, convincing and manipulating.

2) Participants involved:

This implies the indication of which subject positions are set up; the set of subject positions differs according to the type of situation (Fairclough, 1989: 148). Fairclough (1989:148) explains “Firstly, [...] it derives from the activity type. [...] Secondly, the institution ascribes social identities to the subjects who function within it. [...] Thirdly, different situations have different speaking and listening positions associated them – speaker, addressee, hearer, overhearer, spokesperson, etc.”

As to the participants involved in political speech the varieties are possible only as to the personalities delivering a speech, but from general viewpoint those are always leading figures on the political stage, like, G. W. Bush, B. Obama or V. V. Freiberga. Not all participants of political discourse communities are gifted with oratorical abilities and not all people are entitled to express viewpoints of the ideological group they belong to. Thus, there is hardly any political speech the participants of which would be anonymous or unknown. Of course, the speeches selected for the analysis of this paper were consciously chosen among the most famous speakers, but even in the course of selection there were hardly any speech, whose author would be unknown.

3) Relations of participants:

This question is closely linked to the previous one, only this time “it comes to the question of relations and we look at subject positions more dynamically, in terms of what relationships of power, social distance etc. are set up and enacted in the situation, “ specifies Fairclough (1989: 148).

In political speeches relations between participants are more or less determined by the genre, namely, the person, who delivers the speech usually has a greater or lesser degree of authority in front of others and thus is being expected to be tolerated and agreed. It is typical in NATO speeches that belong to the type of internal political communication and accordingly there is some internal order as to the roles of participants of corresponding speech event. The situation is a little bit different as soon as a speech is addresses to greater masses, namely, to a nation or

particular group of citizens. In speech event of the kind the roles may differ and among the listeners there might be numerous opponents and the orator might be not tolerated in spite of him being an influential figure.

4) The role of language:

The role of language here is looked upon the aspect how people communicate, whether it occurs in spoken or written forms etc. And since the political speech is closely linked with rhetorical aspects and persuasion it is easier to convince people through spoken discourse.

Intertextual context:

Participants in any discourse operate on the basis of assumptions about which previous series of discourse and the current one are connected to and their assumptions determine what can be taken as given in the sense of part of common experience, what can be alluded to, disagreed with and so on.

Al Gore (see Appendix 5):

“Like most Americans I have been wrestling with the question of what our country needs to defend to do defend itself from the kind of focused, intense and evil attack that we suffered a year ago, September 11.”

The intertextual, as well as situational context determines that nobody needs an explanation what this attack was. Everybody knows that September 11, 2001, was the date when Eastern terrorists attacked New York’s Twin towers and no specifications are required as to this.

Later in his speech Al Gore calls it:

“the cold-blooded murder of more than 3,000 Americans.”

And he says:

“Great nations persevere and then prevail.”

Again, due to the intertextual context this utterance needs no specification. The situational, as well as intertextual context, determines no other interpretation of what great nations are except that it is America. It is determined also by Al Gore’s belonging to this nation and it would be surprising if Al Gore concedes to anything else. Like the word “terrorism” is unconsciously related to Eastern people, particularly, Saddam Hussein, Osama bin Laden and Al Qaeda.

Similar things are present also in the speech by Z. Ozolina (see Appendix 11):

“A Think-Tank conference has gathered the brightest minds from all over the world to offer new, innovative, provocative, challenging, and brave ideas that will contribute to

a better understanding of what the international community can deliver to make the world more secure.”

This is also the case, when intertextual context determines the meaning of utterance and without any extra specifications the audience is aware of what is meant here.

3.3. Explanation in Political Speech Analysis

The final stage in critical discourse analyses is the stage of explanation.

Every speech, every oratorical performance has certain effects on audiences. The degree to which it affects listeners depends on how successfully the speaker has used earlier discussed discourse elements.

The political speeches under discussion in general deal with the struggle between different ideologies, the establishing of which politicians would hide behind the concept of peace, liberty and the like. It is the struggle between the Western world, democracy and the Eastern world with its authoritative regime. People are aware more or less of the fact that behind this struggle there lay not only political, but economic reasons, as well. People are aware that this struggle is based on ambitions of individuals. Still, political, religious and other leading figures are not allowed to demonstrate their ambitions explicitly and thus they need to convince masses that the struggle is realized in the name of communities, countries, parts of the world; they have to convince people to get support, to get direct and indirect permission to act in a certain way. Political speech thus is the way to deliver their ideas and through linguistic means make them appear as true and acceptable for larger groups and nations. Thus, for example, the way Saddam Hussein speaks to his people, manipulating with religious allusions (see Appendix 6, 7), make more believing people to act in the way he has intended, in the way he needs for establishing his influence, for spreading his ideas. Democratic leaders act similarly calling NATO a power of freedom (see Appendix 3) thus, to make people think that everything what is done on behalf of NATO is for the sake of freedom, peace and liberty. However, opinions vary also between leaders of seemingly the same ideologies. Thus, for example, B. Obama (see Appendix 10) in his anti-Iraq war speech goes against Bush's administration and through emotional lexical means and rhetorical questions he gathers those people, who do not believe in the ideologies G.W. Bush introduces. Every speech is a performance, every speech is a manipulation and every speech has effects upon listeners, upon the way they act, upon social events that constitute world's history day by day.

3.4. Peculiarities of Latvian Political Discourse

Since the theme of the paper concerns not only political discourse which occur within the English language, but also those political utterances that we meet on Latvian political stage, the next sub-chapter will introduce the theory about the role of culture in the discourse studies, as well as the theory and practice spread among Latvian language specialists.

As to the interaction of discourse and culture Halliday (1991: 46) says: “The context of a situation, however, is only the immediate environment. There is also a broader background against which the text has to be interpreted: its context of culture.” He explains (ibid.: 46) :

“Any actual context of situation, the particular configuration of field, tenor, and mode that has brought a text into being, is not just a random jumble features but a totality – a package, so to speak, of things that typically go together in the culture. People do these things on these occasions and attach these meanings and values to them; this is what a culture is.”

Krumina (2004: 323-325) lists four important aspects of discourse that are crucial cultural information bearers:

- 1) formulaic
- 2) lexical
- 3) prosodic
- 4) non-verbal

Formulaic aspect refers to the fact that “things may be expressed differently in other languages and that cultural conventions differ. Thus, for instance, an investigation of invitations in American English revealed that Americans tend to make “pseudo –invitations” – *I’ll call you some time! Give me a call!* – that are never fulfilled. This caused frustration in non-native speakers, who were not aware of the fact that for Americans only invitations with specific indication of the time and place of meeting seem to count as real invitations (ibid.: 324). Speaking in terms of politics in Latvia and referring to what has been mentioned above we can become a little bit ironic and assert that like American speakers tend to use pseudo-invitations so Latvian political figures tend to use a bulk of pseudo-promises in order to acquire supporters for their ideologies. The variety and amount of those false statements become always more widespread.

The second aspect of cultural importance introduced by Krumina (2004: 324) is the lexical one referring to variants and registers of corresponding language. For example – bring a “plate” for Australians means – bring something to eat.

The third aspect is *prosodic* – important features of spoken language, for example, tone groups, stress, pausing, intonation (ibid.: 324). For linguistic analyses of this paper this remains of secondary importance since the speech units under discussion are in transcribed form. Non-verbal aspects look at mimics, gesture, posture and other elements of body language. For example – not making closed gestures that appear as crossing legs, arms etc. in front of the audience (ibid.: 325). Still, in political speeches despite the fact of restricted *prosodic* and non- verbal expression, it might be attractive for the listener to see by what phonetic means and body language the speaker enhance and colours his performance.

Today, when globalisation plays its important part in the aspects of our lives, political included, a widespread phenomenon is what Krumina calls “communicative interference” – phenomenon, when people transfer the rules of their own native speech communities to what seems to them to be corresponding situation in new speech community [...] politicians are willing to join the world geographically, to give a contribution in the process of globalisation, everybody should take account of the sequences in language, that also languages a kind of emerge (ibid.: 326).

Since in politics as in business English is the leading language, Latvian politicians adapt themselves more to those language rules set by English grammar, syntax and vocabulary. This is well seen in the speech by A. Pabriks (see Appendix 12)

“To begin with, let me thank you all for coming to Riga where – it is no secret – the NATO Summit is taking place. It is of the utmost significance for our country that – one would say- the most important gathering of state leaders is being held in Riga right now. [...] However spectacular and even awesome official NATO meetings may be, it is in the very interests of NATO alongside, there should be an alternative, fresh and even provocative think-tank or forum for discussing global security concerns and developing new solutions or critically investigating the old ones.”

The politician seem to be trying to copy the American oratory style by using bright epithets and complex sentence structures for the sake of sounding more clever, more convincing and influential. However, the extract given above sounds a little bit clumsy in comparison with the fluent speeches of V.V. Freiberga and Z. Ozolina. Both women are known as bright personalities and it reflects also in the way they speak. It is obvious that a speaker has to be convinced about the ideas he or she spreads otherwise a speech might not have the supposed effect.

Continuing about *discourse* tendencies in Latvia, there are many things we have to develop. Theoretical background about the concept itself is yet not completely developed. A lecturer of the University of Latvia, Sergejs Kruks calls *discourse* “ievazātais vārds” and points to the fact that in comparison with simple speaking a discourse is a social activity (Kruks, 2005). However, social activities differ and thus also linguistic aspects differ. Specialists in Latvia speak of it in terms of stylistics - “the power of language to express additional information relating to the setting of an act of communication and the subjective attitude towards the topic of the speech or towards the addressee,” (Rozenbergs, 2004: 8). Still, Peter Verdonk (2002: 5), the author of the book *Stylistic*, describes stylistics as a discipline that confines itself only to a linguistic expression. Therefore, speaking in terms of political language from the point of view of stylistics, the analyst might pass over contextual features and thus misinterpret linguistic utterances. Kruks (2005) confesses that in the course of the investigation of political discourse in Latvia the main problem has been how to do it properly?

What is done up to now shows that political discourse in Latvia increasingly borders mutual intolerance. The analysis of parliamentary discourse in Saeima reveals that “contradictions, ignorance and denial are directed to both – to the speeches, as well as, to the speakers themselves,” (Kruks 2005).

Latvian political elite today is characterised by an unconditional struggle for power and instead of contributing development and quality of political community and political discourse, they contribute the ways to offend oppositions. Meanwhile cultivation of democratic values, holding to the matter and not shifting from the topic – those are things gradually vanishing from Latvian political discourse.

CONCLUSION

Political discourse, particularly political speech is a manipulation with audiences through lexical, as well as, grammatical means and the situational context in which a particular speech occurs. The way political manipulations and aims are reached was the subject of this paper. In order to establish theoretical background and comprehension of the matter the research was initiated with the study of available theory of the concept of discourse and discourse analysis. The main resources for discourse studies were the works by Halliday, van Dijk, Fairclough, Paltridge, Faber and other language specialists. Although, the authors claim that the concept of discourse is highly extensive and the term implies various aspects to be considered, there is a common assumption that underlies all theoretical studies. It defines a discourse as the use of language in a particular situational context. However, theoretical varieties also existed as to the definition of political discourse. To come to necessary findings different authors (van Dijk, Schaffner, Fairclough) were compared and the final conclusion lead to the fact that political discourse exists in various forms ranging from internal communication within political institutions and organizations to external communication forms that appear in the public space. Another much discussed issue is a link between political language and the ways it embrace different ideologies. In order to expose discourse techniques that serve to fulfil political goals, the author of the paper conducted critical discourse analysis of political speech based on Fairclough's approach of analysing ideologically marked texts. The analysis consisted of three stages: text description, interpretation and explanation, the former of which was the most comprehensive implying the analysis of lexical, grammatical, as well as, textual aspects. Two latter stages concerned the role of situational context, participants and other side issues of a particular speech event. The first stage most explicitly revealed the ways the language functions for manipulating with audiences. All political speeches introduced the same manner of using extended metaphors, euphemistic expressions and parallel constructions. Politicians favour to speak in a roundabout way thus implicitly pointing to ideological assumptions and leaving a space for interpretation.

As to Latvian political discourse the analysis showed that Latvian speakers are adopting world's leading oratory techniques. Still, less experienced speakers lack individuality, as well as, oratorical skills. It might be explained with the fact that the study of oratory, rhetoric, as well as, of political discourse is yet not fully developed and needs establishing theoretical framework thus to disperse ambiguity.

The study of political discourse might be all in all ambiguous unless the analyst has no clear idea and purpose of research. It is useful to compare different theories, but for actual analysis only one approach should be accepted otherwise the analyst may deviate from the main point

of his or her studies. Furthermore, discourse analysis, especially, political discourse analysis requires not only theoretical knowledge and well-planned strategy, but also interpretive and even creative skills thus to grasp the actual meaning of the texts.

THESES

1. Language is closely linked to its social function.
2. The concept of *discourse* is a *dense fabric* holding connection between language and the situational context it occurs.
3. Different fields of social sciences and humanities consider the concept of discourse from different perspectives.
4. Political discourse is closely linked with the concepts of power and ideology.
5. Discourse is a fundamental tool in political struggle and mass persuasion.
6. Political figures are well aware of the influence of a good speech therefore the genre of political speech is a well-considered and developed field of political discourse.
7. Each speech is an elaborately planned performance where ideological assumptions emerge linguistic structures thus to turn a speech into a political tool of mass persuasion.
8. Theoretical framework of discourse analysis introduces numerous strategies of conducting discourse analysis.
9. Discourse analysis of political speech requires a clear idea and purpose of research.
10. The main focus in political speech analysis is laid on discourse techniques that reveal political motives.
11. Politicians use numerous lexical, grammatical, as well as, contextual means to spread ideologies, make negative things seem positive, draw parallels between the same or opposite phenomena.
12. The most widespread discourse techniques are the use of metaphors, euphemisms, as well as, parallel constructions.
13. Situational context determines the way the listeners interpret linguistic features of a particular speech.

14. Every speech is a performance, every speech is manipulation and every speech has effects upon listeners, upon the way they act and social events that day by day constitute world's history.

REFERENCES

- 1) Dale, P. and Wolf, J.C. (2000) *Speech Communication Made Simple, A Multicultural Perspective*. Miami: Dade Community College.
- 2) Faber, B. (2007). *Discourse, Technology and Change*. London: YHT Ltd.
- 3) Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. New York: Longman.
- 4) Gee, J.P. (1999). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis. Theory and Method*. New York: Routledge
- 5) Halliday, M.A. K. and Hasan, R. (1991). *Language: Context and Text, Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 6) Krumina, L. (2004). *Cross Cultural Perspective of Classroom Discourse*. In *Valoda dažādu kultūru kontekstā*. Daugavpils: Daugavpils Universitātes Humanitārā fakultāte.
- 7) McLean I., (1996) *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 8) Orwell, G. (1957). *Inside the Whale*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- 9) Paltridge, B. (2006) *Discourse Analyses*. London: YHT Ltd.
- 10) Rozenbergs, J. (2004) *The Stylistics of Latvian*. Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds.
- 11) Spolsky, B. (1998) *Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 12) van Dijk, T.A., (1997a). *Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Sage Publications, Ltd.
- 13) van Dijk, T.A., (1997b) *Discourse as Structure and Process*. London: Sage Publications, Ltd.
- 14) Verdonk, P. (2002) *Stylistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 15) Wehmeier, S. (ed.), (2005). *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 16) Yule, G. (1996) *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 17) Meadows, B. (2008) Distancing and Showing Solidarity via metaphor and metonymy in Political Discourse. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analyses across Disciplines*. 1 (2): 1-17.
- 18) Schaffner, Ch. (1996) Political Speeches and Discourse Analyses. *Current Issues in Language & Society*. 3 (3): 201-204.

Internet sources:

- 19) Garecht, J. (2002) *Preparing for a Political Speech*. Available from <http://www.localvictory.com/Articles?political-speeches.html> [Accessed February 22, 2008].

- 20) Kruks, S. (2005) *Sabiedrības attieksme un politiskais diskurss*. Available from <http://www.politika.lv/index.php?id=5380> [Accessed April 21, 2008].
- 21) *What is discourse?* Available from <http://www.wisegeek.com/what-is-discourse.htm> [Accessed February 22, 2008].

Practical sources:

- 22) *Speech by Pope Benedict XVI*. Available from <http://www.zenit.org/article-16955?l=english> [Accessed April 23, 2008].
- 23) *Speech by Bush, G.W.* Available from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/05/20050507-8.html> [Accessed April 23, 2008].
- 24) *Speech by Bush, G.W. (NATO)*. Available from <http://www.rigasummit.lv/en/id/speechin/nid/51/> [Accessed April 23, 2008].
- 25) *Speech by Churchill, W.* Available from <http://www.hpol.org/churchill/> [Accessed April 23, 2008].
- 26) *Speech by Gore, A.* Available from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2002/sep/23/usa.iraq> [Accessed April 23, 2008].
- 27) *S. Hussein's Letter*. Available from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2003/apr/30/iraq.brianwhitaker> [Accessed April 23, 2008].
- 28) *Speech by Hussein, S.* Available from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2003/apr/04/iraq1> [Accesses April 23, 2008].
- 29) *Speech by Ickes, H.* Available from <http://www.historyplace.com/speeches/ickes.htm> [Accessed April 23, 2008].
- 30) *Speech by Pope John Paul II* http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/messages/peace/documents/hf_jp-ii_mes_19781221_xii-world-day-for-peace_en.html [Accessed April 23, 2008].
- 31) *Speech by Obama, B.* Available from <http://usliberals.about.com/od/extraordinaryspeeches/a/Obama2002War.htm> [Accesses April 23, 2008].
- 32) *Speech by Ozolina, Z.* Available from <http://www.rigasummit.lv/en/id/speechin/nid/37/> [Accessed April 23, 2008].
- 33) *Speech by Pabriks, A.* Available from <http://www.rigasummit.lv/en/id/speechin/nid/35/> [Accessed April 23, 2008].

34) *Speech by Vike- Freiberga, V.* Available from

<http://www.rigasummit.lv/en/id/speechin/nid/51/> [Accessed April 23, 2008].

THE EXTRACT OF THE SPEECH BY POPE BENEDICT XVI AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF REGENSBURG, GERMANY

SEPTEMBER 12, 2006

Your Eminences, Your Magnificences, Your Excellencies, Distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a moving experience for me to be back again in the university and to be able once again to give a lecture at this podium. I think back to those years when, after a pleasant period at the Freisinger Hochschule, I began teaching at the University of Bonn. That was in 1959, in the days of the old university made up of ordinary professors. The various chairs had neither assistants nor secretaries, but in recompense there was much direct contact with students and in particular among the professors themselves. We would meet before and after lessons in the rooms of the teaching staff. There was a lively exchange with historians, philosophers, philologists and, naturally, between the two theological faculties. Once a semester there was a *dies academicus*, when professors from every faculty appeared before the students of the entire university, making possible a genuine experience of *universitas* - something that you too, Magnificent Rector, just mentioned - the experience, in other words, of the fact that despite our specializations which at times make it difficult to communicate with each other, we made up a whole, working in everything on the basis of a single rationality with its various aspects and sharing responsibility for the right use of reason - this reality became a lived experience. The university was also very proud of its two theological faculties. It was clear that, by inquiring about the reasonableness of faith, they too carried out a work which is necessarily part of the "whole" of the *universitas scientiarum*, even if not everyone could share the faith which theologians seek to correlate with reason as a whole. This profound sense of coherence within the universe of reason was not troubled, even when it was once reported that a colleague had said there was something odd about our university: it had two faculties devoted to something that did not exist: God. That even in the face of such radical scepticism it is still necessary and reasonable to raise the question of God through the use of reason, and to do so in the context of the tradition of the Christian faith: this, within the university as a whole, was accepted without question. I was reminded of all this recently, when I read the edition by Professor Theodore Khoury of part of the dialogue carried on - perhaps in 1391 in the winter barracks near Ankara - by the erudite Byzantine emperor Manuel II Paleologus and an educated Persian on the subject of Christianity and Islam, and

the truth of both. It was presumably the emperor himself who set down this dialogue, during the siege of Constantinople between 1394 and 1402; and this would explain why his arguments are given in greater detail than those of his Persian interlocutor. The dialogue ranges widely over the structures of faith contained in the Bible and in the Qur'an, and deals especially with the image of God and of man, while necessarily returning repeatedly to the relationship between - as they were called - three "Laws" or "rules of life": the Old Testament, the New Testament and the Qur'an. It is not my intention to discuss this question in the present lecture; here I would like to discuss only one point - itself rather marginal to the dialogue as a whole - which, in the context of the issue of "faith and reason", I found interesting and which can serve as the starting-point for my reflections on this issue.

In the seventh conversation edited by Professor Khoury, the emperor touches on the theme of the holy war. The emperor must have known that surah 2, 256 reads: "There is no compulsion in religion". According to the experts, this is one of the suras of the early period, when Mohammed was still powerless and under threat. But naturally the emperor also knew the instructions, developed later and recorded in the Qur'an, concerning holy war. Without descending to details, such as the difference in treatment accorded to those who have the "Book" and the "infidels", he addresses his interlocutor with a startling brusqueness on the central question about the relationship between religion and violence in general, saying: "Show me just what Mohammed brought that was new, and there you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command to spread by the sword the faith he preached". The emperor, after having expressed himself so forcefully, goes on to explain in detail the reasons why spreading the faith through violence is something unreasonable. Violence is incompatible with the nature of God and the nature of the soul. "God", he says, "is not pleased by blood - and not acting reasonably is contrary to God's nature. Faith is born of the soul, not the body. Whoever would lead someone to faith needs the ability to speak well and to reason properly, without violence and threats... To convince a reasonable soul, one does not need a strong arm, or weapons of any kind, or any other means of threatening a person with death...".

The decisive statement in this argument against violent conversion is this: not to act in accordance with reason is contrary to God's nature. The editor, Theodore Khoury, observes: For the emperor, as a Byzantine shaped by Greek philosophy, this statement is self-evident. But for Muslim teaching, God is absolutely transcendent. His will is not bound up with any of our categories, even that of rationality. Here Khoury quotes a work of the noted French Islamist R. Arnaldez, who points out that Ibn Hazn went so far as to state that God is not

bound even by his own word, and that nothing would oblige him to reveal the truth to us. Were it God's will, we would even have to practise idolatry.

At this point, as far as understanding of God and thus the concrete practice of religion is concerned, we are faced with an unavoidable dilemma. Is the conviction that acting unreasonably contradicts God's nature merely a Greek idea, or is it always and intrinsically true? I believe that here we can see the profound harmony between what is Greek in the best sense of the word and the biblical understanding of faith in God. Modifying the first verse of the Book of Genesis, the first verse of the whole Bible, John began the prologue of his Gospel with the words [...]. This is the very word used by the emperor: God acts with logos. Logos means both reason and word - a reason which is creative and capable of self-communication, precisely as reason. John thus spoke the final word on the biblical concept of God, and in this word all the often toilsome and tortuous threads of biblical faith find their culmination and synthesis. In the beginning was the logos, and the logos is God, says the Evangelist. The encounter between the Biblical message and Greek thought did not happen by chance. The vision of Saint Paul, who saw the roads to Asia barred and in a dream saw a Macedonian man plead with him: "Come over to Macedonia and help us!" - this vision can be interpreted as a "distillation" of the intrinsic necessity of a rapprochement between Biblical faith and Greek inquiry.

THE SPEECH BY GEORGE W. BUSH IN RIGA

MAY 7, 2006

Sveiki Draugi. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for the warm welcome. Madam President, Laura and I thank you for your kind words of introduction, we thank you for your principled leadership, and I thank you for your friendship, and we thank you for the hospitality that you and Dr. Freibergs have shown us.

I want to thank the people of the Republic of Latvia for being such gracious hosts for my visit here. And I want to also thank the Prime Minister for joining us, and members of the government. Thank you, Mr. Prime Minister. Laura and I are so pleased to make this second journey to the Baltic States, and our first visit to the great land of Latvia. We're honored, as well, to be in the company of President Ruutel of Estonia, and President Adamkus of Lithuania -- thank you both for coming. These are good friends to Latvia, and good friends to America.

The Baltic countries have seen one of the most dramatic transformations in modern history, from captive nations to NATO allies and EU members in little more than a decade. The Latvian, Estonian, and Lithuanian people showed that the love of liberty is stronger than the will of an empire. And today you're standing for liberty beyond your borders, so that others do not suffer the injustices you have known. The American people admire your moral courage in the cause of freedom.

This week, nations on both sides of the Atlantic observe the 60th anniversary of Hitler's defeat. The evil that seized power in Germany brought war to all of Europe, and waged war against morality, itself. What began as a movement of thugs became a government without conscience, and then an empire of bottomless cruelty. The Third Reich exalted the strong over the weak, overran and humiliated peaceful countries, undertook a mad quest for racial purity, coldly planned and carried out the murder of millions, and defined evil for the ages. Brave men and women of many countries faced that evil, and fought through dark and desperate years for their families and their homelands. In the end, a dictator who worshiped power was confined to four walls of a bunker, and the fall of his squalid tyranny is a day to remember and to celebrate. [...] The Baltic States had no role in starting World War II. The battle came here because of a secret pact between dictators. And when the war came, many in this region showed their courage. After a puppet government ordered the Latvian fleet to return to port,

sailors on eight freighters chose to remain at sea under the flag of free Latvia, assisting the United States Merchant Marine in carrying supplies across the Atlantic. A newspaper in the state of South Carolina described the Latvian crew this way: "They all have beards and dressed so differently... They are ... exhausted, but full of fighting spirit." [...]

The end of World War II raised unavoidable questions for my country: Had we fought and sacrificed only to achieve the permanent division of Europe into armed camps? Or did the cause of freedom and the rights of nations require more of us? Eventually, America and our strong allies made a decision: We would not be content with the liberation of half of Europe -- and we would not forget our friends behind an Iron Curtain. We defended the freedom of Greece and Turkey, and airlifted supplies to Berlin, and broadcast the message of liberty by radio. We spoke up for dissenters, and challenged an empire to tear down a hated wall. Eventually, communism began to collapse under external pressure, and under the weight of its own contradictions. And we set the vision of a Europe whole, free, and at peace -- so dictators could no longer rise up and feed ancient grievances, and conflict would not be repeated again and again.

In these decades of struggle and purpose, the Baltic peoples kept a long vigil of suffering and hope. Though you lived in isolation, you were not alone. The United States refused to recognize your occupation by an empire. The flags of free Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania -- illegal at home -- flew proudly over diplomatic missions in the United States. And when you joined hands in protest and the empire fell away, the legacy of Yalta was finally buried, once and for all. The security and freedom of the Baltic nations is now more than a noble aspiration; it is the binding pledge of the alliance we share. The defense of your freedom -- in defense of your freedom you will never stand alone.

From the vantage point of this new century, we recognize the end of the Cold War as part of an even broader movement in our world. From Germany and Japan after World War II, to Latin America, to Asia, and Central and Eastern Europe, and now to the broader Middle East, the advance of freedom is the great story of our age. And in this history, there are important lessons. We have learned that free nations grow stronger with time, because they rise on the creativity and enterprise of their people. We have learned that governments accountable to citizens are peaceful, while dictatorships stir resentments and hatred to cover their own failings. We have learned that the skeptics and pessimists are often wrong, because men and women in every culture, when given the chance, will choose liberty. We have learned that even after a long wait in the darkness of tyranny, freedom can arrive suddenly, like the break

of day. And we have learned that the demand for self-government is often driven and sustained by patriotism, by the traditions and heroes and language of a native land.

Yet we've also learned that sovereignty and majority rule are only the beginnings of freedom. The promise of democracy starts with national pride, and independence, and elections. But it does not end there. The promise of democracy is fulfilled by minority rights, and equal justice under the rule of law, and an inclusive society in which every person belongs. A country that divides into factions and dwells on old grievances cannot move forward, and risks sliding back into tyranny. A country that unites all its people behind common ideals will multiply in strength and confidence. The successful democracies of the 21st century will not be defined by blood and soil. Successful democracies will be defined by a broader ideal of citizenship -- based on shared principles, shared responsibilities, and respect for all. For my own country, the process of becoming a mature, multi-ethnic democracy was lengthy and violent. Our journey from national independence to equal injustice [sic] included the enslavement of millions, and a four-year civil war. Even after slavery ended, a century passed before an oppressed minority was guaranteed equal rights. Americans found that racial division almost destroyed us, and the false doctrine of "separate but equal" was no basis for a strong and unified country. The only way we found to rise above the injustices of our history was to reject segregation, to move beyond mere tolerance, and to affirm the brotherhood of everyone in our land. [...]

In recent months, the Baltic governments gave assistance during the election in Ukraine, and the people of that country chose a wise and visionary leader. As President Yushchenko works to strengthen the rule of law and open Ukraine's economy, the United States will help that nation join the institutions that bind our democracies. Later on this trip I'll travel to Georgia, another country that is taking a democratic path and deserves support on its journey. My country will stand by Georgian leaders who respect minority rights and work to peacefully unify their country, and grow closer to the free nations in Europe. We're also committed to democratic progress in Moldova, where leaders have pledged to expand freedom of the press, to protect minority rights, and to make government institutions more accountable.

All of us are committed to the advance of freedom in Belarus. The people of that country live under Europe's last dictatorship, and they deserve better. The governments of Latvia and Lithuania have worked to build support for democracy in Belarus, and to deliver truthful information by radio and newspapers. Together we have set a firm and confident standard:

Repression has no place on this continent. The people of Minsk deserve the same freedom you have in Tallinn, and Vilnius, and Riga.

All the nations that border Russia will benefit from the spread of democratic values -- and so will Russia, itself. Stable, prosperous democracies are good neighbors, trading in freedom, and posing no threat to anyone. The United States has free and peaceful nations to the north and south of us. We do not consider ourselves to be encircled; we consider ourselves to be blessed. No good purpose is served by stirring up fears and exploiting old rivalries in this region. The interests of Russia and all nations are served by the growth of freedom that leads to prosperity and peace. Inside Russia, leaders have made great progress over the last 15 years. President Putin recently stated that Russia's future lies within Europe -- and America agrees. He also stated that Russia's democratic future will not be determined by outsiders -- and America agrees, as well. That nation will follow its own course, according to its own history. Yet all free and successful countries have some common characteristics: freedom of worship, freedom of the press, economic liberty, the rule of law, and the limitation of power through checks and balances. In the long run, it is the strength of Russian democracy that will determine the greatness of Russia. And I believe the Russian people value their freedom, and will settle for nothing less.

For all the problems that remain, it is a miracle of history that this young century finds us speaking about the consolidation of freedom throughout Europe. And the stunning democratic gains of the last several decades are only the beginning. Freedom is not tired. The ideal of human dignity is not weary. And the next stage of the world democratic movement is already unfolding in the broader Middle East.

We seek democracy in that region for the same reasons we spent decades working for democracy in Europe -- because freedom is the only reliable path to peace. If the Middle East continues to simmer in anger and resentment and hopelessness, caught in a cycle of repression and radicalism, it will produce terrorism of even greater audacity and destructive power. But if the peoples of that region gain the right of self-government, and find hopes to replace their hatreds, then the security of all free nations will be strengthened. We will not repeat the mistakes of other generations, appeasing or excusing tyranny, and sacrificing freedom in the vain pursuit of stability. We have learned our lesson; no one's liberty is expendable. In the long run, our security and true stability depend on the freedom of others. And so, with confidence and resolve, we will stand for freedom across the broader Middle East. In this great objective, we need a realism that understands the difficulties. But we must turn away

from a pessimism that abandons the goal and consigns millions to endless tyranny. And we have reason for optimism. When the people of Afghanistan were finally given the vote, they chose humane rulers and a future of freedom. When the people of the Palestinian Territories went to the polls, they chose a leader committed to negotiation instead of violence. When Iraqi voters turned out by the millions, they repudiated the killers who hate and attack their liberty. There's much work ahead, but the direction of events is clear in the broader Middle East: Freedom is on the march.

Recent elections have brought a tremendous catalyst for change, and more are on the way. Elections are set to start at the end of this month in Lebanon, and those elections must go forward with no outside interference. The people of Lebanon now have the opportunity to bridge old divides and build an independent government. Egypt will hold a presidential election this fall. That election should proceed with international monitors, and with rules that allow for a real campaign.

As in other parts of the world, the work of democracy is larger than holding a fair election; it requires building the structures that sustain freedom. Selective liberalization -- the easing of oppressive laws - is progress, but it is not enough. Successful democracies that effectively protect individual rights require viable political parties, an independent judiciary, a diverse media, and limits on executive power. There is no modernization without democracy. Ultimately, human rights and human development depend on human liberty.

As in other parts of the world, successful democracies in the broader Middle East must also bridge old racial and religious divides -- and democracy is the only force capable of doing so. In Iraq, the new Cabinet includes members of all of Iraq's leading ethnic and religious groups, who, despite their differences, share a commitment to democracy, freedom, and the rule of law. The new President of Iraq is a member of a minority group that was attacked with poison gas by the former regime. Democracy is fostering internal peace by protecting individual rights, while giving every minority a role in the nation's future. Iraq's free government is showing the way for others, and is winning the respect of a watching world.

In the Middle East, we are seeing the rule of law -- the rule of fear give way to the hope of change. And brave reformers in that region deserve more than our praise. The established democracies have a duty to help emerging democracies of the broader Middle East. They need our help, because freedom has deadly enemies in that region -- men who celebrate murder,

incite suicide, and thirst for absolute power. By aiding democratic transitions, we will isolate the forces of hatred and terror and defeat them before violence spreads.

The Baltic states are members of a global coalition, and each is making essential contributions every day. Lithuania is preparing to deploy a reconstruction team to western Afghanistan, and has troops in Iraq conducting patrols and aiding in reconstruction. Estonians are serving in Afghanistan, they're detecting and removing explosives, and Estonian troops serve side-by-side with Americans in Baghdad. Latvia has a team in Kabul, Afghanistan, clearing mines, and soldiers in Iraq providing convoy security and patrols. Your commitment to freedom has brought sacrifice. We remember Lieutenant Olafs Baumanis, who was killed in Iraq. We ask for God's blessings for his family, and we're honored that his wife, Vita, is here with us today.

It's no surprise that Afghanistan and Iraq find strong allies in the Baltic nations. Because you've recently known tyranny, you are offended by the oppression of others. The men and women under my command are proud to serve with you. Today I'm honored to deliver the thanks of the American people.

Sixty years ago, on the 7th of May, the world reacted with joy and relief at the defeat of fascism in Europe. The next day, General Dwight D. Eisenhower announced that "history's mightiest machine of conquest has been utterly destroyed." Yet the great democracies soon found that a new mission had come to us -- not merely to defeat a single dictator, but to defeat the idea of dictatorship on this continent. Through the decades of that struggle, some endured the rule of tyrants; all lived in the frightening shadow of war. Yet because we lifted our sights and held firm to our principles, freedom prevailed.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, the freedom of Europe, won by courage, must be secured by effort and goodwill. In our time, as well, we must raise our sights. In the distance we can see another great goal -- not merely the absence of tyranny on this continent, but the end of tyranny in our world. Once again, we're asked to hold firm to our principles, and to value the liberty of others. And once again, if we do our part, freedom will prevail.

Thank you, and God bless.

THE SPEECH BY GEORGE W. BUSH IN NATO SUMMIT IN RIGA

NOVEMBER 28, 2006

UNIDENTIFIED PARTICIPANT: Ladies and gentlemen, the Co-chairman of the German Marshall Fund of the United States, Marc Leland. Ladies and gentlemen, the President of the Republic of Latvia, Her Excellency, Vaira Vike-Freiberga. Ladies and gentlemen, the President of the United States. [...]

[Speech by Vaira Vike Freiberga]

GEORGE W BUSH, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: Madam President, thank you for your kind words, thank you for your leadership and thank you for friendship.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Prime Minister, Senator Sessions from the great State of Alabama who is with us. Marc Leland, my friend from a long period of time. I want to thank the rector of this important university, distinguished guests, ladies and gentleman, thank you for your warm welcome. I am delighted to be back in Riga.

I appreciate the lead Latvia Transatlantic Organization, the Commission of Strategic Analysis and the German Marshall Fund of the United States for organizing this important conference.

This is my third visit to the Baltics as the President of the United States. And it is my second visit to this beautiful city. I just can't stay away.

I am thrilled and honored to back here. And I bring greetings and good wishes of the American people. Not far from where we meet today stands Riga's freedom monument. It was erected in 1935 during this country's brief period of independence between the two world wars.

During the dark years of Soviet occupation, the simple act of laying flowers at the foot of this monument was considered a crime by communist authorities. In 1989, the monument was a scene of one of the most remarkable protests in the history of freedom: hundreds of thousands of people stood together and formed a human chain that stretched nearly 400 miles across the Baltics. [...] As members of NATO, you are vital part of the most effective multilateral organization in the world and the most important military alliance in history. As NATO allies,

you will never again stand alone in defense of your freedom, and you'll never be occupied by a foreign power.

Each of the Baltic countries is meeting this obligation to strengthen NATO by bringing new energy and vitality and clarity of purpose to the alliance. Your love of liberty has made NATO stronger. And with your help, our alliance is rising to meet the great challenges and responsibilities of this young century by making NATO the world's most effective united force for freedom.

One of the great responsibilities of this alliance is to strengthen and expand the circle of freedom here in Europe. In the nearly six decades since NATO's founding, Europe has experienced an unprecedented expansion of liberty. A continent that was once divided by an ugly wall is now united in freedom.

Yet the work of united Europe is not fully complete. Many nations that threw off the shackles of tyranny are still working to build the free institutions that are the foundation of successful democracies.

NATO is encouraging these nations on the path to reform. And as governments make hard decisions for their people, they will be welcomed into the institutions of the Euro-Atlantic community.

After I took office in 2001, I declared that the United States believes in NATO membership for all of Europe's democracies that seek it and are ready to share the responsibility that NATO brings. [...]

As we help the new democracies of Europe join the institutions of Europe, we must not forget those who still anguish in tyranny. Just across the boarder from here lies the nation of Belarus, a place where peaceful protestors are beaten and opposition leaders are dispersed by the agents of a cruel regime.

The existence of such oppression in our midst offends the conscience of Europe and it offends the conscience of America. We have a message for the people of Belarus, the vision of a Europe: whole, free and at peace includes you, and we stand with you in your struggle for freedom.

Another great responsibility of this Alliance is to transform for new challenges. When NATO was formed in 1949, its principal mission was to protect Europe from a Soviet tank invasion.

Today the Soviet threat is gone. And under the able leadership of the Secretary General, NATO is transforming from a static alliance focused on the defense of Europe into an expeditionary Alliance ready to deploy outside of Europe in the defense of freedom.

This is a vital mission. Over the past six years, we have taken decisive action to transform our capabilities in the Alliance. We created a new NATO transformation command to insure that our Alliance is always preparing for the threats for the future. We created a new NATO battalion to counter the threats of enemies armed with weapons of mass destruction.

We created a new NATO response force to ensure that our Alliance can deploy rapidly and effectively. Here in Riga we are taking new steps to build on this progress. At this Summit, we will launch a NATO special operations forces initiative that will strengthen the ability of special operations personnel from NATO nations to work together on the battlefield. [...]

We will launch a new NATO training cooperation initiative that will allow military forces in the Middle East to receive NATO training and counter terrorism and counter proliferation and peace support operations.[...]

The most basic responsibility of this alliance is to defend our people against the threats of the new century. We are in a long struggle against terrorists and extremists who follow a hateful ideology and seek to establish a totalitarian empire from Spain to Indonesia. We fight against the extremists who desire safe havens and are willing to kill innocents anywhere to achieve their objectives.

NATO has recognized this threat. And three years ago NATO took an unprecedented step when it sent allied forces to defend a young democracy, more than 3,000 miles from Europe. Since taking command of the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan, NATO has expanded it from a small force that was operating only in Kabul into a robust force that conducts security operations in all of Afghanistan. [...]

We saw the effectiveness of NATO forces this summer when NATO took charge of security operations in Southern Afghanistan from the United States. The Taliban radicals that were trying to pull down Afghanistan's democracy and regain power saw the transfer from American to NATO control as a window of opportunity to test the will of the alliance.[...]

Today Afghanistan is NATO's most important military operation. And by standing together in Afghanistan we will protect our people, defend our freedom and send a clear message to the extremists - the forces of freedom and decency will prevail.

Every ally can take pride in the transformation that NATO is making possible for the people of Afghanistan. Because of our efforts, Afghanistan has gone from a totalitarian nightmare to a free nation with an elected president, a democratic constitution, and brave soldiers and police fighting for their country. [...]

A nation that was once a terrorist sanctuary has been transformed into a ally in the war on terror led by a brave president, Mohammed Karzai.

Our work in Afghanistan is bringing freedom to the Afghani people. It is bringing security to the Euro Atlantic community and it is bringing pride to the NATO alliance.

NATO allies are also making vital contributions to the struggle for freedom in Iraq. At this moment, a dozen NATO allies, including every one of the Baltic nations, are contributing forces to the coalition in Iraq. And 18 NATO countries, plus Ukraine, are contributing forces to the NATO training mission that is helping develop the next generation of leaders for the Iraqi security forces.[...]

By helping to equip the Iraqi security forces and training the next group of Iraqi military leaders, NATO is helping the Iraqi people in the difficult work of securing their country in their freedom. [...]

But there is one thing I am not going to do. I am not going to pull our troops off the battlefield before the mission is complete. The battles in Iraq and Afghanistan are part of a struggle between moderation and extremism that is unfolding across the broader middle east. Our enemy follows a hateful ideology that rejects fundamental freedoms like the freedom to speak, to assemble, or to worship god in a way you see fit. It opposes the rights for women. Their goal is to overthrow governments and to impose their totalitarian rule on millions.

They have a strategy to achieve these aims. They seek to convince America and our allies that we cannot defeat them and that our only hope is withdrawal and abandoned an entire region to their domination.

The war on terror that we fight today is more than a military conflict. It is the decisive ideological struggle of the 21st century. And in this struggle, we can accept nothing less than victory for our children and our grandchildren.

We see the struggle in Lebanon where last week gunmen assassinated that country's industry minister, Pierre Gemayel, a prominent leader of the movement that secured Lebanon independence last year. His murder showed once again the viciousness of those who are trying to destabilize Lebanon's young democracy.

We see the struggle in Syria where the regime allows Iranian weapons to pass through its territory into Lebanon and provides weapons and political support to Hezbollah.

We see the struggle in Iran where a reactionary regime subjugates its proud people, arrests free trade union leaders and uses Iran's resources to fund the spread of terror and pursue nuclear weapons.

We see the struggle in the Palestinian territories where extremists are working to stop moderate leaders from making progress toward the vision of two democratic states, Israel and Palestine, living side by side in peace and security.

In each of these places, extremists are using terror to stop the spread of freedom. Some are Shia extremists, other are Sunni extremists. But they represent different faces of the same threat. And if they succeed in undermining fragile democracies and drive the forces of freedom out of the region, they will have an open field to pursue their goals.

Each strain of violent Islamic radicalism will be emboldened in its efforts to gain control of states and establish new safe havens. The extremists would use oil resources to fuel their radical agenda. And to punish industrialized nations and pursue weapons of mass destruction. Armed with nuclear weapons they could blackmail the free world, spread their ideologies of hate, and raise a mortal threat to Europe, America, and the entire civilized world.

If we allow the extremists to do this, then 50 years from now history will look back on our time with unforgiving clarity and demand to know why we did not act.

Our alliance has a responsibility to act. We must lift up and support the moderates and reformers who are working for change across the broader Middle East. We must bring hope to millions by strengthening young democracies from Kabul to Baghdad to Beirut. And we must advance freedom as the great alternative to tyranny and terror.

I know some in my country, and some here in Europe are pessimistic about the prospects of democracy and peace in the Middle East. Some doubt whether the people of that region are ready for freedom or want it badly enough, or have the courage to overcome the forces of totalitarian extremism.

I understand these doubts, but I do not share them. I believe in the universality of freedom. I believe that the people of the Middle East want their liberty. I'm impressed by the courage I see in the people across the region who are fighting for that liberty. We see this courage in the eight million Afghan's who defied terrorist threats and went to the polls to choose their leaders.

We see this courage in the nearly 12 million Iraqi's who refused to let the car bombers and assassins stop them from voting for the free future of their country. We see this courage in the more than one million Lebanese who voted for a free and sovereign government to rule their land. And we see this courage in citizens from Damascus to Tehran, who like the citizens of Riga before them keep the flame of liberty burning deep within their hearts knowing that one day it's light will shine throughout their nations. [...]

The question facing our nations today is this: will we turn the fate of millions over to totalitarian extremists and allow the enemy to impose their hateful ideology across the Middle East? Or will we stand with the forces of freedom in that part of the world and defend the moderate majority who want a future of peace?

My country has made its choice and so has the NATO Alliance. We refuse to give in to the pessimism that consigns millions across the Middle East to endless oppression. We understand that ultimately the only path to lasting peace is to the rise of lasting free societies.

Here in the Baltic region, many understand that freedom is universal and worth the struggle. During the Second World War, a young girl here in Riga escaped with her family from the advancing Red army. She fled westward, moving first to a refugee camp in Germany and then later to Morocco where she and her family settled for five-and-a-half years.

Spending her teen age years in a Muslim nation, this Latvian girl came to understand a fundamental truth about humanity - moms and dads in the Muslim world want the same things for their children as moms and dads here in Riga: a future of peace, a change to live in freedom and the opportunity to build a better life.

Today that Latvian girl is the leader of a free country, the iron lady of the Baltics, the President of Latvia.

And the lessons she learned growing up in Casablanca guide her as she leads her nation in this world.

Here's how she put it earlier this year in an address to the joint meeting of the United States congress. "We know the value of freedom, and feel compassion for those who are still deprived of it. Every nation on earth is entitled to freedom, your president said." She said, "we must share the dream that some day there won't be a tyranny left any where in the world. We must work for this future, all of us large and small together. Like your president, I believe this dream is within reach. And through the NATO alliance, nations large and small are working together to achieve it."

We thank the people of Latvia for your contributions to NATO.

And for the powerful example you set for liberty. I appreciate your hospitality at this summit. America is proud to call you friends and allies in the cause of peace and freedom. May God bless you and may God continue to bless America.

Thank you very much.

THE SPEECH BY WINSTON CHURCHILL

MARCH 5, 1946

The United States stands at this time at the pinnacle of world power. It is a solemn moment for the American democracy. For with this primacy in power is also joined an awe-inspiring accountability to the future. As you look around you, you must feel not only the sense of duty done, but also you must feel anxiety lest you fall below the level of achievement. Opportunity is here now, clear and shining, for both our countries. To reject it or ignore it or fritter it away will bring upon us all the long reproaches of the aftertime.

It is necessary that constancy of mind, persistency of purpose, and the grand simplicity of decision shall rule and guide the conduct of the English-speaking peoples in peace as they did in war. We must, and I believe we shall, prove ourselves equal to this severe requirement. [...]

The safety of the world, ladies and gentlemen, requires a unity in Europe, from which no nation should be permanently outcast. It is from the quarrels of the strong parent races in Europe that the world wars we have witnessed, or which occurred in former times, have sprung.

Twice the United States has had to send several millions of its young men across the Atlantic to fight the wars. But now we all can find any nation, wherever it may dwell, between dusk and dawn. Surely we should work with conscious purpose for a grand pacification of Europe within the structure of the United Nations and in accordance with our Charter.

In a great number of countries, far from the Russian frontiers and throughout the world, Communist fifth columns are established and work in complete unity and absolute obedience to the directions they receive from the Communist center. Except in the British Commonwealth and in the United States where Communism is in its infancy, the Communist parties or fifth columns constitute a growing challenge and peril to Christian civilization.

The outlook is also anxious in the Far East and especially in Manchuria. The agreement which was made at Yalta, to which I was a party, was extremely favorable to Soviet Russia, but it was made at a time when no one could say that the German war might not extend all through

the summer and autumn of 1945 and when the Japanese war was expected by the best judges to last for a further eighteen months from the end of the German war.

I repulse the idea that a new war is inevitable -- still more that it is imminent. It is because I am sure that our fortunes are still in our own hands and that we hold the power to save the future, that I feel the duty to speak out now that I have the occasion and the opportunity to do so.

I do not believe that Soviet Russia desires war. What they desire is the fruits of war and the indefinite expansion of their power and doctrines.

But what we have to consider here today while time remains, is the permanent prevention of war and the establishment of conditions of freedom and democracy as rapidly as possible in all countries. Our difficulties and dangers will not be removed by closing our eyes to them. They will not be removed by mere waiting to see what happens; nor will they be removed by a policy of appeasement.

What is needed is a settlement, and the longer this is delayed, the more difficult it will be and the greater our dangers will become.

From what I have seen of our Russian friends and allies during the war, I am convinced that there is nothing they admire so much as strength, and there is nothing for which they have less respect than for weakness, especially military weakness.

For that reason the old doctrine of a balance of power is unsound. We cannot afford, if we can help it, to work on narrow margins, offering temptations to a trial of strength.

Last time I saw it all coming and I cried aloud to my own fellow countrymen and to the world, but no one paid any attention. Up till the year 1933 or even 1935, Germany might have been saved from the awful fate which has overtaken her and we might all have been spared the miseries Hitler let loose upon mankind.

There never was a war in history easier to prevent by timely action than the one which has just desolated such great areas of the globe. It could have been prevented, in my belief, without the firing of a single shot, and Germany might be powerful, prosperous and honored today; but no one would listen and one by one we were all sucked into the awful whirlpool.

We must not let it happen again. This can only be achieved by reaching now, in 1946, a good understanding on all points with Russia under the general authority of the United Nations Organization and by the maintenance of that good understanding through many peaceful years, by the whole strength of the English-speaking world and all its connections.

If the population of the English-speaking Commonwealth be added to that of the United States, with all that such cooperation implies in the air, on the sea, all over the globe, and in science and in industry, and in moral force, there will be no quivering, precarious balance of power to offer its temptation to ambition or adventure. On the contrary there will be an overwhelming assurance of security.

If we adhere faithfully to the Charter of the United Nations and walk forward in sedate and sober strength, seeking no one's land or treasure, seeking to lay no arbitrary control upon the thoughts of men, if all British moral and material forces and convictions are joined with your own in fraternal association, the high roads of the future will be clear, not only for us but for all, not only for our time but for a century to come.

THE EXTRACT OF THE SPEECH BY FORMER VICE PRESIDENT OF
THE U.S.A. AL GORE

SEPTEMBER 23, 2002

Thank you very much. I certainly appreciate the warmth of your welcome and I want to thank Gloria Duffy for that generous - and I hasten to add, over-generous - introduction. Tipper and I both enjoyed listening to that. To George Dobbins, the program director, and Connie Shapiro, our moderator. Also, I want to thank Mayor Willie Brown for his help in helping to establish this on relatively short notice. I appreciate his friendship.

Thanks for your kind words on my service as vice president. I felt it was a tremendous honor. I enjoyed the job. I have to tell you that I did some research about the vice presidency and found that quite a number of my predecessors did not really fully appreciate the job. Some of them resigned. Just to give one example before I get into my speech here. John C. Calhoun actually resigned the vice presidency in 1825 to become a senator from South Carolina. And as many of you know, he subsequently lost that seat to Strom Thurmond, who's still there.

I want to talk about the relationship between America's war against terrorism and America's proposed war against Iraq. Like most Americans I've been wrestling with the question of what our country needs to do to defend itself from the kind of focused, intense and evil attack that we suffered a year ago, September 11. We ought to assume that the forces responsible for that attack are even now attempting to plan another attack against us.

I'm speaking today in an effort to recommend a specific course of action for our country, which I sincerely believe would be better for our country than the policy that is now being pursued by President Bush. Specifically, I am deeply concerned that the course of action that we are presently embarking upon with respect to Iraq has the potential to seriously damage our ability to win the war against terrorism and to weaken our ability to lead the world in this new century.

To begin with - to put first things first - I believe we should focus our efforts first and foremost against those who attacked us on September 11th and who have thus far gotten away with it. The vast majority of those who sponsored, planned and implemented the cold-blooded murder of more than 3,000 Americans are still at large, still neither located nor apprehended, much less punished and neutralized. I do not believe that we should allow ourselves to be

distracted from this urgent task simply because it is proving to be more difficult and lengthy than was predicted. Great nations persevere and then prevail. They do not jump from one unfinished task to another. We should remain focused on the war against terrorism.

I believe that we are perfectly capable of staying the course in our war against Osama Bin Laden and his terrorist network, while simultaneously taking those steps necessary to build an international coalition to join us in taking on Saddam Hussein in a timely fashion. If you're going after Jesse James, you ought to organize the posse first. Especially if you're in the middle of a gunfight with somebody who's out after you.

I don't think we should allow anything to diminish our focus on the necessity for avenging the 3,000 Americans who were murdered and dismantling the network of terrorists that we know were responsible for it. The fact that we don't know where they are should not cause us to focus instead on some other enemy whose location may be easier to identify. We have other enemies, but we should focus first and foremost as our top priority on winning the war against terrorism.

Nevertheless, President Bush is telling us that America's most urgent requirement of the moment - right now - is not to redouble our efforts against Al Qaeda, not to stabilize the nation of Afghanistan after driving its host government from power, even as Al Qaeda members slip back across the border to set up in Afghanistan again; rather, he is telling us that our most urgent task right now is to shift our focus and concentrate on immediately launching a new war against Saddam Hussein. And the president is proclaiming a new, uniquely American right to preemptively attack whomsoever he may deem represents a potential future threat.

Moreover, President Bush is demanding in this high political season that Congress speedily affirm that he has the necessary authority to proceed immediately against Iraq and, for that matter, under the language of his resolution, against any other nation in the region, regardless of subsequent developments or emerging circumstances. Now, the timing of this sudden burst of urgency to immediately take up this new cause as America's new top priority, displacing our former top priority, the war against Osama Bin Laden, was explained innocently by the White House chief of staff in his now well-known statement that "From a marketing point of view, you don't introduce new products in August."

Nevertheless, all Americans should acknowledge that Iraq does indeed pose a serious threat to the stability of the Persian Gulf region, and we should be about the business of organizing an international coalition to eliminate his access to weapons of mass destruction. Iraq's search for weapons of mass destruction has proven impossible to completely deter, and we should assume that it will continue for as long as Saddam is in power. Now, let's be clear, there's no international law that can prevent the United States from taking action to protect our vital interests when it is manifestly clear that there is a choice to be made between law and our survival. Indeed, international law itself recognizes that such choices stay within the purview of all nations. I believe, however, that such a choice is not presented in the case of Iraq. Indeed, should we decide to proceed, our action can be justified within the framework of international law rather than requiring us to go outside the framework of international law. In fact, even though a new United Nations resolution might be helpful in the effort to forge an international consensus, I think it's abundantly clear that the existing U.N. resolutions passed 11 years ago are completely sufficient from a legal standpoint so long as it is clear that Saddam Hussein is in breach of the agreements made at the conclusion of the Persian Gulf War [...].

SADDAM HUSSEIN'S "LETTER"

APRIL 28, 2003

In the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful.

They had made a covenant with God that they would not turn back in flight, and a covenant with God must be answered for.

From Saddam Hussein to the great Iraqi people, the sons of the Arab and Islamic nation, and honourable people everywhere. Peace be upon you, and the mercy and blessings of God.

Just as Hulaku entered Baghdad, the criminal Bush entered it, with Alqami, or rather, more than one Alqami. They did not conquer you - you who reject the occupation and humiliation, you who have Arabism and Islam in your hearts and minds - except through betrayal. Indeed, it is not a victory while there is still resistance in your souls. What we used to say has now become reality, for we do not live in peace and security while the deformed Zionist entity is on our Arab land; therefore there is no rift in the unity of the Arab struggle.

Sons of our great people: Rise up against the occupier and do not trust anyone who talks of Sunni and Shia, because the only issue that the homeland - your great Iraq - faces now is the occupation. There are no priorities other than driving out the infidel, criminal, cowardly occupier. No honorable hand is held out to shake his, but, rather, the hand of traitors and collaborators. I say to you that all the countries surrounding you are against your resistance, but God is with you because you are fighting unbelief and defending your rights. The traitors have allowed themselves to declare their treachery, even though it is shameful, so declare your rejection of the occupier for the sake of great Iraq, for the nation, for Islam and for humanity. Iraq - together with the sons of the nation and the people of honour - and we shall restore the stolen relics and rebuild Iraq which they (may God bring shame upon them) wish to split into pieces. Saddam has no property in his own name and I defy anyone to prove that there were palaces except in the name of the Iraqi state. I left them a long time ago to live in a small house. Forget everything and resist the occupation, because error begins when there are priorities other than the occupier and his expulsion. Remember that they are aiming to bring in those who will fight one another so that your Iraq will remain weak and they can plunder it as they have been doing. Your party, the Arab Ba'ath Socialist party, is proud that it did not extend its hand to the Zionist enemy and did not give in to the cowardly American or British aggressor. Whoever stands against Iraq and plots against it will not prosper in peace at the hands of America. Greetings to everyone who resists, to every honourable Iraqi citizen, and to every woman, child and sheikh in our great Iraq. United, and the enemy and the traitors who

came in with him will flee. Know that the one with whom the invading forces came, whose planes flew to kill you, will send you nothing but poison. God willing, the day of liberation and victory will come, for us, for the nation, and above all for Islam. This time, as always when right triumphs, the days to come will be more beautiful. Take care of your possessions, your departments, and your schools. Boycott the occupier. Boycott him, for this is a duty towards Islam, religion and the homeland.

Long live great Iraq and its people. Long live Palestine, free and Arab from the river to the sea. God is greatest. May the despicable ones be despised.

SPEECH BY SADDAM HUSSEIN

APRIL 4, 2003

Your decision to defend your homeland, your honour and your religion was made before this decisive battle even began, and today, by the will of God the Great, your sacrifices will be honoured.

I address you from time to time, as my moral and constitutional duty, and as God called upon his prophet to incite his fighters to battle.

I tell you that after we've relied on God the great and after He inspired us with faith and courage, we will emerge victorious over our criminal invaders and we will be victorious on all battlefronts after we emerged victorious within ourselves with our faith and love for our nation. And as I told you, sons and daughters of Iraq, before this battle began, the enemy will rely on manoeuvres and deployment here and there, wherever they find an area that is clear from our valiant army's defences.

And they wait around for our divisions to come and confront them and fire a large number of missiles on us - acting in the way that we had expected, and according to our expectations, we have organised our defences, including the defences of Baghdad.

Whenever the enemy is confronted, it moves along to another place in the precious land of Iraq... And now the enemy is approaching Baghdad in the same way, and the defences of Baghdad's walls is the responsibility of the Republican Guard and the army.

(The enemy) will not be able to storm Baghdad, because there are believers who are willing to sacrifice their lives for God and the nation, so every Iraqi family be assured and have no fear.

I say, as I have said before, we are not waiting for victory, because it is in our hands...This is God's promise to the believers, and it is our right to achieve this victory.

We are determined to repel them and destroy them at the walls of the capital Baghdad, as we are determined to destroy their armies on every inch of Muslim Iraqi land.

Fight them brothers, hit them day and night and let the land of Muslims be a scorching fire for their feet and their faces wherever they pass. With God's help, their stomachs may grill in hell forever and our martyrs will attain paradise. Throughout history evil invaders have targeted capitals and believed battle would be decided in the capital. But when the capital is steadfast and the invaders are defeated and repelled, they retreat in defeat. Allahu Akbar (God is great); Glory for God; glory for the mujahideen of Iraq and disgrace and shame for the enemies of God and humanity. Long live Iraq; Long live our glorious nation; Long live Palestine. Long live Iraq. Long live Iraq; Allahu Akbar, Allahu Akbar; and let losers be disgraced.

THE EXTRACT OF THE SPEECH BY HAROLD ICKES

MAY 18, 1941

I want to ask a few simple questions. And then I shall answer them.

What has happened to our vaunted idealism? Why have some of us been behaving like scared chickens? Where is the million-throated, democratic voice of America?

For years it has been dinned into us that we are a weak nation; that we are an inefficient people; that we are simple-minded. For years we have been told that we are beaten, decayed, and that no part of the world belongs to us any longer.

Some amongst us have fallen for this carefully pickled tripe. Some amongst us have fallen for this calculated poison. Some amongst us have begun to preach that the "wave of the future" has passed over us and left us a wet, dead fish.

They shout--from public platforms in printed pages, through the microphones--that it is futile to oppose the "wave of the future." They cry that we Americans, we free Americans nourished on Magna Carta and the Declaration of Independence, hold moth-eaten ideas. They exclaim that there is no room for free men in the world any more and that only the slaves will inherit the earth. America--the America of Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln and Walt Whitman--they say, is waiting for the undertaker and all the hopes and aspirations that have gone into the making of America are dead too.

However, my fellow citizens, this is not the real point of the story. The real point--the shameful point--is that many of us are listening to them and some of us almost believe them.

I say that it is time for the great American people to raise its voice and cry out in mighty triumph what it is to be an American. And why it is that only Americans, with the aid of our brave allies--yes, let's call them "allies"--the British, can and will build the only future worth having. I mean a future, not of concentration camps, not of physical torture and mental straitjackets, not of sawdust bread or of sawdust Caesars--I mean a future when free men will live free lives in dignity and in security.

This tide of the future, the democratic future, is ours. It is ours if we show ourselves worthy of our culture and of our heritage.

But make no mistake about it; the tide of the democratic future is not like the ocean tide--regular, relentless, and inevitable. Nothing in human affairs is mechanical or inevitable. Nor are Americans mechanical. They are very human indeed.

What constitutes an American? Not color nor race nor religion. Not the pedigree of his family nor the place of his birth. Not the coincidence of his citizenship. Not his social status nor his bank account. Not his trade nor his profession. An American is one who loves justice and believes in the dignity of man. An American is one who will fight for his freedom and that of his neighbor. An American is one who will sacrifice property, ease and security in order that he and his children may retain the rights of free men. An American is one in whose heart is engraved the immortal second sentence of the Declaration of Independence.

Americans have always known how to fight for their rights and their way of life. Americans are not afraid to fight. They fight joyously in a just cause.

We Americans know that freedom, like peace, is indivisible. We cannot retain our liberty if three-fourths of the world is enslaved. Brutality, injustice and slavery, if practiced as dictators would have them, universally and systematically, in the long run would destroy us as surely as a fire raging in our nearby neighbor's house would burn ours if we didn't help to put out his.

If we are to retain our own freedom, we must do everything within our power to aid Britain. We must also do everything to restore to the conquered peoples their freedom. This means the Germans too.

Such a program, if you stop to think, is selfishness on our part. It is the sort of enlightened selfishness that makes the wheels of history go around. It is the sort of enlightened selfishness that wins victories.

Do you know why? Because we cannot live in the world alone, without friends and without allies. If Britain should be defeated, then the totalitarian undertaker will prepare to hang crepe on the door of our own independence.

Perhaps you wonder how this could come about? Perhaps you have heard "them"--the wavers of the future--cry, with calculated malice, that even if Britain were defeated we could live alone and defend ourselves single handed, even against the whole world. [...]

These men and women, hundreds of millions of them, now in bondage or threatened with slavery, are our comrades and our allies. They are only waiting for our leadership and our encouragement, for the spark that we can supply. [...]

Here in America we have something so worth living for that it is worth dying for! The so-called "wave of the future" is but the slimy backwash of the past. We have not heaved from our necks the tyrant's crushing heel, only to stretch our necks out again for its weight. Not only will we fight for democracy, we will make it more worth fighting for. Under our free institutions, we will work for the good of mankind, including Hitler's victims in Germany, so that all may have plenty and security [...].

THE EXTRACT OF THE MESSAGE OF POPE JOHN PAUL II FOR THE
CELEBRATION OF THE DAY OF PIECE

JANUARY 1, 1979

To all of you who desire peace:

The great cause of peace between the peoples needs all the energies of peace present in man's heart. It was to the releasing and cultivation of these energies - to the training of them - that my predecessor Paul VI decided, shortly before his death, that the 1979 World Day of Peace should be dedicated:

Throughout his pontificate, Paul VI walked with you along the difficult paths towards peace. He shared your anxiety when peace was threatened. He suffered with those engulfed by the misfortunes of war. He encouraged all efforts to restore peace. In every circumstance he kept up hope, with indomitable energy.

Convinced that peace is something built up by everyone, he launched in 1967 the idea of a World Day of Peace, with the desire that you would take it over as an undertaking of your own. Every year since then his Message offered to the leaders of the nations and of the international organizations the opportunity to renew and express publicly that which legitimizes their authority: the enabling of free, just and fraternal human beings to progress and co-exist in peace. Widely differing communities met to celebrate the inestimable benefit of peace and to affirm their willingness to defend and serve it.

I take from the hands of my revered predecessor the pilgrim's staff of peace. I am on the road, at your side, with the Gospel of peace. "Blessed are the peacemakers." I invite you to celebrate the World Day at the beginning of the year 1979, placing it, in accordance with the last wishes of Paul VI, under the banner of teaching peace.

The attainment of peace is the summing-up and crowning of all our aspirations. We sense that peace is fullness and joy. To achieve peace between countries, many attempts are made through bilateral or multilateral exchanges and international conferences, and some people take courageous personal initiatives to establish peace or to ward off the threat of a new war.

But at the same time, we see that individuals and groups never bring to a conclusion the settling of their secret or public conflicts. Is peace therefore an ideal beyond our grasp? The daily spectacle of war, tension and division sows doubt and discouragement. In places the flames of discord and hatred even seem to be kindled artificially by some who do not have to pay the cost. And too often gestures of peace are ridiculously incapable of changing the course of events, even if they are not actually swept away and in the end taken over by the overbearing logic of exploitation and violence.

In one place, timidity and the difficulty of carrying out needed reforms poison relations between human groups in spite of their being united by a long or exemplary common history; new desires for power suggest recourse to the overpowering influence of sheer numbers or to brute force, in order to disentangle the situation, and this under the impotent and sometimes self-interested and compliant gaze of other countries, near or far; both the strongest and the weakest no longer place confidence in the patient procedures of peace.

Elsewhere, fear of a precarious peace, military and political imperatives, and economic and commercial interests lead to the establishment of arms stockpiles or to the sale of weapons capable of appalling destruction. The arms race then prevails over the great tasks of peace, which ought to unite peoples in new solidarity; it fosters sporadic but murderous conflicts and builds up the gravest threats. It is true that at first sight the cause of peace seems to be handicapped to a crippling extent.

And yet, in nearly all public statements at the national level or that of the international organizations, rarely has there been so much talk of peace, detente, agreement, and the rational solution of conflicts in conformity with justice. Peace has become the slogan that reassures or is meant to beguile. In a sense, we do have something positive: the public opinion of the nations would no longer tolerate the justifying of war or even taking the risk of an offensive war.

But if we are to accept the challenge presented to the whole of humanity confronted with the hard task of peace, we need more than words, whether sincere or demagogical. The true spirit of peace must make itself felt in particular at the level of the statesmen and of the groups or centres that control, more or less directly, more or less secretly, the decisive steps either towards peace or towards the prolonging of wars or situations of violence. At the least, people must agree to place their trust in a few elementary but firm principles, such as the following. Human affairs must be dealt with humanely, not with violence. Tensions, rivalries and

conflicts must be settled by reasonable negotiations and not by force. Opposing ideologies must confront each other in a climate of dialogue and free discussion. The legitimate interests of particular groups must also take into account the legitimate interests of the other groups involved and of the demands of the higher common good. Recourse to arms cannot be considered the right means for settling conflicts. The inalienable human rights must be safeguarded in every circumstance. It is not permissible to kill in order to impose a solution.

Every person of good will can find these principles of humanity in his or her own conscience. They correspond to God's will for the human race. In order that these principles may become convictions in the minds of both the powerful and the weak, and in order that they may come to imbue all activity, they must have their full force restored to them. At every level, this calls for long and patient education.

To overcome this spontaneous feeling of impotence, an education worthy of the name must have as its first task, and produce as its first beneficent result, the ability to see beyond the unfortunate facts in the foreground, or rather to recognize, in the very midst of the raging of murderous violence, the quiet progress of peace, never giving in, untiringly healing wounds, and maintaining and advancing life. The movement towards peace will then be seen as possible and desirable, as strong and already victorious.

THE SPEECH BY BARACK OBAMA

2002

I stand before you as someone who is not opposed to war in all circumstances. The Civil War was one of the bloodiest in history, and yet it was only through the crucible of the sword, the sacrifice of multitudes, that we could begin to perfect this union and drive the scourge of slavery from our soil.

I don't oppose all wars. My grandfather signed up for a war the day after Pearl Harbor was bombed, fought in Patton's army. He fought in the name of a larger freedom, part of that arsenal of democracy that triumphed over evil.

I don't oppose all wars. After September 11, after witnessing the carnage and destruction, the dust and the tears, I supported this administration's pledge to hunt down and root out those who would slaughter innocents in the name of intolerance, and I would willingly take up arms myself to prevent such tragedy from happening again.

I don't oppose all wars. What I am opposed to is a dumb war. What I am opposed to is a rash war. What I am opposed to is the cynical attempt by Richard Perle and Paul Wolfowitz and other armchair, weekend warriors in this administration to shove their own ideological agendas down our throats, irrespective of the costs in lives lost and in hardships borne.

What I am opposed to is the attempt by political hacks like Karl Rove to distract us from a rise in the uninsured, a rise in the poverty rate, a drop in the median income, to distract us from corporate scandals and a stock market that has just gone through the worst month since the Great Depression.

That's what I'm opposed to. A dumb war. A rash war. A war based not on reason but on passion, not on principle but on politics.

Now let me be clear: I suffer no illusions about Saddam Hussein. He is a brutal man. A ruthless man. A man who butchers his own people to secure his own power.... The world, and the Iraqi people, would be better off without him.

But I also know that Saddam poses no imminent and direct threat to the United States, or to his neighbors...and that in concert with the international community he can be contained until, in the way of all petty dictators, he falls away into the dustbin of history.

I know that even a successful war against Iraq will require a U.S. occupation of undetermined length, at undetermined cost, with undetermined consequences.

I know that an invasion of Iraq without a clear rationale and without strong international support will only fan the flames of the Middle East, and encourage the worst, rather than best, impulses of the Arab world, and strengthen the recruitment arm of al-Qaeda.

I am not opposed to all wars. I'm opposed to dumb wars. So for those of us who seek a more just and secure world for our children, let us send a clear message to the president.

You want a fight, President Bush? Let's finish the fight with Bin Laden and al-Qaeda, through effective, coordinated intelligence, and a shutting down of the financial networks that support terrorism, and a homeland security program that involves more than color-coded warnings.

You want a fight, President Bush? Let's fight to make sure that...we vigorously enforce a nonproliferation treaty, and that former enemies and current allies like Russia safeguard and ultimately eliminate their stores of nuclear material, and that nations like Pakistan and India never use the terrible weapons already in their possession, and that the arms merchants in our own country stop feeding the countless wars that rage across the globe.

You want a fight, President Bush? Let's fight to make sure our so-called allies in the Middle East, the Saudis and the Egyptians, stop oppressing their own people, and suppressing dissent, and tolerating corruption and inequality, and mismanaging their economies so that their youth grow up without education, without prospects, without hope, the ready recruits of terrorist cells.

You want a fight, President Bush? Let's fight to wean ourselves off Middle East oil through an energy policy that doesn't simply serve the interests of Exxon and Mobil.

Those are the battles that we need to fight. Those are the battles that we willingly join. The battles against ignorance and intolerance. Corruption and greed. Poverty and despair.

THE SPEECH BY PROFESSOR ZANETA OZOLINA IN NATO SUMMIT IN
RIGA

NOVEMBER 27, 2006

Madam President, Secretary General, Senator Lugar, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, Riga is the centre of the international security debate for these three days. Tomorrow, the heads of 26 member states will take crucial decisions on the transformation of NATO in the XXI century. Transformation is not the final goal, but a process. A process that involves politicians, experts, academics, and NGO representatives discussing new visions, strategies and thinking. Ideas drive transformation! A Think-Tank conference has gathered the brightest minds from all over the world to offer new, innovative, provocative, challenging, and brave ideas that will contribute to a better understanding of what the international community can deliver to make the world more secure.

The NATO summit and the Think-Tank conference in Riga is a historical event for several reasons – the event marks the 16 year-long process of Latvia's return to the international arena, and its new role as one of the many actors shaping global security policy. This is the democratic world's acknowledgment to Latvia, as well as Estonia and Lithuania, of its great and successful transformation from totalitarianism to democracy. Today, we are happy to share our pride and joy in these achievements with our closest allies. This NATO Summit is also historic in turning Riga into the center of important debates on the alliances future, thus helping to shape the international security agenda, as well as set the tone of the global and regional security debate for the next two years.

Madam President,
One the worlds leading politicians once said: "In politics, if you want anything said, ask a man; if you want anything done, ask a woman." You have done a lot – you brought Latvia into the center of the UN reform debate, and now you have brought the global debate to Latvia. Throughout your presidency you have worked hard to bring Latvia into NATO. Today, you have brought NATO to Latvia. Excellences, Ladies and Gentlemen, the President of Latvia – Vaira Vīķe Freiberga.

Riga hosts 250 conference participants from both NATO and partner countries. A country's security cannot be measured by the number of tanks it owns, but by the number of friends it has. NATO's strength lies in its partnership. Success of Riga Summit will be not measured by

adopted declarations but by number of new initiatives, new networks of partnerships and courage that nations who strive for NATO membership will receive. Secretary General – over the last years the alliance has extended the borders of partnership. Today the alliance has brought together the intellectual capacity of its partners at this Riga conference in order to strengthen the alliance. Secretary General!

Latvia's accession to NATO would not be possible without the strong support of its friends. Without the friends who, during 50 long years of occupation, were always convinced that a day of joint celebration for Latvia's independence would arrive. During the days when few believed that Latvia would ever regain its state independence, during the days when some believed that Latvia would become a NATO member state, there always was one country which never lost belief – the United States of America. CONFUCIUS ONCE WROTE - To put the world right in order, we must first put the nation in order; to put the nation in order, we must first put the family in order; to put the family in order, we must first cultivate our personal life; we must first set our hearts right. Senator Lugar – your heart was always right, and the best proof of this is your personal commitment to the enlargement of NATO and to the transformation of the alliance. We are very honored that you kindly agreed to deliver the key note speech tonight. Senator Lugar.

THE SPEECH BY ARTIS PABRIKS IN NATO SUMMIT IN RIGA

NOVEMBER 27, 2006

Excellencies! Ladies and gentlemen!

To begin with, let me thank you all for coming to Riga where - it is no secret - the NATO Summit is taking place. It is of the utmost significance for our country that – one would say – the most important gathering of state leaders is being held in Riga right now. However spectacular and even awesome official NATO meetings may be, it is in the very interests of NATO that alongside, there should be an alternative, fresh and even provocative think-tank or forum for discussing global security concerns and developing new solutions or critically investigating the old ones. I must admit that on reading the five most challenging aspects for the efficiency of NATO today, as seen by the young leaders, I began to think that there was a unifying moment among them. I mean - a unifying moment apart from the obvious fact that they all are connected with the future of NATO. Let us read the questions or the assertions once more:

Challenges in Afghanistan: Bringing Stability or Building Democracy?

NATO and its Partners: How to Improve the Cooperation?

Western Policy Towards Russia: We Need a Coherent Policy.

NATO Enlargement in the Future: Who Will Open the Doors?

Energy Security: A New Challenge for NATO?

So what do they have in common?

I think it can be said with a high degree of credibility that these are the challenges that up to now have been answered too conventionally.

It is by no means sufficient to provide conventional answers to unconventional questions.

They are doomed to fail.

Nobody should expect an official meeting of state leaders to turn into an exercise, as the British might put it, in 'thinking outside the box'. It means – creative, challenging and really new thinking. And it is essentially a new thinking that our forum has to facilitate.

As a representative of Latvia, I am deeply convinced that each of those problems – if not solved properly – will affect all of us, whatever the size or location of our country may be.

However, I would not rush to conclude that NATO is in crisis. No doubt - confronting the Soviet Union gave NATO a clearly defined task - one on which all the allies could agree. With its former enemy gone NATO is experiencing difficulties – the most apparent of them was the controversy over Iraq that led some pundits to openly question the survival of NATO. I still firmly believe that NATO, alongside the European Union and probably the United Nations, is still by far the most effective international organization. The founding members of NATO committed themselves to come to each other's aid in the event of a military attack against any one of them. What gave the agreement strength was that it bound North America to the defense of Western Europe. This was a clear message to the Soviet Union that the US would step in if it tried to push further west into Europe. When we regained our independence, we here in Latvia viewed NATO as the main guarantor of the long-term security of our country, while by the 1990's many people in the world believed that NATO was no longer needed. The "old enemy" was no longer a threat and many countries reduced their military spending. However, as we all know, NATO was to find a new role as new conflicts emerged in the Balkans, parts of the former Soviet Union and in Afghanistan. I think these operations have helped strengthen the alliance between NATO countries and reinforce the view that collective defense and cooperation continue to be the best way to guarantee security. At the same time, any statement claiming there was no cause for concern would be very optimistic. Threats against the democracies of Europe and North America are all but identical. This is made clear in the security policy documents of the EU, NATO and the individual countries. The NATO alliance is the unifying factor, because it offers an infrastructure and mechanism for reaction, which do not exist within the framework of other organizations. The problems NATO is experiencing are not unique or characteristic to this organization alone; - the challenges to NATO are simply a reflection of the most important problems inherent in today's world. Numerous factors have created new challenges in the world: the emergence of international terrorism, asymmetric threats, the spread of weapons of mass destruction, increased social inequalities, a growing dependency on energy, technology and information resources, as well as ecological crises. Global terrorism is not a problem of NATO alone – it is faced by the whole of civilization. Even if militarists refer to the danger of terrorism as asymmetric threats, this does not make the hazard any less relevant for the ordinary citizen. The Balkans, historically one of the world's most persistent trouble spots, is a region where NATO has achieved substantial progress. The same - to a considerable extent - can be said about Afghanistan. If we speak about the extraordinarily complicated relationship of the Western world with Islam, it is NATO that has shown the possibility of cooperating closely with Turkey on a partnership basis.

THE SPEECH BY VAIRA VIKE FREIBERGA IN NATO SUMMIT IN RIGA

NOVEMBER 28, 2006

VAIRA VIKE-FREIBERGA, PRESIDENT OF LATVIA: Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, Speaker of the House of Parliament of Latvia, excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, it's truly a delight to be able to stand here in front of such a distinguished audience and for the second time in less than two years to be able to introduce a speaker here in Riga, the President of the United States.

It is particularly gratifying to do so on this eve of the 2006 Summit of NATO in Riga. An event for which we have been planning a long time but an event that we have been dreaming about for even longer.

And, indeed, when Latvia recovered its independence at long last in 1991 it was all it could do to try and keep that independence. To sort of glow on that flame of liberty and see if we could survive in a world that, of course, was there to receive but to receive us on its own terms.

We had to change every thing in our country and our system. We had to adapt and do it very quickly. Change can be painful. Reforms take a lot of effort. I am proud of my people and of the efforts that they have expended and at the results they have achieved but we have been able to do so because our people have never lost their faith in liberty. And they have never lost their conviction that they had a right to be free and that the democratic system is the only one that is worth living, the one in which every citizen has a chance to contribute to making a better world.

As we recovered our own democracy, of course, we have also seen it has failings. We have not reached perfection from one day to the next. We have made mistakes and that's precisely the privilege of a democracy; of making mistakes and learning from them.

We have had disagreements and continue to do so on a variety of issues. That, too, is a fundamental tenant of democracy.

But the one thing that is simply fundamental is the freedom to be able to express one's views, the freedom to chart one's course, and to adopt it and the freedom to freely choose one's friends and one's allies.

And in that sense, every step of the way we have felt that for Latvia, the United States is a country whose principles, whose ideals are very much the same as our own. There's a country that in spite of its wealth and influence has never forgotten the principles set forth by its founding fathers. It's a country that believes in moral principles but is ready to die for them if need be.

That sort of commitment, that sort of support that we have felt, we, of course, in turn now stand ready to pass on to others. We like to think of democracy as something that is catching, in the sense that it is an example to others that they would wish to follow. It is not something that we can sell, it is not something we can force on people. But we certainly can convince them of the benefits of it and most of all we'd like to give them a chance.

I would like to thank very much the United States for itself to Latvia and the other foreign nations to regain their freedom and liberty to regain their ability to make their own choices. It is a privilege to me for the second time in such a short period to give to you a speaker today, a man who believes deeply in the rights of democracy to believe deeply in human freedom and human dignity ladies and gentlemen I give to you the 43rd President of the United States of America, George W. Bush.

Attestation Page (Dokumentārā lapa)

Bakalaura darbs „Angļu un latviešu valodas politiskais diskurss” izstrādāts LU Moderno valodu fakultātē.

Ar savu parakstu apliecinu, ka pētījums veikts patstāvīgi, izmantoti tikai tajā norādītie informācijas avoti un iesniegtā darba elektroniskā kopija atbilst izdrukai.

Autors: Ilze Lepiksone _____

Rekomendēju darbu aizstāvēšanai

Vadītāja: asoc. profesore, Dr.Philol. Biruta Uzija _____

Recenzents: docente, Dr.Philol. Indra Karapetjana _____

Darbs iesniegts Anglistikas nodaļā

Metodiķe: _____

Darbs aizstāvēts bakalaura gala pārbaudījuma komisijas sēdē

Komisijas sekretāre: _____