



universität
wien

Diplomarbeit

Titel der Diplomarbeit

Critical Discourse Analysis - Scope, Challenges and
Limitations

Verfasserin

Regina Bösch

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Magistra der Philosophie (Mag. phil.)

Wien, 2011

Studienkennzahl: A 190 344 593 T

Studienrichtung: Lehramt UF Englisch UF Musikerziehung

Betreuer: hon. Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Henry George Widdowson

I would like to thank

my supervisor, Prof. Widdowson, for his guidance and his critical comments on my thesis;

my sister, Ursula, for never leaving my side;

my father, Hubert, and my brother, Christoph, for their faith in my abilities;

my cousin, Charlotte, for finding the right words again and again;

my friends, Dani and Lisi, for accompanying me and showing me new directions;

my dear Stephan, for his unwavering love and support.

Table of Content

1. Introduction	1
2. Exploring the Field: Critical Discourse Analysis in Practice.....	2
2. 1 Common Ground	2
2. 2 Theoretical Background and Basic Concepts	8
2. 2. 1 Context and Relevance	8
2. 2. 2 Discourse and Text	15
2. 3 CDA in Practice	22
2. 4 Critical Approaches to CDA	30
3. Practical Application	41
3. 1 Pretext	43
3. 2 Context Analysis	44
3. 2. 1 The Producer(s).....	45
3. 2. 2 The Recipients	47
3. 2. 3 Sociopolitical and Historical Context	49
3. 2. 4 Observations	51
3. 3 Textual Analysis	52
3. 3. 1 Text and Sentence Structure.....	53
3. 3. 2 Terms of Address and Reference	54
3. 3. 3 Lexical Choice and Metaphor Use.....	57
3. 3. 4 Repetition and Parallel Structures	59
3. 3. 5 Presuppositions	61
3. 3. 6 Observations	64
3. 4 Relating Text to Pretext	67
3. 4. 1 Observations	68

3. 5 Some More Aspects of Context.....	69
3. 5. 1 A Diachronic Perspective.....	69
3. 5. 2 A Fellow Republican: Newt Gingrich.....	71
3. 5. 2. 1 Terms of Address and Reference	72
3. 5. 2. 2 Lexical Choice and Metaphor Use	74
3. 5. 2. 3 Repetition	76
3. 5. 2. 4 Presuppositions.....	78
3. 5. 3 The Opponent: Barack Obama	80
3. 5. 3. 1 Terms of Address and Reference	81
3. 5. 3. 2 Lexical Choice and Metaphor Use	83
3. 5. 3. 3 Repetition	84
3. 5. 3. 4 Presuppositions.....	85
3. 5. 3. 5 Cross-Reference	86
3. 5. 4 Opposing Ideologies? Some More Comments on Obama.....	87
3. 5. 4. 1 Terms of Address and Reference	87
3. 5. 4. 2 Word Choice and Structures	89
3. 5. 4. 3 Presuppositions and Ideological Statements	90
3. 5. 5 Observations	92
4. Conclusion.....	95
References	98
Sources for the Speeches.....	101
Corpus	101
Appendix	102
Appendix 1.....	102

John McCain: Remarks By John McCain On His Jobs For America Economic Plan.....	102
Appendix 2.....	105
Newt Gingrich: Address to the Conservative Political Action Committee.....	105
Appendix 3.....	114
Barack Obama: Democratic Nomination Victory Speech - Change We Can Believe In	114
Appendix 4.....	118
Barack Obama: Obama Delivers Speech on Economy	118
Appendix 5.....	125
George W. Bush: 2004 State of the Union Address	125
Appendix 6.....	133
George W. Bush: 2004 Republican National Convention Address	133
Lebenslauf	140
Persönliche Daten	140
Akademische Laufbahn	140
Einschlägige Tätigkeiten.....	140
Abstract	141

1. Introduction

The original aim of this paper was to carry out an analysis of the discourse of the Republican Party of the United States of America, employing methods of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The Republican Party is known for their neo-liberal approach to economic issues. Therefore, I initially formulated a research question which focussed on the discursive construction of such issues in republican discourse.

Most particularly, I was interested in issues connected to unemployment and work, as this has been an issue in the public discourse in European countries. Neo-liberal influences seemed to have contributed to an increasingly negative depiction of unemployed people, and there appears to be a tendency to cut public funds for social support pretending that it is largely an individual's responsibility that determines their success at the employment market, rather than economic developments on which individuals have next to no influence. Based on this observation, it seemed plausible that the discourse of the US Republican Party might reveal a similarly negative depiction of unemployment and construct the people concerned as responsible for their undesirable situation, neglecting potential influences of national and global economic development on the increasing insecurity on the employment market. This conjecture should be tested in the course of this thesis.

However, the endeavour turned out to be much less straight-forward than I anticipated. I discovered that the methods I intended to apply are highly controversial. From this observation arose the desire to enquire into this controversy and gaining deeper insight into its nature, by practically applying methods proposed by CDA scholars and testing them for validity.

In order to understand the controversial issues in connection with CDA practice, it will be necessary to provide a detailed overview of the field. I will examine the theoretical and philosophical foundations that practitioners draw on in their work, as well as the diverse terminology used in different variants of CDA and notable examples of practical applications which exist at present. Subsequently, I will comment on various criticisms that have been raised against CDA practice.

Based on the results of this examination, I will use the initial research question as a model for assessing the methodological procedures suggested by CD analysts. More precisely, I will analyse a speech delivered by the republican presidential candidate John McCain in depth, following the methods laid out by scholars working within the CDA paradigm.

At the same time, however, I will maintain a critical stance towards these procedures with reference to the critical observations and suggestions for improvement made by other scholars. This model analysis serves the purpose of answering a “meta-question”, as it were, namely the question how well the procedures of CDA are designed to achieve their own aims of detecting hidden meanings in discourse.

The ideal outcome will be a thorough assessment of the validity of CDA methods and the criticism against them. Furthermore, the practical application may point towards further suggestions for improvement of CDA methods and procedures.

2. Exploring the Field: Critical Discourse Analysis in Practice

2. 1 Common Ground

Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) - sometimes also referred to as Critical Linguistics, or CL - is a branch of discourse analysis that has developed since the 1980s from roots within “Text linguistics, [...] Cognitive Science, Literary Studies and Sociolinguistics, as well as in Applied Linguistics and Pragmatics” and others (Wodak & Meyer 2009, 1). Blommaert and Bulcaen (2000: 447) call CDA “one of the most influential and visible branches of discourse analysis”. Even though Critical Discourse Analysis is probably the most frequent term, more recently, the denotation CDS (Critical Discourse Studies) has also gained some recognition, since it suggests reference to the fact that such research is multidisciplinary, as well as multimodal (meaning that texts from different media are considered as worthy of analysis).

The field in its entirety is rather difficult to pin down. Research is done using a broad variety of methods due to its multifarious roots (Cameron 2000: 48 f; Wodak & Meyer 2009: 2). Consequently, the approach resists being classified as a “school of thought” in which a more or less fixed set of methods is used (e.g. Fairclough 1992: 225). In

fact, researchers who refer to their own work as CDA have themselves a variety of backgrounds (linguistics, communication sciences, economics etc.). This fact is commonly regarded as a positive trait by researchers in the field.

Nevertheless, for practical reasons, and out of a demand for a clear demarcation of the field, there has been the demand for Critical Discourse scholars to account for the shared headline under which they conduct their research. A notable common element in critical approaches to discourse is that they see themselves as rooted in Critical Theory, the starting point of which is often dated to 1937, when Max Horkheimer published an essay entitled “Traditionelle und kritische Theorie” (“Traditional and critical theory”) (Wodak & Meyer 2009: 6). Even though Critical Theory cannot be classified as an academic discipline in the classical sense – it rather is “a set of interests and theoretical commitments” (Cameron 2002: 50) – it has been rather influential. The movement, which draws on ideas developed by the Frankfurt School, has affected a number of fields within the humanities and the social sciences (Wodak & Meyer 2009: 6). It is the basis of a certain attitude towards the objects of these sciences: researchers adopt a critical stance towards “reality” and knowledge, in order to fathom and question their constructed nature. The aim of this attitude is to uncover the aims and interests that underlie such constructs, that is, for example, which agents have power within the system and which ones do not (Cameron 2000: 50, 123). Rather than just seeking deeper understanding of the world, Critical Theory demands that research – particularly social research – should aim at producing applicable outcomes for changing society for the better (Wodak & Meyer 2009: 6). Thus, CDA has not only a theoretical orientation, but a focus on intervention as well, which is driven by ideological convictions.

Some Critical Discourse analysts also base their conception of the significance of discourse on the writings of the French sociologist Michel Foucault (Jupp & Norris 1993: 49). Here, discourse is regarded as a means for exercising power and domination, because “[d]iscourses [...] guide the individual and collective formation of reality” (Jäger & Maier 2009: 36), and this makes them such a politically relevant object of research (Fairclough 2009b: 517). Though the Foucaultian influence is detectable in a lot of CDA works, scholars have also distanced themselves from this in some respect. Fairclough (1992), for example, provides a detailed positioning of

his own variant of (Critical) Discourse Analysis against the philosophical background of Foucault's writing, in which he discloses significant differences. These notably include the higher level of abstraction both with regard to the Foucaultian definition of *discourse* (which goes beyond concrete textual actualisation) and his lack of attention to the analysis of actually occurring interaction (Fairclough 1992: 60).

In addition to these shared roots, there have been other suggestions as to what unifying aspects there are in the works of CD analysts: Teun van Dijk (2009: 63), for example, proposed that it is not the methods or backgrounds of the researchers which make them Critical Discourse analysts, but their interests and objectives: Researchers are often politically active in various fields, and are typically inclined towards the political left (though these inclinations vary between more or less strict Marxism, anti-Fascism and other foci). Following the Frankfurt School definition of Critical Theory, which holds that "that social theory should be oriented towards [...] changing society" (Wodak & Meyer 2009: 6), they understand themselves as socially and politically committed and regard it their duty to conduct their research to the benefit of underprivileged social groups, and ultimately to effect a change towards more egalitarian societal structures.

Regardless of the fact that diversity of CDA methodologies is often stressed, and there is no demand for a definite unification of the field from inside it, scholars have also established some common approaches to the objects of research and parallels in the way that research projects are carried out. Wodak and Meyer (2009: 2) have presented some of these as follows:

- an interest in the properties of 'naturally occurring' language use by real language users (instead of a study of abstract language systems and invented examples)
- a focus on larger units than isolated words and sentences and, hence, new basic units of analysis: texts, discourses, conversations, speech acts, or communicative events
- the extension to non-verbal (semiotic, multimodal, visual) aspects of interaction
- action and communication: gestures, images, film, the internet, and multimedia
- a focus on dynamic (socio)-cognitive or interactional moves and strategies

- the study of the functions of (social, cultural, situative and cognitive) contexts of language use
- an analysis of a vast number of phenomena of text grammar and language use: coherence, anaphora, topics, macrostructures, speech acts, interactions, turn-taking, signs, politeness, argumentation, rhetoric, mental models, and many other aspects of text and discourse.

It must be noted that these aspects are not distinctive with regard to CDA, but are deemed important in other areas of linguistics as well. To distinguish CDA from other fields of language study, the above list may be extended by their explicit commitment to explaining and altering the power distribution in society (see also Fay 1993: 33).

The basic interest in examining these aspects of language occurrence is rooted in the assumption that the things people say (and do) give an insight into what they think and believe. Language, according to Fairclough (2009b: 517), provides a “‘breeding ground’ for ways of thinking”. Language is believed to actively “[construct] the world” (Fairclough 2000: 23), that is, it enables language users to think in certain ways about the world they perceive. They may also, however, discourage other ways of thinking about this world.

Intuitively, language users often regard language as a means to simply portray reality. This perception goes with a supposedly direct relationship between what people say or do, and a perceived natural state of reality, which exists previously and independently of those social practices.

Conversely, the concept prevalent in CDA holds that discourse (including language) is conceptualised both as being shaped by social practice, and shaping social practice in turn. The idea that language could serve as a medium to depict reality “the way it is”, that there is indeed a fixed “way it is” at all, is regarded as a misconception. Reality and the knowledge of a society (that is, socially shared concepts of what is “true”) are taken to be a construct, resulting from social practices (Schiffrin 1994: 233), which are no simple givens, but can (and should, according to CDA) be questioned and changed (Cameron 2002: 123).

CDA exponents generally think of this gap between the “every-day” perspective on discourse and its underlying constructed nature as problematic. It supposedly leads

to the effect of “naturalisation”, which is perceived as detrimental to a critical perspective towards discourse: In “uncritical”, ordinary language use, the world (e.g. the way in which society is organised, its internal hierarchies etc.) is typically depicted as “neutral”, “inevitable” or “unchangeable”. Thus, people tend to think of these phenomena as “inevitable” or “unchangeable”, and fail to understand that they may be a result of controlled developments, which serve the interests of certain people or groups (Cameron 2002: 123). By these means, discourses unfold a persuasive force and enable participants to think about reality in certain terms, but not in other potential terms.

In theory, “ordinary” language users are sometimes not aware of the way in which the language they encounter might manipulate their ways of seeing the world, and shape them to the convenience of a more powerful speaker/writer, since there is supposed to be meaning invested in texts that can only be “prised out by linguistic analysis” (Widdowson 1998: 142). This will make naive language users vulnerable to manipulation and persuasion (de Saussure 2007: 183). Thus, powerful discourse structures, which reflect and reinforce power distribution in society, go unquestioned and unchanged.

Roger Fowler (1996: 50 f) therefore proposes a particular interest in “official language”, including genres such as speeches, policy papers and newspapers. Such texts are typically unidirectional, so that listeners or readers cannot react to them directly (Goffman 1981: 138). This lack of interactivity supposedly contributes to their persuasive force. Furthermore, their official character (that is to say, the social power of the producers of such texts) might give them a particularly powerful impact upon the people who consume them. These kinds of text (notably political and commemorative speeches, as well as policy papers) certainly have a particular appeal for CDA analysts. It must be noted, however, that a large variety of text types from different contexts have been analysed by CDA scholars. CDA’s range of research objects stretches from the linguistic depiction of traumatic national history (Reisigl 2009) to the language use of the Labour Party (Fairclough 2000) and to the communication between doctors and patients (Hein et.al. 1985).

With their ambition to contribute to changes in society, CD analysts seek to identify “the values and assumptions that underlie the discourse” (Paltridge 2006: 183) and

show why and to what effect, and with which objectives, people use discourse the way they use it (Paltridge 2006: 178). Since language users supposedly cannot achieve this fully in every-day life, the role of the scholar is to reveal features in language which point to such a manipulation or an abuse of power (note that also non-linguistic texts, signs, images etc. are taken into consideration). The ways in which notions of such categories as gender, race and other identity factors are constructed via discourse are frequent objects of their research (178).

Generally, scholars are critical of existing hierarchical structures. Consequently, a typical starting point for a CDA project would be the awareness of a non-egalitarian societal structure reflected in (and reinforced by) discourse, that is, a “social wrong” (Fairclough 2009a: 171). These social wrongs are normally defined from a left-wing point of view within CDA, and comprise such things as “dominance in bourgeois-capitalist society”, instances of xenophobic discrimination, gender roles in discourse, and so on. It is suggested, for example, that power structures within a system are reinforced and naturalised (also “normalised”) by the dominant discourse practices in society (Jäger & Maier 2009: 35). The analyst then, taking the role of an activist, is in the position to assess discourses in terms of “adequacy”, that is, how accurately they construct the world, whose interests are served and whose are neglected, and so forth. (Fairclough 2000: 23). The outcome of such an assessment typically is a suggestion for improvement. The analyst could, for example, draw the conclusion that a change in the construction of power relations within society would be beneficial for hitherto underprivileged social groups.

In order to pin down discourse structures that are seen as corruptive, language features (such as pronouns, verbs, metaphors, synecdoche, etc.) are examined (e.g. Fairclough 2000; Reisigl 2009; van Leeuwen 2009). These features then are described with regard to, for example, their perceived inclusive or exclusive functions, their distortion of real social processes and phenomena, or their potential to exercise power and domination over other discourse participants. Fairclough (2000: 35), for example, argues that the construction of “in-groups” and “out-groups” via rhetorical means can be understood by analysing the use of pronouns such as “we” and “they” in positive and negative contexts respectively. This practice is sometimes referred to as “Othering”.

Generally, CDA aims at describing discourse structures on a higher level, in order to demonstrate patterns of change which affect larger areas of discourse (such as the “discourse of globalisation”). The reason for this probably lies in CDA’s aspirations to foster fundamental changes in societal organisation, which is a large-scale endeavour as such. However, even though larger patterns are the eventual focus of most research projects, individual texts are seen as “instances” of such discourses, from which underlying structures can be inferred (van Dijk 2009: 80). Thus, by scrutinising and interpreting specific language items in individual texts, or collections of texts, CD analysts hope to be able to draw conclusions about the properties of the more abstract discourse that forms their base (Fairclough 2000: 159).

2. 2 Theoretical Background and Basic Concepts

2. 2. 1 Context and Relevance

As has been said before, CDA should not be seen as a uniform “school of thought”. Most individual scholars present their own work as distinct “approaches” within the paradigm (see Fairclough 1992: 225; Jupp & Norris 1993: 47; Reisigl & Wodak 2009). Reisigl and Wodak (95) point out that the actual methodological procedures need to be designed specifically for each research project in order to do justice to the object. Therefore, differences in the definitions of key terms, such as *discourse* or *context*, are noteworthy. Significant differences in methodology between individual scholars may well arise from rather subtle differences in the definition of these terms. It would seem advisable to look at those distinctions in order to understand the ways in which CDA scholars arrive at their results.

One problematic aspect with regard to CDA terminology is that CD analysts frequently find that the more colloquial uses of these terms interfere with the aim of a precise scholarly definition (van Dijk 2008: 25). Typically, such uses are rather broad - and therefore comparatively vague – and do not serve as a good foundation for scholarly work. To anticipate one example, the term *context* might refer to a rather broad variety of factors which may determine language use. Consequently, scholars are compelled to render those terms more acute by narrowing down the broader meaning of these terms and attempting to find precise applications for them (e.g. van Dijk 2008: 25, van Leeuwen 2008: 144).

The interference of the “everyday” uses of generally common words such as *text* or *discourse* is perhaps of particular interest for CDA, because their claim is to address a wide public. As has been mentioned, most scholars in this field regard it their remit to speak for under-privileged or discriminated social groups. For this reason, demands have been made of CDA scholars (and students) to “avoid an esoteric style” (van Dijk 2009: 63). The aim of the maxim to “remain close to [the] informal uses [of terms]” (van Dijk 2008: 25) is to make research outcomes graspable for the very people they seek to benefit. This aim is hard to achieve in practice, of course, and it is probably fair to say that it is hardly achieved at all. Indeed, CDA deals with such a high level of abstractions that an amazing number of technical terms has cropped up (often used by different scholars in slightly, or even significantly, diverging ways), and scholars appear unable to avoid immensely complicated writing styles (see also Widdowson 1998: 149).

As a consequence, when attempting to provide an overview of the branch, we are confronted with problems in CDA terminology. As an example, let us take a look at a basic term: *context*. It is a determining feature of discourse studies that they examine language (and/or other interaction phenomena) *in context*. Therefore, the requirement to determine the nature of context, and its relation to text (in other words, *discourse*) is to be expected. Needless to say, CD analysts have identified a variety of features which define *context*, and each scholar places different weight on each of these features.

In most cases, CDA scholars have understood *context* as the social environment in which verbal or other interaction takes place. Very often, this environment as a whole is referred to using the term *context*. Language users draw upon contexts in order to understand the meaning of interactions. Wodak (2009: 586) suggests considering the following levels of context for analysis (the illustrating example concerns a speech by G.W. Bush in connection with the 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center):

- (i) the immediate, language or text internal co-text (i.e., Bush’s speech, 12 September 2001);
- (ii) the intertextual and interdiscursive relationship between utterances, texts, genres, and discourses (i.e., other speeches and media reporting on the specific speech, reporting on 9/11 or other speeches related to 9/11);

- (iii) extralinguistic social/sociological variables and institutional frames of a specific 'context of situation' (the setting, other political parties, TV);
- (iv) the broader sociopolitical and historical contexts, which the discursive practices are embedded in and related to (events surrounding and leading up to 9/11).

In this and many other variants of CDA, there is no detailed explanation of how exactly *context* interrelates with *text* (see Fairclough 2009a: 163). Theoretically, all these facets of the context of an utterance guide the way in which a specific text (such as the above mentioned speech by G.W. Bush) is actualised, as well as the way in which it may be interpreted by its recipients. Text producers seek to make themselves understood, and recipients then try to derive meaning from texts. The list of context levels given above implies that researchers can, by analysing the context on those levels, gain deeper insight into the range of meaning(s) that participants are practically capable of deriving from certain texts. Hence, there appears to be an assumed correlation between potential meaning(s) and contextual factors. This assumption, however, is not characteristic of CDA, but features in other branches of the study of language as well. CDA practitioners are peculiar in that they pin down selective readings of texts in order to alert language users to perceived injustice.

The specific interest of CDA scholars lies in contextual factors which reflect, and thus aggravate, social relations of power, domination, and inequality (van Dijk 2009: 63). Such factors, according to Reisigl and Wodak (2009: 119) are discourse-analytically detectable via "contradictory and manipulative relationships between discourses and power structures". In other words, CD analysts aim to uncover untruthful and biased representations of reality in texts.

The aim of analysing such relationships of domination and manipulation entails the necessity to describe the relationship between *text* and *context* on several levels: firstly, a text can function as "a facet of action" (Fairclough 2009a: 164), that is, a text is produced because the producer wants to do something with it. Secondly, there is the function of representing (aspects of) reality. In this sphere, CDA tries to locate ideological influences which might express themselves as selective or distorting representations of reality (see Reisigl & Wodak 2009: 119; Van Dijk 2008: 143). In addition to these two levels, Fairclough (2009a: 164) identifies factors which are

concerned with the participants personally at the joint of *text* and *context*. Their membership in particular social groups (which gender, ethnicity, political group they belong to, and so on) which shape their identities often play an important role in CD analyses. Since a critical perspective is normally based on the assumption that certain social groups exercise power over others, the group memberships of language users and the effects they may have on interactions are of high significance for them. This division into levels is a theoretical construct which enables the analyst to discern the categories of *genre*, *discourse* and *style* of a text respectively.

Needless to say, this is one of the more problematic aspects of the notion of *context* within the critical paradigm. Van Dijk (2008: 114) concedes that it is difficult to assess the degree to which individual aspects of the participants' identities actually play a role in individual instances of interaction. He speculates that age or class membership might be more powerfully influential than gender, for example. Along similar lines, Fairclough (1992: 47) points out that social identity components such as "gender, ethnicity or age which [sic] are likely to substantially affect [...] a conversation may have little effect in a conference of biologists." As yet, however, there is a lack of data upon which a detailed description of the relevance of certain identity factors in specific interaction could be built on (van Dijk 2008: 114). Thus, it is virtually unpredictable in how far language users will make their identity components matter in interaction (see also de Saussure 2007: 184). The quote by Fairclough (1992: 47 f) given above can be read as an implicit acknowledgement of this impossibility. According to him, context itself will not provide a full understanding of the factors governing interaction. One must go back to the properties of the underlying discourse (here meaning "the language associated with a particular social field or practice", Fairclough 2009a: 162) in order to "explicate the context-text-meaning relationship" (Fairclough 1992: 47 f).

These considerations point towards a somewhat problematic aspect of the relationship between *context* (in all its facets) and meaning: the aspect of *relevance*.

[Relevance theory] holds, essentially, that we home in on an interpretation which is relevant to the occasion when we conjoin what is actually said in the text with existing assumptions in the context and draw a meaning from the conjunction [...]" (Widdowson 2004: 45).

Obviously, particular aspects of context can only enable conclusions about the pragmatic meaning of discourse, if they are relevant to the participants at the time. However, instances where an analyst can find concrete textual evidence for the relevance of a particular identity category, for example, are probably very rare (van Dijk 2008: 19). For example, we may scarcely find communicative episodes where participants actually articulate what their membership in a particular social group means to them in that particular instance of interaction. This is likely to hold true a fortiori when the object of interest is covert, as is the case with regard to the clandestine tactics of manipulation and power abuse that CDA seeks to uncover. Evidently, all language users have strategies for expressing and understanding relevant aspects when participating in communicative acts. Consequently, CDA scholars avail themselves to the same strategies as regular recipient to infer relevant contextual information (van Dijk 2008: 19). Still, we need to bear in mind that, if it is difficult to account for the subjective relevance of certain context features with regard to the producer of a text at a given instance, this probably applies a fortiori to the relevance schemata of recipients.

Most scholars who work in the CDA paradigm use the term *context* to designate social environment as a whole, with different levels to be considered in an analysis. This entails the difficulty of analysing the particular relevance of these factors in individual cases, which remains unresolved so far.

A contrasting definition of the term has been put forward by one CDA scholar, Teun van Dijk, who has advocated the inclusion of cognitive sciences in the critical study of discourse in his “Sociocognitive Approach” (van Dijk 2009: 62 ff). He provides an extensive description of his use of the term *context*, which clearly stands out against other uses of the term in some respects. Here, *context* is detached from its material actuality and shifted to a sociocognitive level. Van Dijk describes contexts as *mental models* (van Dijk 2008: 16 ff, van Dijk 2009: 66) which comprise those features of the communicative situation that are relevant for the participants at the given time. These models are highly flexible, as well as incomplete representations of (parts of) social reality, which allow discourse participants to evaluate the present communicative situation quickly and adjust to its demands. Thus, the participants’ discursive behaviour is guided by providing relevant information on the supposed knowledge

shared by the other participants, the style appropriate to the situation, and a large number of other factors. Consequently, mental models provide a basis for accounting for linguistic choices language users make, omissions and other features occurring in a text.

Van Dijk stresses the fact that these models are individual and subjective. They differ from situation to situation, and may even change during one “social episode” (van Dijk 2008: 16 ff, 25). This theory does not draw on a supposedly fixed causality between language and context. On the contrary, it is explicitly directed against such deterministic views (p. 217). The construct of *mental models* integrates the problematic notion of *relevance* into the theoretical concept of *context* (p. 79). Furthermore, van Dijk adds a new dimension to the interrelation of *text* and *context*. In his line of argument, *texts* can be integrated into *contexts* and thus influence the formation of new texts (p. 19) – a phenomenon which is more frequently accounted for by the concept of *intertextuality* (Fairclough 1992: 47, 118, 133; Reisigl & Wodak 2009: 93). On the cognitive level, van Dijk speaks of mental “macronodes”, whose formation is influenced by the texts a person is exposed to. These “macronodes” are being altered and adapted on-line, while the person is participating in discourse (van Dijk 2009: 70). This idea accounts for intertextual links on the level of cognitive processes.

The concept of mental models echoes the title a book by Philip Johnson-Laird which was published in 1983. In this extensive work, the author provides a detailed account of the way in which he and other researchers have attempted to trace mental processes and derive a theory about mental processes and events from these findings. The author deals extensively with concepts of meaning, co-text and understanding, but his perspective is informed by logics and natural science approaches, rather than sociology. Johnson-Laird’s conception of *mental models* deals with the traceable basic features of human comprehension and production of language. It is important to note that, though the conceptualisation is elaborate and convincing (see, for example, Johnson-Laird 1983: 429 f), the applications outlined in the book are of a much more limited scope than those proposed by van Dijk in CDA. It is explicitly stated that “[there] is [...] little danger of creating a psychology capable of modelling an individual's thoughts” (p. 12), and the empirically supported

properties of mental models do not contain categories such as identity or ideology. Nevertheless, the latter evidently draws on the cognitive concept. I shall explore similarities and differences between the two scholars in greater detail below.

Going back to van Dijk's application of the *mental model* concept on CDA, elaborate and plausible though this application may be, it does add to the terminological confusion with regard to the notion of *context*. The word, in the "Sociocognitive Approach", is only applied to the "subjective mental representation" that discourse participants have of their social environment (van Dijk 2009: 66). Consequently, the referent term for the material social environment is lost. To complement for this loss, van Dijk chooses to select a different term, namely *social situation* (van Dijk 2008, 25). Thus, the total number of terms within the CDA paradigm is increased, which is confusing for readers.

It is probably sensible to think about discourse and related phenomena in cognitive terms, as well as linguistic and sociological ones. But although this perspective on discourse analysis undoubtedly has its merits, it does not revolutionise CDA fundamentally. It has to be acknowledged that the gap between *context* and meaning has not disappeared, just because *context* is renamed *social situation* in this CDA variant. Van Dijk (2008: 73) himself feels there is a lack of data which might enable detailed accounts of how people arrive at their mental models. He also acknowledges that the influence of identity factors and other personal traits of the participants remains probabilistic (pp. 64, 127). The extent to which his *mental models* are applied by language users themselves in individual instances can only be guessed by observing the textual outcome – a shortcoming of CDA methodology in its entirety. It is still unexplained how these models are supposed to function in detail, what shapes them, and how they can possibly be observed and described. Furthermore, it remains an open question whether a greater amount of data will indeed lead to a thorough understanding of the mental processes involved in discourse production and understanding, as van Dijk evidently hopes. This hope appears to be somewhat optimistic at present.

2. 2. 2 Discourse and Text

Context is, as can be guessed, not the only contested and problematic term in the paradigm of CDA. Another basic notion that is frequently used in diverging senses is the term *discourse* itself. Teun van Dijk (2009: 67) unreservedly acknowledges that defining the term in great detail might be more trouble than it is worth, since this endeavour would involve “many other fundamental notions that need definition”. Even though the notion of *discourse* may be too large to define it ultimately, naturally, many scholars whose work deals with discourse have offered definitions of the sense in which they apply the concept in their own work.

Coming back to the problematic interference of the vagueness of everyday uses of basic terms, the word *discourse* is regularly used in different senses. At the most basic level, the term may be used to refer to at least three things: *discourse* can either denote the process of deriving meaning from words or signs in communication (Fairclough also refers to this aspect as *semiosis*; 2009a: 163), or apply to all language within a certain larger field of social life (e.g. “political discourse”), or all language that expresses a particular view on (parts of) the world (e.g. “neo-liberal discourse”) (Fairclough 2009a: 162 f). All these uses of the term can be found in the works of CDA scholars.

First, it can be pointed out that there are quite a few basic elements which are shared across the paradigm of CDA. A conveniently broad definition of *discourse* has been offered by Louis de Saussure in his attempt to give an overview of CDA:

[D]iscourse is an organized set of utterances reflecting, [sic] or in relation with an organized set of thoughts [...] (de Saussure 2007: 181).

This definition is essentially parallel to the notion of *semiosis*. It may be understood to define discourse as the process of deriving *meaning* from a *text*. However, it may also be applied to the other possible senses of *discourse* as well, however. Reisigl and Wodak propose some constitutive properties of discourse (2009: 89): Discourses are considered to be “related to a macro-topic”, to “[involve] several social actors,” and to be “linked to the argumentation about [...] truth [or] normative validity”. These properties point towards a use of the term that corresponds more with the other two aspects enumerated by Fairclough (2009a: 162 f) above, for example “political” or

“neo-liberal discourse”. Needless to say, any such inclusive conception of the term leaves open many questions when one tries to apply it practically. De Saussure’s definition, for example, gives no indication as to what precisely the relation between utterance and thought is, and how it can or should be examined.

Basically, if the term *discourse* is used referring to the relationships between the concrete world and the social reality of people. This leads to the challenge of identifying the different facets of such relationships that may become relevant for discourse analysis, since each scholar is likely to place different value on each of these facets in his/her practice. One possible way of systematising the different elements of discourse has been proposed by Widdowson (2004). His book bears the title *Text, Context, Pretext*, while “text” refers to the level of instantiation (or “materialization”; Jäger & Maier 2009: 37), “context” to various influential elements outside the text itself, and “pretext” to the speaker’s intentions, pre-existent knowledge, values and so on. Analysts who are inclined towards the cognitive sciences, for instance van Dijk, may want to extend this enumeration by introducing a level of mental representation.

However, the nature of the relationship between discourse and “material reality” is conceptualised in different ways by different scholars; in the tradition of Michel Foucault, Jäger and Maier (2009: 36) see discourse as material reality. As it is not possible for human beings to interact (that is, to be socially active) outside discursive structures, discourses “not only shape but even enable (social) reality”. In this conceptualisation, discourses are seen as constitutive of social subjectivity. Via “form[ing] individual and mass consciousness”, they create social subjects and “determine [social] action” (Jäger & Maier 2009: 36 f). In this sense, Jäger and Maier regard the things people say (and do) as immediately causal for, for instance, “legitimiz[ing] and secur[ing] dominance” (Jäger & Maier 2009: 35). This materialist view, however, is not shared by all scholars.

Again, Teun van Dijk stands out against other scholars in focussing on the relationship between the object world and the representations of this world in people’s minds. He has incorporated sociocognitive elements to form the distinct variant of CDA introduced above. Conversely to Jäger and Maier, he opposes the notion of “(immediate) ‘material conditions,’” (van Dijk, 2008: 118) with regard to

discourse production and understanding. His methodology is based on the assumption that humans cannot relate directly to the world around them at all. Their only way of doing so is via the above mentioned *mental models*. They serve as a guideline for understanding discourse, as well as producing it (van Dijk 2009: 77 f).

Most scholars, however, neither adhere to the strictly materialist variant of CDA that is proposed by Jäger and Maier, nor to the view that social interaction cannot be studied without cognitive interfaces, exemplified by van Dijk. Though Norman Fairclough, for example, explicitly comments on the option to include findings from the field of cognitive science in the critical study of discourse (Fairclough 2009: 183), he neither dismisses them as downright irrelevant, nor does he seek to integrate them into his own CDA variant. Seemingly, the endeavour to fathom the workings of the human mind is simply perceived as exceeding the scope of Fairclough's work – and this may well sum up the attitudes of many other scholars, whose backgrounds and research objectives do not correspond with van Dijk's, towards this topic. Often, researchers do not make an elaborate concept of *discourse* explicit at all. Mostly, scholars like Fairclough seem to content themselves with a basically materialist attitude comparable to that uttered by Jäger and Maier.

Despite an extensive reference to Michel Foucault's discourse concept, Fairclough criticises that this is not suitable for all aspects of discourse analysis (Fairclough 1992: 38, 60). In this earlier work, Fairclough (1992: 62) restricts the use of the term *discourse* to cases "where linguists have traditionally written about 'language use', 'parole' or 'performance'". Later on, the concept is elaborated further. However, the use of this term is far from uniform across the research area. For other scholars, it is not always clear which significance is attributed to language itself within the notion of discourse: many scholars use the terms *social interaction* and *discourse* interchangeably. This suggests that non-linguistic interactive practices, such as purely visual presentations, bodily actions and so on, are also included in their concept of *discourse*. In fact, this inclusion of other ways of interacting is frequently advocated explicitly and features in the self-representation of CDA as the key-word "multimodality" (e.g. Wodak & Maier 2009: 2; Fairclough 2009a: 163). However, this claim is hardly ever put into practice. CDA appears to deal with linguistic features and

context analysis in most studies, choosing their focus according to the objective of the respective study.

One aspect that seems to be common to all variants of CDA is that the relationship between the perception of social reality and *discourse* is typically regarded as a mutually constitutive or “dialectic” one (Fairclough 2000: 67; 2009). This means that neither is exclusively constitutive of the other, but the formation of each depends on the other. Van Dijk (2009: 83) describes the influences of discourses on the structures of society as oscillating between “bottom-up and top-down linkage”.

Generally, discourses on a macro-level are said to be “more than the sum of the utterances composing [them]”, which means that they have properties which are not to be found in the individual utterances which instantiate them (de Saussure 2007: 181). These properties “have primacy over [the] parts [of discourse interrelations]” (Fairclough 1992: 68). This would also imply that discourses are not simply collections of texts, but more than that. If that were so, the question would arise, how those properties of discourses which exceed their textual instantiations can be identified, described, or indeed perceived at all. Moreover, the idea that discourses exist apart from textual instantiation is not shared by some CD analysts: A few openly state their more radical materialist stance (such as Jäger and Maier, see above). Reisigl and Wodak (2009: 89) simply define “texts” as “parts of discourses”. In practice, however, the relationship between a discourse and its instantiations in individual utterances is often described in a way which suggests that a particular discourse may consist of more components than are actualised in a particular text, since analyses often draw on associations, connotations, intertextual relations and other levels of meaning which are not located in the actual text under scrutiny. It is sometimes not apparent whether the differentiation between these two options is made at all.

A reason for this may be that the line between the everyday uses of the term is not always so clear-cut. In its non-scientific usage, the term *discourse* often refers predominantly to language phenomena. Another difficulty arises from the component of “thoughts” in the definition of discourse (see de Saussure 2007: 181), because it is difficult to account for by empirical means. CDA scholars also explicitly acknowledge the great complexity of discourse phenomena, such as relations of interdiscursivity

and intertextuality (Fairclough 1992; Reisigl & Wodak 2009: 90). The notion of intertextuality plays an important role in Fairclough's and others' work and holds that "snatches of other texts" are incorporated into texts. CD analysts argue that inferences about the properties of underlying discourses can be made by examining themes, formulations and other linguistic features which occur and re-occur in several different texts (Reisigl & Wodak 2009: 90; van Leeuwen 2009: 145). The tracing of relationships between texts provides evidence for the historicity of texts, that is to say, the fact that individual texts can be understood as parts of historical developments, as opposed to seeing them as timeless and absolute (see Fairclough 1992: 84). Textual features, such as lexical choice, structure, and so on, are then assumed to point towards properties of an underlying macro-discourse. Interdiscursivity, on the other hand, is a notion which is hardly ever elaborated in theoretical works. Basically, the idea seems to be that discourses can invade each other, so that, for example, language of a particular sphere is taken over into another sphere, or that connotations for particular language items can be introduced (Fairclough 1992: 188).

In connection with the relationship between different discourses, or discourse spheres, *recontextualization* (Fairclough 2009a: 165) is a crucial concept. Discourses appear to be distinct from each other, but are able to "colonise" others or be appropriated to them. It may, for example occur that a discourse whose origins lie in economics is recontextualised and thus becomes relevant in other areas of social life, e.g. "in the political field or the wider educational field" (Fairclough 2009a: 165, see also 1992: 117). The process of recontextualization can be seen as positive or negative – this categorisation probably depends on whether the effects of recontextualization in individual cases are assessed as beneficial or harmful. A negative example given in Fairclough (1992: 114 ff) is the use of language commonly associated with advertising (and thus originally connected to the sphere of commodity marketing) in texts from other domains, like a text giving the "conditions of use" for a credit card, which should be an informative text for the customers, whereby the discourse of advertising allegedly colonises other discourses and so contributes to the spread of consumerism. The demarcation of each discourse sphere (e.g. educational discourse against political discourse) largely corresponds with a general

perception of distinct spheres of social life and appears to be made intuitively by the researcher (for further examples, see also Reisigl & Wodak 2009). There is no indication of a systematic method for arriving at these demarcations. In practice, this might sometimes cause problems, since the placement of actual texts within particular discourse areas is bound to remain arbitrary to a certain degree.

In the light of these highly complex interrelationships between discourses and in texts, the fact that scholars often do not account for them in great detail appears to have practical reasons. Very detailed accounts of these relationships would devour so much time and energy that the scope of individual projects would presumably be greatly limited.

Following up these considerations, discourse structures and textual actualisations are regarded as standing in mutual influence. It is evident that discourses can be analysed only through the expressions they take in actual texts (Widdowson 2004: 75). One central concept on which a critical text analysis is grounded, is the notion of choice (van Dijk 2008: 143), or contrast. When a speaker/writer wants to express a certain thought, s/he always has several ways of doing so at her/his disposal. CD analysts work with the basic assumption that there are certain motives which make a person use version X, rather than the possible versions Y or Z (Cameron 2000: 50). In other words, the actual realisation of an intended meaning indexes a social situation (van Dijk 2008: 147). The assumption that the (often covert) reasons for such choices are detectable via analysis is a central aspect of the theoretical background of CDA practice. "Ordinary" recipients are capable of inferring the intentions of a speaker/writer back from her/his textual output to a certain degree, and a scholarly analysis can reveal even more of these intentions.

In CDA however, the significance that is attributed to the choices of text producers is extended further than in other related disciplines. CD analysts think of these choices as being rooted not only in external contextual factors (which indicate requirements of appropriateness in certain situations), but also in factors such as "evaluations/appraisals" and in "ideology" (van Dijk 2008: 172), and that these can and should be observed as well. According to van Dijk, for example, linguistic style can "be controlled by speakers so as to influence the context definitions of recipients", as it enables the speaker/writer to present herself/himself in a light that is

conductive to her/his pursued aims (2008: 147). This assertion shows that CDA operates on the basis of the assumption that language can be put to manipulative uses to exert influence over recipients directly. The implication is that the degree to which recipients will be persuaded and manipulated by a text is controllable to a significant extent by the text producers.

This view is expressed in numerous accounts of CDA practice. In her essay about political language, Wodak (2009: 583) refers to political language as “necessarily [involving] persuasive elements”, since this lies in the nature of political texts. Lexical choices, for example, may be fraught with positive or negative connotations, and thus the text producer(s) can purposefully present the topic at issue (or the people involved in the portrayed event) in a favourable or a negative light. An often quoted example is the difference between presenting agents as “terrorists”, as opposed to “freedom fighters” (van Dijk 2008: 178). To provide a further example, Fairclough (2000: 81) attributes considerable significance to the fact that New Labour politicians often do not mention multinational companies explicitly when talking about global economy. Clark (1992, cited in van Dijk 2008: 166) shows that the absence of perpetrators in the media coverage of violence against women mitigates the readers’ perception of their guilt. Such “significant absences” are regarded as indicative of covert agendas, in these cases, the concealment of the active role of large companies in shaping processes of global economy to meet their interests, or a euphemistic account of violent crimes against women, in which the culprits are anonymous. Similar features, often referred to as “agent deletion” (though this feature is merely one example among many others) are analysed frequently in CDA studies (see also van Dijk 2008: 105).

It is, however, also acknowledged that language use in practice is governed by conventions to a great extent (Reisigl & Wodak 2009: 90; van Dijk 2009: 69). The actual requirements posed by a certain text genre or a communicative situation are of course virtually impossible to systematise, a fact which contributes to the problematic nature in the research practice of CDA. The acknowledgement of the degree to which textual structures are determined externally, however, is not taken to mitigate the validity of the research results by the practitioners.

Coming back to the different uses of the term discourse, another of its facets can be located in the relationship between linguistic (or other forms of social) expression and the process of deriving meaning from such practices. Within CDA, discourses are conceptualised as ways of deriving meaning out of social practices within their respective contexts (van Leeuwen 2009: 144). Widdowson (2004: 75) concisely distinguishes between “what people say” (i.e. text), and “what people talk about” (i.e. discourse). In this conceptualisation, textual evidence can be observed and described, whereas discourse takes place on a subjective level, between and inside participants’ minds.

Essentially, of course, *meaning* is the very thing that the study of discourse, critical or not, is ultimately concerned with. In this context, yet again, the definition matters. The word *meaning* can be understood to mean two things: the so-called *meaning potential* (that is, the full range of ambivalent ways of understanding an utterance) of a text, and the particular meaning or meanings a recipient chooses to make of this text. Usually, the term is used for both of these senses, often concretised as meaning potential (Fairclough 1992: 75). This double use of the term may lead to confusion: sometimes it is not clear with regard to the objectives of CDA projects, whether the meaning potential or the individual meaning derived by participants are at issue, and how these two senses are interconnected or distinguished.

In the light of this overview it becomes clear that the central object of research for CDA, *discourse*, is an elusive and rather vague concept. The perspectives on some key terms of the paradigm vary considerably from author to author. It is unlikely that these different conceptualisations can ever be unified. Due to these inconsistencies in the use of many terms, one would have to infer their properties from the way each analysis is carried out in order to really understand the conceptualisation of key terms in each particular application.

2. 3 CDA in Practice

On the basis of their diverging definitions of CDA’s essential terms, it is not surprising that CDA scholars should show considerable differences in their research practices as well. Perhaps more surprising is the fact that many studies in the field of CDA indeed are comparable in the objectives they pursue, the results they obtain and the

steps they take in order to obtain them. I have touched upon a few practical examples taken from the wide field of CDA in the previous section. The following chapter will provide a more detailed overview across some aspects of this practice in order to give an impression of how the theoretical considerations elaborated above are implemented.

Teun van Dijk has been quoted above stating that it is the political commitment which sets CD analysts apart, rather than their methods (2009: 63). In accordance with this commitment, the particular interest of CDA scholars towards texts from political discourse spheres is manifest. Many analyses deal with official documents, speeches, policy papers and so on (such as Cillia & Wodak 2009; Fairclough 2000; Reisigl 2009). In principle, however, analyses of any kind of text are considered to provide valuable insights into the power distribution and hierarchical structures in society (Fairclough 1992: 38). Consequently, the language of advertisement or interactions in medical contexts have also been analysed (for example Hein et al. 1985). The practitioners' political aspirations contribute to the appearance of the field as uniform, at least to a certain degree.

In many respects, CDA practice draws on its legacy from linguistics. Many works draw on Michael Halliday's systemic-functional grammar (henceforth SF grammar). The most important input from SF grammar on which CDA is built is probably the approach to meaning *in context*. SF grammar's particular influence lies in its central aim to systematically explore language in the context of its use. This has certainly been fruitful for CDA practice. In SF grammar, these are categorised into the ideational, the interpersonal and the textual functions, basic concepts which are echoed in some works located in CDA; Fairclough's own categorisation of language functions undoubtedly echoes Halliday's: he distinguishes "'identity', 'relational', and 'ideational' functions" (1992: 64). CDA is also indebted to SF grammar for aspects of the "constructive nature" of discourse (p. 64). Still, although a certain SF grammar heritage is not denied by CDA scholars, some aspects of it have also been contested. Van Dijk (2008: 218), for example, argues that there are certain aspects within SF grammar which should be developed further in order to serve the purpose of CDA better. He points out that SF grammar has a systematisation of the notion of *context* that is too vague for it to be immediately applicable for CDA. Furthermore, in

accordance to van Dijk's commitment to a cognitive approach to discourse, he criticises Halliday for his anti-cognitivist stance. It would be an exaggeration in general to say that CDA uses SF grammar as a methodological guide in its full scope. Even though CDA scholars have adopted or been inspired by ideas taken from Halliday, they usually apply them in a rather selective and often idiosyncratic manner.

Another defining feature which remains the same in the majority of practical studies within the CDA paradigm is that there is a key interest in a diachronic perspective on the research object. Most analysts base their results on observations of change they detect in a certain discourse field. Thus, one of the key interests of Fairclough's survey of the language of New Labour (2000: 89, 92) is to adduce evidence of the purposeful alteration of existing discourse structures which he detects in the discursive practice of members of the Labour Party. He claims that this alteration is accomplished by the conscious recontextualization and recombination of pre-existing discourses (for example, using discourse structures derived from economic discourses in educational discourse, and thus establishing a link between the two social spheres. Other scholars have set a focus on historical developments covering longer time spans, notably Reisigl and Wodak (2009, see also Reisigl 2009, Czyżewski 2009). This diachronic orientation of many variants of CDA probably lies rooted in the nature of the discourse as a social construct. The properties of discourse are most easily observed at instances where there is a change of some kind in these structures, for it is only then that subjects (in this case, the researchers) can adopt a critical stance towards these structures. As soon as new ways of speaking about the world become fully normalised, they appear unmarked and thus much more elusive to observation and criticism.

In addition to this distinctive perspective on the object of their research, there are some similarities in methodological proceedings among different authors. Many studies conducted within the paradigm are built up in similar ways. Researchers frequently suggest that the rough categorisation of macro-topics should initiate the study (Reisigl & Wodak 2009: 93; van Dijk 2009: 68). Then, individual texts are placed in the adherent macro-discourses and in their respective contexts (or, in van Dijk's terms, social situations). Sometimes, these larger units of discourse meaning

are described in an in-depth description of the larger context in which the particular texts can be placed (for example Fairclough 2000). Then, usually, the authors proceed to the analysis of linguistic features in order to establish connections between underlying discourse properties and textual actualisations, a complex endeavour with many open questions (see below). The analysis is usually concluded by considerations of possible improvements and applications.

Next, similarities on the level of textual analysis can be noted. Although the degree of detail in which textual analyses are carried out varies considerably, both between individual scholars and within the work of each scholar, there are some features which reoccur.

CDA is often centrally concerned with word meaning, the argument being that it is possible for certain agents in a society to consciously and purposefully steer the semantic meaning of words (Fairclough 2000: 154), in order to pursue their goals, or to gain and sustain power. This belief is reflected in numerous examples taken from a variety of studies. Fairclough (2009b: 512) provides the example of referring to university students as “customers”. Other examples are given in Fairclough’s extensive study of the language of New Labour in 2000, where the conscious attribution of particular connotations to a certain term is at issue (see for example the introduction of the term “stakeholding”, Fairclough 2000: 84). The tactics employed in order to change the semantic meanings of certain words take advantage of the general ambivalence of word meaning: by “highlight[ing] different senses” of a word, individual pragmatic uses of a word are promoted and become naturalised (Fairclough 1992: 188). Although this is in itself a neutral practice in communication, in this case the author detects an ulterior motive behind this practice.

Similarly, Cillia and Wodak (2009) have studied anti-Semitic discourse patterns in the rhetoric of the Austrian right-wing politician Jörg Haider, who employs particular lexical items “to criminalise Ariel Muzicant [spokesperson of the Austrian Jewish community]” and thereby to discredit him in the debate about restitutions for victims of National Socialist crimes, as well as their descendants. Textual evidence of anti-Semitic discourse is provided in the exclusive reference to a person as “a Jew”, “something which is only ever done to activate anti-Semitic ideologies” (p. 201). This is also an instance where the notion of *intertextuality* is an important concept for CDA

practice. The authors show how texts draw on other texts and thus demonstrate their historicity. In this case, Haider utilises features of previous anti-Semitic discourse consciously (drawing, for example, on National Socialist diction), and so evokes pre-existent stereotypes about Jewish people in the perception of recipients.

In terms of word meaning, the use of synonyms frequently appears as a part of a CDA research project. The study of synonyms sometimes provides instances where the significance of choice becomes apparent. One striking – and popular – example is the choice between “terrorists” and “freedom fighters” in media reports (van Dijk 2008: 178) quoted further above. Still, we must bear in mind that the use of synonyms does not always yield such graphic examples. Connotations may be more subtle and difficult to pin down, and interpretations more difficult to justify. Likewise, CDA has established the study of metaphor use in everyday language. In literary criticism, metaphors have long been considered a rewarding object of analysis. CDA has introduced them into the study of “ordinary language” and argues that they should be studied critically. The choice of a particular metaphor can “structure the way we think and the way we act, and our systems of knowledge and belief, in a pervasive and fundamental way” (Fairclough 1992: 194). An example provided by Fairclough in a more recent publication (2000: 69) is the construal of “change” in the language of New Labour. Change, which comprises developments like the globalisation of the economy, is metaphorically constructed as a natural process that is inevitable and unquestionable by using words from semantic fields related to natural catastrophes. The mechanisms and interests behind this “change” are not made explicit in discourse that is controlled by New Labour politicians.

Other aspects of word meaning and structure that are of interest to CDA scholars can be summarised under the heading of “mitigation”. One example that has been mentioned above is the euphemistic media coverage of violent crimes against women (Clark 1992, cited in van Dijk 2008: 166). Similar phenomena have been described by others, notably with regard to the language used by National Socialist in Austria in the years between 1939 and 1945. The authors argue that Austrian politicians have mitigated the negative portrayal of National Socialist crimes committed in Austria and by Austrians, in their accounts by omitting information on who the perpetrators were (Cillia & Wodak 2009: 198).

However, CDA also sets store by the analysis of the structural organisation of language, notably grammatical choices. Potentially, any choice of structure could carry ideological meaning. Since the choice of the active voice is generally regarded to be the “unmarked” variant, the use of passive sentence structures can be indicative of a certain agenda. The passive voice often enhances what has been called “agent deletion” (see above), namely the deliberate omission of an agent (or agents) in the description of an event. CD analysts try to cull possible reasons for such omissions which presumably lie in the interests of the text producer(s) (Fairclough 1992: 182). The same effect of blurring agency that the use of passive voice entails can be achieved by nominalisation. Nominalisation is the choice of a noun over a verb that could be selected as well. It “turns processes and activities into states and objects” (Fairclough 1992: 182) and thus contributes to a more abstract depiction of that same process.

Another important issue in CD analyses is the representation of social groups and agents in general. It is a regular characteristic of language use, particularly in public spheres, that speakers indicate group membership and identity of themselves and other participants in certain ways. Typically, so-called “in-groups” are constructed to address a particular target group and evoke solidarity, whereas “out-groups” serve the purpose of demarcating the identity of in-group members (Reisigl 2009: 215, van Dijk 2008: 105). In order to do this, the positive traits of the “in-group” are frequently highlighted, whereas negative aspects of belonging to it are presented as negligible. Complementing this strategy of positive self-representation, we frequently find negative representation of “the Other”. Such strategies are deemed significant for a critical approach to discourse (Fairclough 2000: 35; Wodak 2009: 585), as speakers/writers are likely to use them with particular – perhaps ideological – aims, for example to “[shift] the blame” to groups outside one’s own identification group as a means of constructing a euphemistic self-representation and justify one’s own actions (Reisigl & Wodak 2009: 118) . They may also construe certain persons or social groups as victims or perpetrators, as active or passive. Biased representation of agents is reportedly also reflected in the choice of verbs: van Leeuwen (2009: 155) argues that the use of verbs which regularly take a non-human object referring to a human object can present those human beings as dehumanised resources.

All the aspects of textual analysis mentioned in this section so far are detectable in written as well as spoken texts (or genres which could be placed in either category, such as speeches). However, CDA has also dealt with features which are exclusive to spoken interaction, such as the phenomenon of turn taking. Turn-taking is governed by conventions about the right to interrupt other speakers, to open and close conversation, or to introduce new topics into a conversation. According to CDA scholars, such conventions point towards the relations of power between the discourse participants (Fairclough 1992: 153). During a medical examination, for example, it is usually the doctor who holds the privileges of introducing new topics, interrupting the patient or bringing the conversation to an end. Even if doctors make a particular effort to listen to their patients and engage them in personal interaction, the power distribution remains intact: the fact that doctors exercise power over their patients in their role as experts is reflected, for example, in the turn-taking behaviour of the participants (Fairclough 1992: 147 ff).

However, CDA is also concerned with properties of texts on higher levels. The “architecture” of a text, the inherent build-up is deemed to point towards “systems of knowledge and belief and the assumptions about social relationships and social identities” which underlie it (Fairclough 1992: 77). Fairclough (2000: 129) argues further, for example, that presenting information in boxes in a text is indicative of a particular agenda behind the text. Information boxes can be seen as “pedagogical”, and therefore “reader-directive”, because the information is presented in a way that does not encourage the recipient to question it or read it in a resistant way. One further example provided by Fairclough (p. 129) concerns the conventions guiding the production of tabloid newspaper articles. Allegedly, these conventions inherently assign particular roles to the people interacting with this kind of text: the text producer is construed as an authoritative “news giver”, whereas the recipient is restricted to passive consumption.

Particularly with regard to their concern with lexical choice, CDA shares pretensions with movements of political correctness. Findings of discourse analysts have enhanced campaigns for gender-sensitive language use, for example, by raising awareness for sexist structures in language (notably the use of “he” as a generic pronoun, see Graddoll & Swann 1989, cited in Fairclough 1992: 205). This

connection is apparent in the importance of the application of CDA findings (Reisigl & Wodak: 2009: 95), which is frequently stressed by CDA scholars. It is once more Norman Fairclough (1992: 90) who advocates the enhancement of language awareness in education in an early publication. Much of the work of CDA is motivated by the scholars' political engagements. Therefore, it is hardly surprising that they should wish to put their findings to a use which is beneficial for society.

Some aspects of the methodology in CDA resemble those in literary criticism very much (e.g. Reisigl 2009). This influence can be traced back to Hodge and Kress (1993: 160), who suggest the application of a "hermeneutic strategy" for reading texts guided by a "a critical doubt that texts mean what they seem to". They refer to their own practical work as CDA, but also as "social hermeneutic" (Hodge & Kress 1993: 175).

It is noteworthy, for example, that Roger Fowler, who can be regarded as one of the founding fathers of critical linguistics, is also an exponent of literary criticism, and advocates a synthesis of both areas in his book *Linguistic Criticism* of 1996. Here, he points out an important difference between literary criticism and SF grammar: whereas SF grammar applies its analytic procedures "to the text 'cold'", without forming any thesis about the text in advance, Fowler advocates the use of an initial thesis to be confirmed via analysis (1996: 8). As we will see, this is regarded as a common feature of CDA practice as well, and a problematic one at that (see below).

In addition to an emphasis on preformed expectations about what the analyst expects to find, the reliance on introspection and the focus on the analyst's point of view can be seen as a parallel to literary criticism. Both literary critics and CD analysts approach texts basically with the aim of evaluating its form, for example in relation to a particular ideological paradigm: CDA scholars could be said to provide anti-capitalist, anti-Fascist or Marxist readings of texts, albeit not literary ones.

Another central notion which CDA shares with literary criticism is *intention* (Fish 1989: 7). We frequently find that speculations about the intentions of text producers play a central role in the critical analysis of discourse.

Summing up these considerations, the CDA project appears immensely complex. All possible levels of linguistic and social phenomena appear in analyses, even if they

are often only briefly touched upon. The sheer vastness of this endeavour often forces practitioners to consider each level in a comparatively shallow manner.

2. 4 Critical Approaches to CDA

After considering the width of the CDA paradigm, it is necessary to point out that the entire approach is highly controversial. There are a number of scholars from linguistic backgrounds who regard the practices in the paradigm with scepticism. Part of the problematic aspects of CDA seems to be rooted in the very nature of its research object; an essential goal of CDA is to examine the relationship between the world views and values systems of social actors, and their ways of carrying out social practices (Paltridge 2006: 183). This relationship is intrinsically difficult to examine, since this can only be done via the way actual individuals express them (discursively). Furthermore, CDA scholars themselves concede that this relationship is not direct or transparent (Fairclough 2000: 67).

The fact that some methods are derived from literary criticism has also been held against CDA. Widdowson has described the approach as “a kind of literary poetics” (1998: 149). This means that CDA researchers do not account sufficiently for the difference between signification (on the semantic level) and significance (on the level of pragmatics). Partly, this problem has been anticipated above in connection to the notion of *relevance*. Which contextual factors are made relevant by the participants can only be guessed at; it is unlikely that all of them would present themselves to an observer.

I have mentioned a number of aspects which apply both to literary criticism and CDA and will now explore problematic aspects of this correlation. In SF grammar, as I have explained further above, there is a demand for a disinterested approach to a text (Fowler 1996: 8). In opposition to this, Fowler advocates the formation of a thesis about any text before the analysis, a tendency that is evident in CDA practice as well, even though it is not usually made explicit. CDA practitioners regularly follow a pre-formed hypothesis as to what they expect to find in a text. Indeed, it is conceivable that, without such a preformed hypothesis, an endeavour of the kind proposed by CD analysts is unattainable in the first place. This assertion will be put to the test in the second section of this paper.

Another central notion which CDA shares with literary criticism is *intention*. It is a regular feature of CDA work that the analysts make assertions about the intention an author or speaker may have had when producing a text. The assertion that “what a text means is what its author intends” (Knapp & Michaels 1985, cited in Fish 1989), which has been uttered by literary critics, appears polemical and would almost certainly not be validated by any CDA scholar. However, it is common practice in CDA to impute to a text producer certain intentions which the analyst seeks to uncover.

It seems that CDA scholars do not acknowledge that this poses a discontinuity with their claims: Hodge and Kress, for example, explicitly state the importance of considering the recipient’s point of view in any analysis (1993: 175), but do not seem to give it particular attention in their analytical practice. Their claims about intentions are allegedly based on textual evidence itself. This disregards the difference between semantic and pragmatic aspects of meaning.

Stanley Fish (1989: 87) identifies *interpretation* as one of the key issues in literary criticism. In applied linguistics, the focus CDA sets on interpretation has of course been regarded as problematic (see Widdowson 2004: 20), because an interpretation cannot claim to be objective in the way analysis ought to be. This entails the question “What is the source of interpretative authority?”, which Fish calls “the central question” in literary criticism (1989: 87). With regard to CDA at least, this question so far remains unanswered by critics and defendants of CDA alike.

One variant of CDA, the socio-cognitive approach developed by van Dijk (e.g. 2009: 77 ff), merits an in depth consideration. The “approach” proposes its own way of integrating the concepts of *relevance* and *context* into his *mental models*, but it does not provide any hint at a method for determining this relevance. He gives an example from his own practice (2009: 166), in which he states that a text producer, regardless of her/his gender, might adopt a mental model with “a masculine perspective”, when s/he produces a text which portrays maleness as the unmarked state of being. The same supposedly applies to instances where violent treatment of young black people by white policemen and –women is represented (i.e. a “white” perspective is adopted). How he arrives at this conclusion, however, is not explained in detail. In fact, there is no explanation as to what determines the “masculinity”, or the

“whiteness”, of a potential mental model or how these features come into being. The mental models of participants are inherently unobservable for outsiders, and it is doubtful whether even interrogations of actual discourse participants will yield reliable data on the configuration of concrete *mental models*. Even though the socio-cognitive variant of CDA suggests integration of results from natural sciences into the paradigm, it ultimately does not put to use any definite results from disciplines such as neuroscience or cognitive studies. The *mental models* concept stays on a purely theoretical level, and fails to fertilise CDA on the practical level. The researcher essentially has to resort to intuitive guess-work (of varying degrees of persuasiveness) when it comes to explaining what mental models really do. Insight into cognitive processes eventually might be able to contribute to more reliable results in the field of CDA, but so far, these seem to offer no more than assumptions, and thus fail to enhance the credibility of CDA results. The problem of determining relevant features as a means of understanding a text remains unsolved.

Van Dijk’s practical application, even though the term is probably adopted from Johnson-Laird (1983) and other cognitive researchers, is certainly not consistent with the constraints that are laid out in the book *Mental Models*. The question is whether the concept of *mental models*, which has been developed using procedures from cognitive science, is adequate in that it can fulfil the requirements posed by CDA.

There are certainly aspects in the works of both scholars which overlap. Similarly to van Dijk, Johnson-Laird tries to examine the ways in which ways people understand language input. However, I would argue that some basic parameters are fundamentally different in the two conceptualisations of *mental models*. The original variant of the concept aims to empirically account for an exemplary model of which rules underlie human reasoning, whereas van Dijk’s adapts this concept in order to draw conclusions about actual mental processes in the minds of individuals or collectives of people.

Johnson-Laird emphatically demonstrates that formal logic cannot account for real-life human reasoning, not even within the controlled surroundings of experiment. *Mental models* in Johnson-Laird’s terms are, quite evidently, much more basic than would be required for CDA application: they predominantly deal with the ways in

which geometrical shapes or artificial sentences of the kind of “All the artists are beekeepers” are processed in the mind (Johnson-Laird 1983: 94, 116).

Johnson-Laird’s notion of *discourse* (see pp. 356 ff), furthermore, is more correctly denoted as *co-text*. The term is used exclusively to denote units of language that extend beyond a sentence, rather than the meaning making processes people employ when dealing with this language (see, e.g. p. 376f). The analyses of understanding processes, furthermore, remain on a purely semantic level, equalising *context* with *co-text*, and restricting the analysis of “discourse” to the level of text grammar, or “[s]tory grammar”, and its role as an aid for understanding larger stretches of language (p. 363). Extralinguistic phenomena are not considered in the analysis. Thus, it would be deceptive to adopt Johnson-Laird’s notion of *context* directly into a cognitively oriented CDA, as it operates on a different level and does not make assertions about the relevance of *context* in the sense in which CDA uses the term.

In addition to this, the notion of *consciousness* is regarded from strictly cognitive point of view which speculates about the minds capacity to compute information in parallel, but makes no assertions as to an individual’s value systems or believes (Johnson-Laird 1983: 453). The author concedes that the question whether consciousness can be mechanically replicated is still an open one (p. 474), because the necessary criteria for consciousness have not been established empirically. This justifies the conclusion that issues of identity and ideological disposition cannot be understood within the constraints of this model at the present stage.

The *mental models* concept is impressively persuasive in its original form, because scholars have conducted very specific experiments in order to trace the way in which mental processes may work, testing working memory or the way in which people recount a description they have been given. But although the concept apparently has a sound empirical foundation, it does not seem to be justified to apply the concept in an unedited form for the purposes of CDA. General insights into these processes are not far-reaching enough to account for ideological views and emotional processes, or the linguistic forms by which those might be expressed or initiated. Conversely to CDA approaches, the original *mental models* concept is quite remote from practical application. To summarise this point, *mental models* are as yet far from providing

reliable accounts of ways in which manipulative use of language could affect the formation of models in the minds of discourse participants.

In connection with *mental model* theory, there has been a lot of research about the nature and the processes involved in comprehension when reading (e.g. Grabe 2009). Findings of reading theory reveal similar results: they seem to be unsuitable for inferences about individual comprehension processes, but merely suggest what general processes of comprehension and interpretation of texts may involve (see Grabe 2009: 44).

Schema theory essentially holds that words or passages “trigger” certain *schemata* in people’s minds, which help them make sense of utterances or texts by providing basic information about social situations, relations, or features of reality relevant for the meaning of this utterance (Grabe 2009: 77). This notion in itself is a useful tool to understand the workings of the human mind. Widdowson (2004: 43) notes that it is the knowledge and assumptions that members of a social group share amongst themselves “which define an individual as the member of a community”. However, if this notion were to be applied fruitfully in CDA, a few fundamental questions would have to be answered, such as which schemata are likely to be triggered under which circumstances, and how such correlations can be examined from an outside perspective. The theory so far lacks empirical evidence for important questions such as “what schemas are, how they organize themselves, how they are used under different circumstances, how large they are, how many there are, or how they develop, change and merge” (Grabe 2009: 78). Another *schema* theorist, Walter Kintsch, describes issues such as “[c]ognition and emotion” as “research topics for the future” (1998: 421) and concedes, that all that can be said about them at present is that they are important.

This contemplation of the findings of cognitive science and reading theory reveal that these areas are given insufficient attention in the practice of CDA. One insight from the study of reading that should be identified as important in CDA concerns the notion of *relevance*. As an exponent of reading theory, Grabe (2009: 45) stresses the importance of the reading purpose in the formation of a situation model. Any reader may have very different reasons for reading a text (or interacting with a text in any other way), and these reasons “will most heavily influence the construction of the

situation model” (Grabe 2009: 45). Thus, the reader may approach a text with a critical attitude from the beginning, or simply expose her-/himself to a text for the sake of distraction. In each case, the reader will interact very differently with the text. The individual interaction of a recipient with a text would be highly significant in connection with the CDA project, since the processes which a text triggers in a recipient’s mind are the central issue in most works in the field. However, there seems to be a significant lack of attention to such phenomena in the practice of CDA.

Coming back to more immediate points of criticism, critics have put forward the argument that it is effectively impossible to determine the relevance of certain context features for discourse participants at a particular instance. People seem to handle texts somewhat idiosyncratically. They can derive interpretations from the same text which may differ to the point of being unrecognisable – depending on their subjective relevance schemes. Widdowson (2004: 86) illustrates this by using an extract from a novel that deals with misunderstandings on the basis of different relevance schemes of the participants. Texts can be observed and interpreted on a semantic level, and such an interpretation may provide more than one possible readings of a particular (set of) text(s). However, Widdowson (2004: 18) argues that, in order to understand the pragmatic significance of any text for its producer or recipient, it would be necessary to provide a full interpretation of the context on its various levels. CDA presents its work as doing just that in a more or less systematic way. Needless to say, however, it is impossible to analyse context in all its facets, or even to provide a full analysis of all textual traits occurring in any text. CDA scholars are necessarily restricted to a pick-and-choose procedure, focussing only on a limited number of aspects of text and context for their analyses, on the basis of what they personally understand to be relevant in a particular research project.

It has been mentioned above that CDA relies on rather informal tools in order to make these choices (de Saussure 2007: 184). The practical works of CDA scholars suggest that individual features of text, as well as *context* components, are selected intuitively, depending on which assertions the analyst is trying to prove using these texts. De Saussure (2007: 184) suggests that this preference enables the analyst to cover phenomena of greater complexity in one single project. If they attempted to procure complete analyses of their selected texts, this could necessarily yield only

limited results. Still, this informal approach naturally renders them vulnerable to criticism: Widdowson (2004: 87) remarks that in scholarly work the selection of textual and contextual features must be “an informed one”. In practice, however, the justification for the text selection often appears to arise as a consequence of the findings resulting from their analyses, which reinforces the impression that the selection has been carried out in an intuitive, and possibly biased, manner in the first place. Stubbs (1997: 2 f) summarises this point by claiming that “analysts find what they expect to find, whether absences or presences”. This state of affairs is certainly unsatisfactory, since it suggests a high degree of arbitrariness in the methodology of CDA.

To take this matter even further, CDA does not restrict its research interest to features of *text* and (material) *context*. Analysts are particularly interested in mental state, value systems and opinions of discourse participants (Paltridge 2006: 183) and claim to be able to draw conclusions about these aspects by analysing textual evidence (Widdowson 2004: 40). The manner in which this is done in the CDA paradigm can be illustrated by an example by Hein, Hoffmann-Richter et al. (1985: 53). The authors carried out an analysis of doctor-patient interaction with a critical perspective. In the conclusion, they state that the doctors they surveyed in this study reported to perceive their patients as passive interlocutors, even though the patients expressed the wish to communicate more effectively with their doctors, was in fact determined by the role models that exist of the way doctors and patients should behave. The report does not suggest that this insight is derived directly from the interviews, but presents it as a mere speculative interpretation by the authors.

The sections on terminology in this paper provide further evidence that relationships between text and context are far from clearly conceptualised in many CDA variants, and that they are sometimes not explicitly conceptualised at all. Widdowson (2007: 87) imputes to CDA scholars that they merely seek to prove precast prejudices and assumptions by selecting unilateral features. He further demonstrates how the same steps of analysis (or rather, interpretation) can lead to entirely different results, if other features were selected (2003b: 162). This suggests that the same text could technically be analysed following CDA models in a manner which provides evidence for diametrically opposed views.

Fairclough, in his earlier work, concedes that the meaning discourse participants make of a text cannot be simply “read off”, since texts are necessarily “ambivalent and open to multiple interpretations” (1992: 75, 88). A critical outlook on the CDA approach reveals that this insight remains largely without impact on the practice of CDA, however. The observable textual evidence is used to prove the ideology underlying the text. Fairclough himself solves this problem by claiming to go back to an underlying order of discourse (or macro-discourse) in which the ideology is “imprint[ed]” (1992: 88). This solution, I would argue, is not satisfactory, as no clue is given as to where we should find evidence as to the ideological properties of a discourse, apart from the instances where they are actualised in a text. This ambivalence goes back to the problematic conceptualisation of discourse as “more than the sum of the utterances composing it” (de Saussure 2007: 181) that I have touched upon above.

The title of a critical article about CDA by Michael Stubbs (1997) is *Whorf's Children*. In this article, the author raises issues that concern the Whorfian heritage which exists – at least implicitly – in the CDA paradigm. This observation is also made by Widdowson, who states:

[CDA reaffirms] the familiar Whorfian notion of linguistic determinism, but applied not only to cognition in respect of the language code, but in respect to its use in communication as well (1998: 139).

Widdowson argues that this practice has its roots in the misconception that semantic meaning is “projected [...] into pragmatic use”. He terms this misconception the “functional fallacy” (1998: 139). With regard to the influences of Whorf’s work in CDA, Stubbs (1997) argues that neither Whorf nor CDA can answer the question which language features actually affect the thoughts of language users, and in what way.

The opaqueness of the relationship between linguistic practices and the reality “outside the discourse” is also commented on by Fairclough (2000: 23). Critics of CDA are likely to accept this notion. The conclusion Fairclough draws from this insight, on the other hand, is contestable: it holds that the “adequacy” of a particular linguistic construal can be assessed by an analyst who adopts a critical view. I can only assume that, by the term “adequacy”, some kind of truth value, or morally superior stance is implied. As a consequence, the focus of such analysis would be to

evaluate how adequately a particular speaker/writer linguistically depicts the reality outside the discourse. This train of thought is evidently contradictory: if the relationship between the “real world” and its linguistic depiction by individuals is inherently non-transparent, it must ultimately be impossible to describe it, regardless of the thoroughness of any analysis carried out. In order to be able to do that, the analyst would have to analyse, as well as interpret not only the text, but its context as well, a goal which is “[hard] to attain”, since it makes context interpretation necessary (Halliday 1994, cited in Widdowson 2004: 18).

It is a problematic tendency within CDA that scholars appear to assess the content of texts with regard to “the truth”, since it contradicts the assumption that social reality is necessarily a discursive construct. I would indeed go so far as to say that it implies that there is some kind of outer reality, and that language could be used to depict this reality “truly”. Another aspect of these assertions is that the assumption of a “covert agenda” behind what somebody says or writes includes the imputation that the person might be untruthful. By attributing certain motives or intentions to a text producer, the producer is accused of consciously distorting “reality” to some degree, as a means of luring recipients into believing that reality complies with the image the text producer wants to transport. While in some cases, such accusations may be justified, because the speaker/writer really sought to delude the listener/reader, it will be difficult to find out in which cases they are and in which they are not on the basis of textual evidence. To illustrate this point with an example: when Tony Blair uses linguistic means in a speech to present “change” as something inevitable and natural, there is no way of knowing whether he does so because it is his personal conviction that change indeed is inevitable and natural, or whether he merely wants to present it in this way in order to achieve a goal (for example, to enhance people’s acceptance of change, but for reasons which do not benefit the people) – at least, the textual and contextual evidence is unlikely to provide evidence for either variant. If we cannot determine whether Blair believes in his own words or not, this cannot be the criterion for criticising his speech. Consequently, in order to condemn his representation of change as inevitable and natural, we must assume that the true nature of change is observable, and that any reasonable person would arrive at the conclusion that this representation is false. The criterion for assessing the “adequacy” of an utterance

must therefore lie outside the discourse itself, a fact which is difficult to reconcile with some theoretical aspects of the notion of discourse (see also Fairclough 2000: 118). In essence, such aspirations probably originate from the analyst's conviction with regard to what is morally right and wrong, which can of course not be objectified. Fairclough, as one of the prominent figures of the approach, provides a few hints at this basic motivation: his suggestion that he, along with other similarly inclined researchers, can (and must) assess the adequacy of a discourse (Fairclough 2000: 23) implies that this group of researchers is in a privileged position with regard to insight into truth or morality.

This is not to suggest that people (and politicians and journalists in particular) do not lie. To assume this would be naive indeed. However, these examples illustrate the inherent difficulty of determining these cases by means of linguistic analysis.

In connection with these considerations, let us come back to a problematic issue which has been touched upon earlier: the distinction between *analysis* and *interpretation*. Researchers usually refer to what they do as *analysis*, as the designation of the paradigm suggests, regardless of the fact that informal and "heuristic" (de Saussure 2007: 184) methods are employed. In Fairclough's early work "Discourse and Social Change" (1992), we find an explicit acknowledgement of a differentiation between *analysis* and *interpretation*: the author argues that it is impossible to derive meaning from texts without interpreting them in the first place (Fairclough 1992: 75). According to this line of argument, analysis can never be fully freed from interpretation on the analyst's part, since choices are involved at all stages (for example, which aspects are worth being described, with which focus the description should be carried out, and many more). Therefore, pure and objective analysis, carried out completely without interpretative bias, is dismissed as an illusion (Fairclough 1992: 199).

Along similar lines, van Dijk (2009: 78) acknowledges that the inference of "shared social representations [which] are being expressed in discourse" must be done rather indirectly. This may be perceived as problematic by critics, whereas van Dijk does not appear to share this view, but simply states the fact.

Conversely to Fairclough, Widdowson (2004: 40) advocates a more consistent delineation between *interpretation* and *analysis*. He detects a shortcoming of CDA's inconsistency with regard to this, as it entails the danger of erroneously presenting interpretation as objective analysis. Allegedly, CDA scholars present their findings as the "most valid", or even the only valid, interpretation of a text, without providing a full account of alternatives. To minimise the risk of remaining unilateral in one's analysis, Widdowson argues, the analyst should provide a variety of possible readings of individual texts. If only one possible reading is given, this reading appears to be presented as more valid or "true" than any other possible reading, even though it is just one out of a range of legitimate readings, none more valid or possible than the other (Widdowson 2003a: 143).

It is true that one might get this impression when studying the results of CDA. Results are often presented in a unilateral fashion, suggesting that the analyst has dug out "the truth" about the intentions of the speaker/writer and the undesirable effects on recipients, but only giving one possible way of interpreting the textual evidence. The recurrence to underlying discourse properties (notably suggested by Fairclough 1992: 47 f) often appears a feeble justification for the interpretation results. This appearance of bias is arguably due to the political and social commitment which is the key incentive for most CDA. However, the argument that commitment as such would render researchers incapable of carrying out unbiased analysis (Widdowson 1998: 148; 2003: 143) seems exaggerated. Most researchers will (at least occasionally) select research topics which they feel strongly about. Technically, it should be perfectly possible to carry out an unbiased study, even if the results run contrary to the authors own value system. The problem arises not from the commitment itself, but from its central and unquestioned status in CDA practice, and the consequent incapability to accept possible results which run contrary to the researcher's conviction.

Another factor which contributes to CDA's unilateral appearance is the fact that most results in CDA are gained predominantly by introspection, a feature which again suggests a link to literary criticism. The approach is very much centred upon the researcher her-/himself (Cameron 2001, cited in Paltridge 2006: 195). Enquiries into the recipients' points of view are very rarely carried out (Widdowson 1998: 143) –

indeed, to go back to an issue introduced above, CDA scholars implicitly deny “ordinary” language users the capacity to provide a critical perspective on texts themselves (Cameron 2002: 123; de Saussure 2007: 183; Fairclough 2000: 154; Hodge & Kress 1993: 160). This approach is inherently problematic, as researchers claim to use their results for the benefit of underprivileged, “naive” language users, but at the same time, they adopt a patronising stance towards the people they purport to speak for by assuming that scholars can introspectively establish which meaning recipients will (subconsciously or not) derive from a text. This implies that the scholarly reading of certain persuasive texts could provide interpretations which are more “real” than those provided by the recipients towards whom these texts are directed (see also Widdowson 1998: 142 f).

At this point, it should not remain unnoticed that there are a few (though arguably too few) instances where effects of texts on readers have been investigated and seem to support the researchers’ assumptions (e.g. Clark 1992, cited in van Dijk 2008: 166). Nevertheless, these cases are rare in comparison to studies which do not deal with interpretations other than the researcher’s at all, and therefore do not alter the negative general impression.

Summing up, shortcomings in the methods, conceptualisations, or lack of supporting data, are frequently identified as problematic in CDA publications, but scholars seldom take steps to eradicate these shortcomings. This is perhaps not surprising, as this would hinder the analysts in carrying out their agenda. Nevertheless, these observations are disappointing for those who hope that CDA will be improved so as to live up to their own claims.

3. Practical Application

The mapping of the current practices of CDA has revealed a number of questions that need answering. I have demonstrated the various approaches CDA scholars take towards their research objects and given examples of how their projects are carried out practically. However, considering the critical stance some scholars have taken towards the approach, a number of open questions cannot be disregarded. The following section of this paper seeks to illustrate these questions by way of

practical application of CDA methods. In the following section, I thereby intend to examine the claims that have been made against CDA practice with regard to their validity.

The structure of this section follows the tripartite schema proposed by H.G. Widdowson (2004) which suggests the division into the categories of *text*, *context*, and *pretext* and is based on fairly compact definitions of the term *discourse*, as well as the relevant categories for an analysis of meaning (see above).

In comparison to other theoretical constructs which have been proposed, his distinction between “[w]hat parties say” and “[w]hat parties talk about” (2004: 75) appears less unwieldy as a central object for the study of meaning-making processes. It is possible of course that this narrower definition takes away components of the much richer *context* notion that is applied in CDA studies and thus could obviate interesting insights. This potential problem will be dealt with in the course of the following section of this paper.

On the basis of an analysis of an exemplary republican speech I intend to demonstrate how well the methods suggested by CDA scholars are suited for the aim of uncovering ideological properties in language use. The focus with regard to content will be on instances which display influences of neo-liberal ideology, which is commonly associated with the Republican Party (see Introduction).

Before starting the analysis, it must be born in mind that, usually, CD analyses are carried out with a rather clear idea of what the analyst is looking for in advance (see Fowler 1996: 8). As I have pointed out, this practice has rendered the approach vulnerable to criticism (e.g. Stubbs 1997: 2, Widdowson 2003a: 143). Attempting a comprehensive analysis of republican speeches through the lens of a critical stance towards neo-liberal economic policies poses a number of challenges.

Rather than starting with a placement of the texts in their respective context(s), I will begin this section with some considerations about the *pretext* of these speeches in order to give an initial impression of the text’s interaction with its surroundings, and the expectations connected with this. This will be followed by a contextual placement of the text and a detailed analysis of textual features. Subsequently, the textual evidence will be related to the pretextual considerations in the beginning. Concluding

the analysis, more aspects of the context will be commented on in order to provide a comprehensive comparison of common and unusual rhetoric features of the text and their potential significance.

3. 1 Pretext

Any speech delivered by the former presidential candidate John McCain may serve as an exemplary republican speech of the time, as his electoral campaign was designed address the republican clientele throughout the country and use rather clear and general terms in order to do so. In addition to this, these general messages might serve the purpose of persuading as yet indecisive voters to vote for the republican candidate. The speech I shall discuss in greater detail was delivered in 2008 and deals explicitly with the republican economic policy, giving an impression of the party's neo-liberal orientation.

The *pretext* of a speech like John McCain's is comparatively easy to guess. It was part of the speaker's campaign to win the presidential elections in 2008. In order to achieve this aim, it is likely that the speech was designed to present the speaker in the most favourable light possible, to persuade voters to vote for him, and to set himself clearly apart from his opponent. All these factors will undoubtedly have influenced the choices involved in devising and delivering the speech. Some of them will be covered below.

Another motive for delivering the speech probably was to advertise his electoral platform and maximise public attention. The contents of this platform are determined by a variety of influences, but the purpose of the speech is likely to be presenting these contents in a way that makes them acceptable and relatable for as many people as possible. This aim is also likely to have, albeit subtle, influence on the choice of pronouns, lexical items and other language features. One might expect, for example, that pronouns are used in a way by which many people will feel included. There are certain topics one might expect to encounter in a speech in the described circumstances. As there is a direct opposition between the two large parties in the presidential elections, a viewer/listener might expect the republican candidate to set himself apart from his opponent and deal with some distinctive aspects of his party's

platform in order to achieve this. Furthermore, the audience is likely to expect some central issues of the current republican agenda, most likely issues connected to economic and security policy, due to the fact that the speech was delivered at a time when the global economy crisis was already noticeable, and the “war on terror” was highly present in international media.

Concerning the *pretext*, there is no way around acknowledging the persuasive nature of the text. This quality, though generally regarded with suspicion in CDA, has been acknowledged by Wodak (2009: 583) as a necessary feature of texts in political domains. Clearly, the whole point of the speech is that it provides a forum for McCain to persuade viewers/listeners that he is a good person with a good programme, whereas his opponent is not so good, and certainly has a political programme inferior to his own. I have already commented on Fairclough’s claim that CD analysts can and should make assessments of the texts they analyse in “terms of their adequacy” (2000: 23). An analyst can certainly take a stance on whether such texts are desirable to produce and publicise in the first place. But, as the analysis has its starting point in the text itself, denying the very object of analysis its ground for existence appears somewhat out of place. It can be regarded as one of the inconsistencies in many practical applications in CDA that judgement about a text is often presented as a result of the linguistic analysis of a text, although it is in fact a result of its interpretation (compare Widdowson 2003: 143). This problem will be dealt with in more detail after the textual analysis.

3. 2 Context Analysis

Beginning a tentative analysis of contextual features, the analyst is confronted with a number of choices. It is difficult to determine the context features that are relevant for gaining insight into the potential hidden meanings in the speech by John McCain. In order to make the vast concept of *context* more manageable, therefore, it has been suggested to divide its entirety into various levels. Ruth Wodak (2009: 586) proposes to cover four levels of context in each analysis (see above), a concept I decided to adopt for the present analysis as well. Most analyses approach the categorisation of *context* rather intuitively. Wodak’s proposal, therefore, may offer an applicable procedure. Interestingly, Wodak includes textual analysis in her list of context

features as the first level, “the immediate, language or text internal co-text” (Wodak 2009: 586). I shall cover these points under their own distinct heading further below.

The second level, “the intertextual and interdiscursive relationship between utterances, texts, genres, and discourses” (Wodak 2009: 586), is much less straightforward. Its definition depends on the focus the analyst chooses for the project at hand. As this thesis is concerned with the effects of neo-liberal ideology on republican language use, other documents on McCain’s “Jobs for America” programme are unlikely to reveal deeper insight with regard to the research question. A more promising route would probably be a genre-internal comparison of this speech with others taken from similar contexts, that is, speeches delivered by republican politicians from around 2008 onwards, which deal with economic phenomena. These speeches should be selected according to the following criteria: they should be comparable in that they address a similarly broad audience and should be related to the McCain speech with regard to the central topics of this analysis, namely economy, work and employment. A comparison between this speech and other texts from the genre might reveal patterns which are not apparent in the textual analysis of just one speech (compare Stubbs 1997: 7). An example of such a comparative analysis will be given below, dealing with a speech by a comparatively well-known fellow republican, Newt Gingrich.

On the third level, the institutional frame of the text is under survey (Wodak 2009: 586). Vague though this term is, it probably means that the medium of distribution of the text might be considered as much as other party’s stances on related topics. Information on the intended audience, other possible participants and the role of the speaker may also be integrated into this section (see Goffman 1981). Political speeches have very particular features that set them apart from other text types and are likely influence the ways in which such texts can be interpreted.

3. 2. 1 The Producer(s)

For many speeches, the category of the text producer is not quite straightforward. There are different levels to be considered. The speaker, in this case John McCain, certainly did not produce the text he speaks himself. He is more likely to just deliver what others have devised for him with particular aims. In Goffman’s terms, McCain is

the *animator* (1981: 144). Behind the animator figure, there is an *author*, or, even more likely, a team of authors, who wrote the speech for him to deliver. Based on Goffman's categories, Levinson (1988) has developed a more elaborate system. According to the associated terminology, McCain's status is unclear to some degree. The situation is not comparable with instances of reported speech, where a speaker relays, as it were, what somebody else has said beforehand, thus having "no illocutionary commitment". McCain, consequently, is more than a mere "transmitter" (177). He may well be the only person ever to speak the words laid down in the speech script for him. Therefore, McCain would most accurately be described as a "*relayer*", that is a "speaker who is not the source" of the text s/he delivers (170).

Within Levinson's model, Goffman's *author* is labelled *producer*, because, in this case, the producers are not identical with the speaker. With this distinction, however, the terminology becomes yet murkier: McCain could have been involved in the production of the speech and thus merit the status of *author*. On the other hand, the professional speech-writers may not be responsible for the content of the speech, but merely the actual wording. With regard to the speaker's role, it seems, the more differentiated categorisation proposed by Levinson (1988) does not fundamentally improve our understanding of the different aspects of the speaker's identity. McCain's potential involvement in text production leads us to Goffman's notion of the *principal* (1981: 144).

With regard to ideological background, we need to consider whose intentions are expressed by the text – a matter which is difficult to determine. The candidates in US presidential elections have much more autonomy to design their election campaigns than candidates in Europe have, because the political parties do not possess a hierarchical structure in the sense that European parties do (Greven 2004: 23). It can be assumed that McCain puts together the campaign team on his own authority to a certain degree. It is plausible, therefore, that the writer(s) who devise McCain's speeches for him receive instructions from him or his advisors. In the light of the decentralised and heterogeneous structure of American political parties, the category of *principal*, "that is, someone whose position is established by the words that are spoken" (Goffman 1981: 144) is rather elusive as well. The contents of pre-election

speeches may be determined by the candidates independently, or influenced by party committees.

The degree to which party-internal interest groups were involved in determining content and wording of this particular speech will hardly be estimable. With regard to political contents, the affiliated think-tanks, such as the Cato Institute or the American Enterprise Institute are probably also a considerable factor in the development of the positions for a presidential electoral platform (compare Greven 2004: 125). To give detailed analyses of the connection of such think tanks with party policies would go beyond the scope of this analysis, however.

It is possible that public appearances of a presidential candidate are also under the influence of pressure groups close to the Republican Party, so that their particular aims do not get neglected. Knowledge of such dynamics could provide deeper insight into hidden agendas in McCain's speech. Traditionally, there are a number of associations and business branches which the Republican Party is associated with. The National Rifle Association is often mentioned in this context, as is the oil industry (Greven 2004: 123), which would probably be the most conspicuous choice with regard to the speech at hand. However, McCain focuses on atom and sustainable energy, rather than on fossil fuels, which certainly does not correspond with the interests of this pressure group. Furthermore, Greven (p. 122) concedes that it is impossible to verify whether the politician influences the industry, or whether it functions the opposite way around. Consequently, it must suffice for the time being to observe that the category of *principal* remains obscure with regard to this speech.

To sum this up, at this stage, it is not possible to clearly distinguish individual or pressure group interests reflected in the text itself. However, it is still a matter of course that the text forms an exemplary text. It can be considered a typically republican text, since it is part of a campaign that presents the party's profile to the entire nation, and possibly beyond its boundaries.

3. 2. 2 The Recipients

The other significant group of discourse of this speech are its recipients. Speeches have a configuration of participants that is very unlike that of other forms of discourse. On the one hand, the members of the audience of a speech are not

interlocutors in the strict sense, since they hardly ever get the chance to speak back at all. On the other hand, “they have the right to examine the speaker directly,” (Goffman 1981:137), so that they may be regarded as privileged over other, more active participants.

With regard to the speech at hand, the receiving group is large and consists of several sub-groups. The speech was delivered at a convention of the Republican Party, where there was an audience immediately present at the delivery. In recordings of the speech (see <http://www.wienerzeitung.at>, February 27 2011), this audience can be seen behind the speaker waving banners which sport supportive slogans, clapping and laughing at the speaker’s jokes. In this sense, they deviate slightly from Goffman’s general description. They can be regarded as communicating with the speaker, even though this happens mainly nonverbally. In the more differentiated terminology of Levinson (1988: 170), it is not clear whether this group of recipients would be classified as *goal*, that is, as recipients who are both addressees and targets of the speaker’s message. They may well feel addressed by the speaker’s use of pronouns or terms of address. However, there is another, potentially more significant group of recipients which I will comment on shortly.

It is possible of course, that the audience immediately present at the delivery of the speech makes up a planned and intentional part of the delivery. By being visibly present and by supporting the speaker on principle, they can be seen as forming a part of the text for the second group of recipients. This sub-group comprises viewers, listeners, or readers who follow the speech on TV or on the internet. These recipients may in fact be the more important ones, that is to say, the group the speech was actually tailored to address. Presumably, the speech should serve to address those voters who have not decided which candidate they should vote, as much as fellow republicans at the national convention. They are the “real” recipients, or *target*, in Levinson’s terms (170 f), those on whom the impact of the speech is meant to unfold. Goffman’s description applies to them neatly: they are meant to “conjure up what a reply might be, but not utter it” (1981: 138).

Concerning the potential meanings of the speech, the intended audience is certainly decisive with regard to modes of address and word choice, presumably it also influences the choice of topic and many other aspects of text production and delivery.

In the case of speeches that are widely broadcasted and published in different formats, the category of *participant* on the receiving end of a speech-event is rather unwieldy as such (Levinson 1988: 178). This applies *a fortiori* in this case, since there is no way of knowing whom the category of *target* actually includes. Recipients could be inattentive, switch off the TV during the speech and thus lose channel-linkage for some time, or engage in other activities while being exposed to the text (p. 178). The status of recipients who view or read the text in temporal delay is also not easy to account for in either Levinson's or Goffman's models.

The construction of in-group identification and positive ascriptions to this in-group will be commented on with regard to textual actualisation in detail. Paradoxically, Levinson argues that this role is "perhaps essentially [...] defined by the pertinence of the *informational (or attitudinal) content*" (p. 178). In practice, this assertion forces the analyst into a process of circular reference, with textual features accounting for aspects of context, and vice versa. Briefly anticipating some observations on the textual level, suffice it to say that the totality of the group of addressees potentially comprises all American citizens, and thus is incredibly diverse. Consequently, a closer inspection of the audience is unlikely to provide deeper insight into the motivation of the speaker. Voter's motivations in a vast country like the United States are bound to be varied, and an analysis must be disregarded for practical reasons, as it would greatly exceed this paper.

3. 2. 3 Sociopolitical and Historical Context

The final level of analysis proposed by Wodak (2009: 586) concerns the "sociopolitical and historical contexts, which the discursive practices are embedded in and related to". This category is alarmingly broad. With regard to McCain's speech on this "Jobs for America" programme, it may be extended so far as to include analyses of the current economic development, the employment market, ideological debates about sustainable energy, open markets and their effects on a globalised economy, conservatism in America and many more aspects. With regard to the aims of the current analysis as well as the constraints of this paper, this section is predominantly concerned with the environment that the speaker's party and the

general political landscape of the United States provide. Again, I am confined to a rather sketchy account of these factors.

Firstly, the speech is part of the discourse determined by the Republican Party of the United States. In order to understand the influence this root might have on the text and its possible interpretation, it may be helpful to provide an overview of its development and its basic ideological and organisational orientation. The Republican Party is one of the great political forces in the United States, opposed by the Democratic Party. The development of a two-party system can at least partly be traced back to the election system of the state (Greven 2004: 25). Bearing in mind that the speech was delivered by McCain as part of an election campaign in which the only serious competitor was Barack Obama, this situation is likely to have influenced the build-up of the speech. Accordingly, frequent references to the opponent are made, and the speaker appears to try to position himself as the better candidate relative to this particular opponent.

It must be interjected, however, that the Republican Party is not a uniform group. The different levels are independent to a certain degree, and their common on a national level interest lies predominantly in winning elections (Greven 2004: 21, 30 f). Presidential candidates are normally not chosen by internal committees, but are elected by those citizens who declare their membership to the respective party.

The party is internally more diverse than its outward appearance may suggest. It has a number of diverse legacies, comprising conservative Christian influences next to (both with regard to social and economic policy) liberal ones (p. 23). The present presidential candidate, therefore, is much less a representative of the entire national party as is the case in European systems. Still, the generally liberal outlook of the party on matters of economy cannot be dismissed. In principle, the party rejects state intervention and propagates the free market. The mainstream of party members has essentially supported the interest of the capital rather than work since the beginning of the 20th century, originally assuming a unity between both interest groups (p. 57), and John McCain is, in all likelihood, an exponent of this orientation.

A detailed analysis of the employment market development in 2008 would go far beyond the scope of this thesis. However, it is likely that the difficult situation for

many workers at the time contributed to the choice of topic with regard to the speech. This suspicion is substantiated by Greven's estimation which holds that the party apparatuses in the US system predominantly exist to work towards winning presidential elections (2004: 21), and that they are therefore likely to consider the public mood when devising electoral platform content. Traditionally, the Republican Party is known for supporting capital interests as opposed to those of the working people (see p. 57). Therefore, one might expect them to disregard the interests of the latter group. For the 2008 election campaign, however, they turn towards issues of unemployment. And the creation of new jobs, training programmes for workers and related issues have already been part of the republican programme for winning the elections. G.W. Bush presented a programme called "Jobs for the 21st Century" in a speech in January 2004

(<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/stateoftheunion2004.htm>, March 2011, see Appendix 5).

3. 2. 4 Observations

The context levels proposed by Wodak (2009: 586) served their purpose as a guideline for approaching the complexity of the context, because, so far, it helped to make the phenomenon manageable. That the four constituents of context are rather vaguely formulated is probably no coincidence, as this vagueness allows for great freedom in their implementation. Regardless of the original intention behind this vagueness, however, it posed certain problems in practice. The decision of which parts of, for example, the "institutional framework" should be taken into consideration remained arbitrary to a great extent. In fact, each category into which *context* is divided might comprise such a great range of topics that these categories really serve as no more than elusive guidelines.

Several instances occurred where the context sub-categories appeared so vague that it was not clear how to classify a particular aspect of the speech's context. Information about the party system of the United States, for instance, appeared to be so complex and multilayered that it seems to have bearings on several aspects of textual analysis. So far, Wodak's categorisation of *context* components, though

providing a very rough guideline, does not seem to remedy the difficulties which the concept poses in analytical practice.

When dealing with the genre of speeches, it is probably even more difficult to establish a text's discourse potential than it is when studying other kinds of interaction, since, as has been noted above, the recipients do hardly "get the floor" (Goffman 1981: 138) to reply or influence the proceedings in any substantial way. Hence, there are no utterances which may provide insight into their reactions to a text. Goffman even goes so far as regarding the "various kinds of audiences" as "not, analytically speaking, a feature of speech events (to use Hymes's term), but of stage event" (p. 139). Nevertheless, in the agenda of CDA, it is the audience members and their perception of the speech that analyses ultimately seek to examine. Their role in the analysis is therefore of great importance. For the time being, however, the effect on the audience cannot be accounted for to a satisfactory extent. We therefore turn towards the analysis of the text itself in order to find evidence for ideological language use.

3. 3 Textual Analysis

The text I have selected for this model analysis is not easy to place as a whole. It is a speech that was delivered at a certain time to a certain audience. But it was also broadcasted (on TV as well as on the internet) and transcribed formally for a wider audience. The transcription of this orally delivered text is to be found on the website <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/07/07/AR2008070701672.html> (24 February 2011, see Appendix 1). My reason for selecting a nationally broadcast speech corresponds with my aim of isolating actualisations of neo-liberal ideology. As the text has presumably been designed to address a very broad audience, the relevance of potential covert intentions and manipulation is likely to be more striking than in the case of texts which address a narrower audience.

In their intended form, speeches can be regarded as a mixture of spoken and written text. They are usually delivered orally, and viewers are normally present at the time and place of delivery. Language use and overall composition typically echo oral

speech. However, they also share many features with written texts in that they are normally scripted in advance and performed later on (compare Widdowson 2004: 11). Furthermore, the situation of the delivery usually allows for unidirectional communication only. Other discourse participants are confined to a passive role (see above). In addition to that, it must be noted that the texts that are dealt with here are even more of a hybrid form. They are either written records of spoken texts which were transcribed after their oral delivery, or they are the initial written drafts which formed the basis of their oral delivery. However, the focus of this analysis is on lexico-grammatical features, because they are most frequently dealt with in comparable studies in CDA (e.g. Fairclough 2000). Hence, this form appears to be sufficient for the task at hand.

3. 3. 1 Text and Sentence Structure

Beginning the analysis at the textual level, an overall structure is difficult to provide. The text is visually divided into paragraphs, a division loosely based on units of thought. However, the text can be divided only into vague sections, each dealing with a particular aspect of the so-called “Jobs for America” plan, a plan for job creation on a national level the presidential candidate is seeking to implement. Each of these sections begins with sketching a problem or a positive account of an aspect of the current economic situation, then goes on to suggest means to achieve positive effects on job development, finally concluding the passage by demonstrating the opposing candidate’s deficiencies in dealing with the problem, and conversely highlighting the speakers plans. These sections, however, are not entirely uniform in their build-up. This core section of the speech, which can be regarded as its main body, are framed by two sections that sport a more personal tone: the introduction to the speech is directed to a businesswoman who is present at the delivery. The concluding section is devoted to a portrayal of American’s virtues, thus closing in a patriotic and grave tone.

The structure of individual utterances is relatively straightforward. Most utterances consist of one clause, or connect clauses by the conjunction “and”. This observation is consistent with the intention of oral delivery and, perhaps more importantly, the facilitation of online processing for the recipients. It can be assumed that

comparatively short sentence structures are the regular case within the genre conventions. After all, the listeners and viewers are expected to understand the speech straight away, without visual support or repetition.

3. 3. 2 Terms of Address and Reference

The use of pronouns may be of interest for this analysis, since it has frequently been described as problematic by CDA scholars. It is noteworthy that, in the beginning of the speech, McCain refers to the addressees of his speech as “Americans” frequently, only very occasionally utilising words like “our”, as in “our economy”. He hardly employs pronouns such as “we” or “you”. If this choice is to be considered significant, one explanation could be that this is done to demarcate Americans against citizens of other nations. Another reason might be to appeal to patriotic feelings of the listeners/viewers. However, it is not clear why the speaker should choose the comparatively distancing denomination as “Americans” for the social group he is addressing, if the reason behind his choice is to invoke patriotic feelings, and thus, arguably, strengthen a feeling of membership in his listeners/viewers. If this were indeed the case, the more inclusive pronoun “we” may have been expected in this place.

This pronoun, however, is predominantly used for a potential future administration, as in the passage, “So how are we going to create good jobs?” The speaker seems to refer to his own hypothetical future administration, which will only come into being under the precondition that he is going to be elected as president. This use of the pronoun is fairly constant throughout the text, with the exception of the last passage which addresses voters explicitly as “you”. Here, the in-group referred to by the use of “we” shifts.

There is nothing beyond our ability to achieve. We are Americans, and we don't hide from history. We make history. All we need is to believe in ourselves as we always have, [...]. (App. 1 line 143 ff)

In this passage, the speaker may refer either to future government members, or to all listeners/viewers who identify as Americans. It is now clearer, however, that the pronoun serves to evoke a feeling of group membership. I would argue that this choice is not unusual with regard to this genre of text. It serves to present the speaker as a member of the group s/he is addressing, and whose sympathy s/he is

trying to evoke. This technique is undoubtedly employed purposefully, but cannot be attributed to a particular ideological orientation.

The pronoun “you” also is used only in strategic sections of the text. Addressing the audience in this direct manner may serve different purposes. First of all, McCain addresses the above mentioned Beth directly as “you”. The next occurrence of the pronoun is in a section which deals with the opposing candidate Obama. The tone of this section may be perceived as somewhat accusatory, but with an ironic twist. The video recording of the speech shows that the audience laugh at these words, eliminating doubts as to whether the message should be taken literally or not.

If you believe you should pay more taxes, I am the wrong candidate for you. Senator Obama is your man. The choice in this election is stark and simple. Senator Obama will raise your taxes. (App. 1 line 47 ff)

Nevertheless, the direct address may serve to provoke listeners/viewers into action – in this case, the action to vote for the republican candidate. It can be understood as ironic in the sense that “the wrong candidate” here is presented as the right candidate, namely for those who have no desire to pay more taxes. The addressees of the pronoun here are potentially all persons who are present or who follow the campaign via the media, given that they are personally affected by tax policy of the US government and eligible to vote in the presidential elections. Particularly in the context of discrediting the political opponent, the pronouns “you” and “your” are used in the following way:

If you are one of the 23 million small business owners in America [...] Senator Obama is going to raise your tax rates. If you have an investment for your child's [...] he is going to raise your taxes. (App. 1 line 53 ff, my emphases)

In the final section of the speech, the pronoun “you” is used once, addressing voters directly, and displaying a different tone. The speaker appeals to listeners/viewers for action, namely for electing him before introducing the pronouns “we” and “our” (see above).

For the sake of completeness, the last notable pronoun use that occurs in the speech is “I”, which is used in reference to the speaker himself. Again, this use is restricted to particular short sections of the speech. At the beginning of the speech, McCain refers to his plans, singling himself out as the key motor of the “Jobs for America Economic Plan”. The stylisation of the presidential candidate as a person who personifies key

values and ideas of the party s/he represents is probably one of the main purposes of delivering speeches of this kind in the first place. The use of “we” referring to a team of people involved in future administration is contrasted by this focus on a single person. Needless to say, it is highly unlikely that the plan was in fact devised by the speaker, even though the pronoun use suggests this.

Another use of the pronoun “I” occurs in a dichotomy with an “other”, namely the opposing candidate. Repeatedly, the speaker demarcates his own positions against his opponent’s. This is, as it were, a classic case of “othering”. Needless to say, the other candidate is portrayed negatively, by imputing to him plans which would thwart economic growth and “hurt the American worker”, whereas the speaker portrays himself as a fighter against such measures and as capable of developing better plans. This is likely to be another key interest of delivering the speech: to demarcate clearly the opposition against the other eligible candidate.

To a certain degree, generalisations serve similar purposes as the use of pronouns. They give an impression of a uniform in-group whose members share values and traits, and which is presented in a favourable light. McCain uses generalisation in several passages, for example when he uses the phrase “the American people”, as in

It's about the aspirations of the American people to build a better life for their families; (App. 1 line 32 f)

The implication here is that it is a regular characteristic of American people to feel responsible for their families, or indeed, to live in families in the first place. Needless to say, this is factually not applicable to the totality of the population. The “American family” is a key term which features several times in the speech. Possibly, the speaker stresses the value system propagated by his party by including families more explicitly in his constructed in-group.

Another example of the generalizing use of the phrase “the American people” is the following passage:

Some economists don't think much of my gas tax holiday. But the American people like it, and so do small business owners. (App. 1 line 43 f)

The dichotomy between the two groups, “[s]ome economists” and “the American people” appears somewhat arbitrary. Strictly speaking, the economists are likely to

be part of the American people, but are implicitly constructed as outsiders to the group. This suggests that the group membership is determined by a person's attitude towards the "gas tax holiday", a suggestion which, of course, cannot be supported logically. However, to draw conclusions from this observation is not a trivial matter. When a speaker refers to "the American people", s/he pretends to speak about everyone who holds US citizenship. But it is easy to imagine that most statements made about this obscure group of people will not truthfully apply to each and every member of the United States (with the possible exception of legal texts determining rights connected to citizenship). Perhaps, the speaker seeks to address a particular section of the population by contrasting "[s]ome economists" with "the American people", though it is difficult to determine who will identify with the so constructed in-group, and on what grounds. Presumably, part of the intention behind this generalisation is to present McCain's own agenda as something that should be supported by all American people, and to include as broad an audience in the constructed in-group as possible. Sure enough, though, this is not a feature pointing towards a particular ideological background or interest, but is legitimised by the purpose and context of the speech.

3. 3. 3 Lexical Choice and Metaphor Use

In addition to pronoun use, particularities in word meaning are also considered relevant in CDA practice. A closer look at the use of metaphors reveals that this stylistic device is not employed often in this speech. However, in one instance, McCain says that he plans "to grow this economy" (line 24). While it is a common word choice to speak of the economy as growing, it is perhaps more unusual for a person to say that he wants to grow it actively. It is difficult to decide in how far significance can be attributed to this unusual use of the word "grow". The speaker is undoubtedly given an active role in the process of economic growth, which corresponds with other verbs in its immediate environment: "create, get [...] moving, reform, achieve, ensure" (line 24 ff) are all verbs that suggest action on the part of the subject, in this case, "I". This representation suggests that the speaker is an active person who corrects undesirable developments single-handed, which contributes to the overly positive image the candidate seeks to evoke of himself. It

must be noted, however, that this assertion is subjective on the part of the analyst and is not supported by elicited data.

The notion of serving one's home country plays an important role in the speech. In one instance, the speaker uses a feminine pronoun referring to the United States: "[...] I have been her servant [...]" (App. 1 line 135 f). However, the feminine pronoun is exchanged for the neutral shortly afterwards. The main reason for this solemn diction seems to be merely to add a bit of pathos to the speech.

There is an instance in the speech where the word "hurt" is used in a peculiar way. One might expect this verb to be followed by living beings in the function of patient, rather than abstract phenomena like the economy. In the speech, both uses are employed. The effect could be one of creating a greater negative impact for the addressees by paralleling a hurt economy with hurt workers and families.

[My opponent's] plan will hurt the American worker and family. It will hurt the economy and cost us jobs. (App. 1 line 57 f)

The Open American National Corpus (henceforth OANC) provides data that suggests that, although there are not a significant number of comparable instances, the verb "hurt" has been used referring to "the Clinton administration" having hurt "U.S. national security". The only instance where "hurt" co-occurs with "workers" concerns physical injury. The OANC does not provide any instances in which the goals of the verb "hurt" is "the American [...] family". This data does not provide additional clues about the possible effect of the passage.

The use of other verbs is also noteworthy. Whereas the opposing candidate is reported to "impos[e]" measures (line 39), the speaker himself "attacks [...] problems" (line 41 f). Both verbs have a certain aggressive connotation. The verb "impose", according to the OANC, is sometimes, though not always, used to express that the people to whom a measure is directed are subjected to this measure involuntarily. One of the most frequent collocates are "sanctions" (seven occurrences). On the other hand, although the OANC gives only three occurrences of the collocation "attack(s) [...] problem(s)", they generally cast a favourable or neutral light on the agent who cracks down on threats to the public weal.

McCain uses an unusual compound, “hiring strike” (App.1 line 19 f). This seems to refer to the situation that many companies currently are not taking in new employees. The significance of the unusual word “strike” is difficult to assess in this context. While the OANC lists the more common collocation, “hiring freeze” (four instances overall), it does not give a single instance of the compound “hiring strike”. In this case, the most trivial interpretation may be the most plausible one, meaning that companies simple are not hiring new employees. Any other aspect, the use of strikes as means of pressure against employers, unionism and other connotations, do not seem to fit in the context.

Generally, the use of heavily connoted words is not particularly noticeable in McCain’s speech. The term “protectionism” (App. 1 line 69) is one of the few nouns that are negatively connoted. The OANC also supports the conjecture that this term is regularly used in a negative sense, usually to condemn state regulation of market developments. Apart from this negative term, McCain uses a number of decidedly positively connoted words, repeatedly referring to the “ingenuity” and “drive” (line 72) of American business people.

It appears fair to say that the word choice supports observations made with regard to pronoun use: positive verbs are used in connection with the speaker himself, but also add to the positive portrayal of the construed “in-group”. On the other hand, negative connotations usually refer to policies of the opponent, or current undesirable events connected to the economic crisis and other events.

3. 3. 4 Repetition and Parallel Structures

A notable tendency throughout the text is that key words or names are frequently repeated, rather than replaced by pronouns. In the first section, “Beth” (App.1 line 8 ff) is repeated three times, later on, the key term “small business(es)” (line 31 ff) is used four times in successive sentences. This is a feature that can also be observed in the language of advertisement and therefore could be classified as persuasive. In any case, this practice does not correspond to principles of economical use of language. In the current examples, however, it is not easily justified to call this use of repetition persuasive. In the case of the first name “Beth”, a more appealing interpretation would be that the speaker tries to give the impression of a personal

relationship to this woman by emphasising the rather intimate term of address, even though he is unlikely to know her very well in fact. This may be done for reasons of politeness, but could also suggest that the speaker is trying to stylise himself as a member of the community who forms the audience (and/or *target*) of his speech (provided that the person referred to would be perceived to be a member of this community herself). In the case of “small business(es)”, the intention behind the repetition is still harder to guess. The placement of this concept may be an attempt at addressing small business owners in particular, or to invoke solidarity with members of this group on the part of other groups of recipients.

Other uses of this rhetoric figure occur later in the speech. The formula “I have a plan,” (App. 1 line 24 f) is repeated once in the fourth paragraph, closely followed by the repetitive use of the phrase “It’s about” (line 30 ff) in the next paragraph, referring to the economy. The effect is series of four parallel clauses, two of which refers briefly to one of the larger topics of the speech which are affirmed and elaborated later on, the other two merely giving a future-oriented perspective on national economy in language that involves listeners personally. On the whole, however, repetition of such formulations is not used with striking frequency.

In the light of the nature of the speech as part of an election campaign, it is not out of place to expect certain features that are common in the language of advertisement. As we shall see below, McCain’s opponent places strategic emphasis on the key-word “change”

(<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/barackobamademocraticnominationvictoryspeech.htm>, March 1 2011, see Appendix 3), which appears in the campaign’s slogan (“Change we can believe in”). In McCain’s speech, however, compared to other texts from this genre, there is no emphasis on the repetitive placement of particular key-words or slogans.

All the same, there are instances which may be considered as ideologically manipulative.

I intend to do just that: to stand on your side; to help business and not government create jobs; to fight for your future and not the personal ambitions of politicians and bureaucrats. (App. 1 line 129 ff)

In this passage, the two sentences beginning with “to help [...]” and “to fight [...]” are structured as parallels, divided by “and not”. Consequently, the items on either side of the conjunction could be perceived as parallels, too, so that “business” relates to “your future”, whereas “government” appears linked to “personal ambitions of politicians and bureaucrats”. From a critical stance toward neo-liberal ideology, one can draw the conclusion that this passage is an attempt at persuading listeners/viewers that only business, not the government, can create jobs on a fair basis with equal access for everyone. In fact, this idea would correspond with neo-liberal belief in the self-regulatory force of the free market. On the other hand, the two sentences could also be read separately, regardless of their parallel structures. Then, the first would indeed give neo-liberal ideology, whereas the second would be one instantiation of a recurring theme, namely that the candidate intends to serve “the people”, rather than “self-interested partisanship” (line 132 f). With this reading, the structural parallelism would be regarded as devoid of manipulative influence.

The same short passage could also be seen as constructing as parallels the phrases “to stand on your side”, “to help businesses”, and “to fight for your future”. This parallelism is easily interpreted as another instance in which the speaker stylises himself as advocating the interests of all potential addressees, thus strengthening the impression of inclusive and broad “in-group” construction.

3. 3. 5 Presuppositions

Unsurprisingly, a number of presuppositions can be found in this speech. In the practice of CDA, the term *presupposition* is often used in connection with the notion of naturalisation. Many works in the field of CDA comment on passages which present a particular state of reality as “given” (see e.g. Fairclough 1992: 120, van Dijk 2008: 185). According to these scholars, there is a potential for manipulation in such representation of the natural state of reality.

The creation of new jobs is one of the key topics of the speech, and McCain frequently implies that more jobs will (automatically, as it were) enhance the national economic development. Though this is a heavily simplified account of much more complex processes, it is hard to counterargument this assertion. It is a view that is likely to be held not just by republicans, but by more progressively oriented groups as

well. Similarly, McCain explicitly utters the presupposition that “the American economy” is what “Americans worry the most about” (App. 1 line 16). Even though it is undoubtedly a generalisation, this utterance does not suggest particular ulterior motives.

Yet another assertion is that the national budget is out of balance with regard to receipts and expenditures. McCain claims that the state spends too much on projects that serve individual interests, rather than the people themselves - an assertion which is as difficult to prove as it is to refute. The complementary phenomena of tax increase and lower expenses at the cost of social benefits are a typical controversy between liberal and socialist political groups. Needless to say, McCain’s affinity towards neo-liberal economy policy is detectable in this assertion. Similarly, the speaker simply declares “the real problems of healthcare” are “cost, availability and portability” (App. 1 line 42), thereby stating that the opponent is merely tackling imaginary problems, or problems which are less severe.

Furthermore, by referring to the dependence on foreign energy deliveries as “dangerous” (line 99), the speaker asserts by implication that this dependence is indeed dangerous, presumably for the national economy, or for the people in the United States. In the speech itself, McCain gives only a brief account of how he came to see the dependence on foreign energy as problematic. Whether this impression is misleading or not, and whether the advancement of atomic as well as renewable energy sources is the right way to respond to this perceived problem, is a matter of ideological inclination on the part of the recipient, rather than a verifiable fact.

The issues of work and unemployment are certainly important in the speech. Contrary to my expectations, however, unemployment is presented as determined by the economy, rather than individual ability or motivation.

All of us know what is happening to the economy. It is slowing. More than 400,000 people have lost their jobs since December, and the rate of new job creation has fallen sharply. (App. 1 line 17 ff)

In this passage, McCain gives no explanation as to why the economy is slowing, or who bears responsibility for the lower job creation rate. These developments are presented neutrally, without apportioning blame or awarding agency to anyone. The fact that so many people have lost their jobs appears to be in direct causality of the

slowing economy, together with the decrease in creating new jobs. In connection with the repeated reference to American's "ingenuity" and "hard work" (line 10), the impression is that the people would be capable and willing to bear the responsibility of job creation themselves, but that there are forces which constrain their efforts, so that they need to be "unleashed":

I believe the role of government is to unleash the creativity, ingenuity and hard work of the American people, and make it easier to create jobs. (App. 1 line 27 ff)

The forces which hinder this "creativity, ingenuity and hard work" are institutions that collect taxes, namely "the IRS", who is threatening to "[take] more of your income and making life harder for small business" (line 46 f), if the opponent is selected president. This, according to the speaker, must be prevented by the government. It seems that, according to McCain, the creation of new employment would take place of its own accord, if there were no "barriers" for business owners. This is expressed in the passage

Building barriers to [...] any American company's access to foreign markets will have a devastating effect on our economy and jobs, and the prosperity of American families. (App. 1 line 74 ff)

Furthermore, the speaker attributes a lot of responsibility to the government with regard to the retraining of unemployed people. In this context, the employment of *presupposition* intermingled with the pronoun use to some degree.

If a worker loses a job we must retrain them and prepare them for 21st Century jobs. (App. 1 line 77 f)

Here, "we" is presented as the agent, whereas the worker her-/himself is assigned a passive role. S/he is being retrained by the government. Choosing the pronoun "we" as subject implicitly takes responsibility off the workers themselves completely, an observation which does not correspond to my own expectations towards republican economic policy. From a left-wing perspective, it may be argued that the assignment of such a passive role to the workers in arranging their own career future is not to be regarded favourably. On the other hand, we could gather from this statement an implicit acknowledgement that opportunities for employment are often shaped by governmental policies, rather than being determined by individual decisions.

Moving on, there is one instance where the speaker imputes a certain opinion to his “in-group”:

We aren't going to continue mortgaging this country's future for things Americans don't want or need. [...] [My opponent] supported the \$300 billion pork laden agricultural subsidy bill. I opposed it. (App. 1 line 92 ff)

In this passage, the speaker juxtaposes the phrases “things Americans don't want or need” and “the \$300 billion pork laden agricultural subsidy bill”. This supposedly gives the impression that the majority of Americans do not approve of this particular bill that was advocated by McCain's opponent.

For now, I will leave the textual analysis at that. Needless to say, there are a large number of other language features which could have been examined in this analysis. I chose those features which struck me as most noticeable, giving particular attention to lexico-grammatical traits, since they can be expected to bear the most direct influence on the text's recipients.

3. 3. 6 Observations

I encountered a number of challenges in the analysis of the textual features of the speech. Evidently, it is pointless to attempt to provide full coverage of all textual features. Critical voices have rightfully demanded of CD analysts that they make informed choices with regard to which textual features should be taken into account for analysis (Widdowson 2004: 18). These choices proved to be extremely difficult to make, since there were no practicable role models to be found for such “informed” selections in the current practice. Lacking an alternative, I loosely followed practical examples provided by CDA, covering many of the language features which are regularly referred to in existing studies. Nevertheless, such a procedure is deficient with regard to justifying choices.

Needless to say, it is impossible to be sure that the language traits actually chosen in an analysis are the ones that yield the most convincing results. Confronted with the abundance of eligible phenomena, it would be tempting to speculate about the gain of individual analytical steps, and pick those which are most likely to produce certain results. Speculations of this kind are difficult to make in general. And, even if they brought good results, they would still be problematic in themselves, because they

would form a strongly biased foundation for an attempt at an objective analysis. Nevertheless, personal experience showed that the only practicable way to elicit features for analysis seems to be an intuitive and uninformed pick-and-choose approach. Consequently, the analyst must deduce that any language feature might be of interest, and that s/he cannot avoid overlooking potentially important information.

In fact, as analyst, I frequently found myself resorting to choices which were intuitive, or even emotional in nature. This observation corresponds with reservations uttered by Widdowson (2004: 78), which hold that the successful derivation of discourse from a text is necessarily illogical. Logical inference can only generate insight into (semantic) meanings which are derived by analytical procedures, but not about the actual ongoing process by which regular discourse participants construct meanings in their everyday lives (p. 74 ff). As a consequence, the interpretation I thus achieved must be acknowledged as subjective, and possibly irrelevant to many or most of the real-life recipients of the text. I doubt that the vague conclusions I managed to draw from this brief analysis could account for the meaning-making processes which actually take place in communication.

At this point it seems justified to at least tentatively confirm a suspicion uttered by critics of CDA, namely that the choice of language features is often based on circular reasoning, on the results the analyst hopes to attain from the analysis (e.g. Stubbs 1997: 2 f). With my own experience, this suspicion has so far gained some substance: with only a vaguely predefined agenda in mind, virtually all textual features appeared to lend themselves to scrutiny. In many cases, diverging readings appeared equally plausible, which suggests that the level of analysis does not tell us a lot about meaning, if not followed by interpretation.

Apart from choosing language features which may prove worth to be investigated, the concept of *presuppositions* raised particular problems. Presuppositions are a regular feature of communication. Indeed, communication would be rendered impossible, if participants sought to articulate everything they meant. They might never reach the actual point of an utterance. Usually, the deviation from commonplace structures is said to carry particular meaning. Following this logic, structures that occur not so frequently, such as the passive voice, are read as

ideologically marked. But presuppositions can be articulated in any possible way, in the simplest of sentence structures, as well as less frequent ones. Let me illustrate the problematic nature of this issue by one example from McCain's speech:

Nuclear power is the most dependable source of zero emission energy we have. (App. 1 line 110 f)

In this case, the presupposition is stated as a regular unmarked, active, present simple sentence. If an analyst sought to attribute ideological significance to a passage like this, unmarked structures would have to be regarded as ideologically significant precisely for the reason that they are unmarked and regular. This line of argument would ultimately annul the assertion that contrast is essentials in the critical analysis of discourse (Cameron 2000: 50). The analyst would have difficulty justifying that in the relevant cases the more complex structure would have been the one more commonly expected choice.

A naturalising assertion about some presumed state of reality could probably come in any other linguistic actualisation as well. Thus, it is difficult to pin down the category of *presupposition* on the level of analysis, or attribute defining formal criteria to the notion. I would argue that the concept requires an interpretative approach to be comprehensible in the first place. Thus, the concept as such is hard to account for from the perspective of textual analysis.

The use of corpus data from the OANC was interesting in some cases. However, the results attained with the help of corpora may be of limited relevance for individual participants. The fact that a particular word is employed most often in a particular co-text does not necessarily mean that the majority of language users would regularly use the same word in a similar co-text. It would be much too optimistic to deduce any predictability from corpus data when examining the potential meanings discourse participants may derive from texts. This holds true *a fortiori* for the OANC, because it is a significantly reduced portion of the American National Corpus.

On the whole, the textual analysis of this speech largely fails to permit conclusions with regard to the expressions of neo-liberal particularities in the language use. Some of the language used in the speech was actually surprising insofar as it seemed not to correspond with stereotypical expectations towards republican ideology. However, in most cases, it was impossible to guess, let alone prove, a definite intended

meaning, or cover all possible ways of understanding the text from textual evidence alone.

The question of genre conventions should also be briefly addressed in this context. It has been acknowledged by CDA scholars that conventions determine the way in which things are said to a large extent (e.g. van Dijk 2008: 69). Widdowson claims “that actual language behaviour is much more formulaic than its users might suppose”, and that language users “conform unwittingly to idiomatic custom” (Widdowson 2004: 60). From this follows that the linguistic choices at a speaker’s disposal are possibly much more limited than the speaker her-/himself is commonly aware of. The question how we can make assumptions as to the degree in which the individual speaker can leave these conventions behind, or how much freedom they allow in individual cases, remains unanswered.

3. 4 Relating Text to Pretext

After this in-depth analysis of the text, there are a few aspects of the *pretext* of McCain’s speech which will be clearer than at the beginning. I uttered a number of expectations towards this kind of text based on its presumed purpose and the context in which the text is encountered. Note that these expectations are based exclusively on introspection.

Nevertheless, most of them are confirmed by the textual evidence. In accordance with my expectations, McCain follows the principle by construing an in-group comprising, basically, all American citizens. The use of the pronoun “I”, and its comparison with the other, “Senator Obama”, also definitely corresponds to the desired self-representation as the better-suited candidate for the presidential chair. The positive positioning of the components of the electoral platform is accomplished by contrasting it with the opponent’s programme and evoking images which can be assumed to be relatable for as large a number of viewers/readers as possible. McCain achieves this with the integrated success stories of other citizens.

If the conclusion is to be drawn from such an analysis in terms dictated by the text itself, the only logical subsequent step to be taken would be to assess not whether a persuasive text like this is desirable as such (as CDA sometimes implicitly suggests),

but to try to evaluate the degree to which it has fulfilled its purpose, or in Halliday's words, "in what respects it succeeds and in what respects it fails, or is less successful" (1994: xv, cited in Widdowson 2004: 18). However, we are not told how to pin down the success of a text. It would be misleading to suggest that the success of McCain's speech would be observable in the election results, since these depend on such a broad variety of factors that an analysis would fill at least one book. And it would generally be misleading to try and pin down a linear relationship between a text and its effect. At the very least, analysts would have to consider the discourse participants' opinions. However, there seem to be no developed methodological procedures for such an endeavour. Furthermore, considering that CDA looks for covert manipulation strategies, such a procedure, if it existed, is unlikely to yield satisfactory results. It is difficult to picture a science-based procedure to elicit from people in what ways they have been manipulated.

In addition to that, it must be borne in mind that the effect of a text cannot be fully determined by the producer (nor, in this case, by the *animator*). As the recipient is "not obliged to co-operate" (Widdowson 2004: 87), the speaker cannot ultimately determine what her/his audience will make of the text. I would indeed argue that, concerning speeches such as this, it is very unlikely that the majority of viewers/listeners will be persuaded of the quality of this platform, or to vote for McCain. Other factors may ultimately be more influential for the voters' choice.

3. 4. 1 Observations

The notion of *pretext* is particularly relevant for the agenda of CDA, as it is basically concerned with what people intend to do by what they say or write. As an analytical category, it is somewhat problematic: it is evident in the case of political speeches that the effects they create often appeal to recipients on an emotional level. Consequently, analysts are hard-pressed to assess perlocutionary effect from an objective distance as a logically graspable phenomenon.

The attempt at pretextual analysis provided in this paper revealed a fundamental problem with regard to such step-by-step procedure for pinning down meanings. In the previous sections, reputedly dealing with textual and contextual features, it became apparent that considerations with regard to pretextual intentions pervade all

levels of analysis: it is necessary to make guesses at the effect a speaker might have wished to achieve, in order to understand the textual data and contextual sub-categories without (at least hypothetical) reference to the basic intentions of the text, for example when I made assertions about the intended recipients or the presumed intentionality of vague reference of the pronoun “we” in the speech.

Assertions of this kind, however, show that this last level of analysis is perhaps the most elusive one as an analytical category. As a regular language user, however, the notion is much easier to handle. In fact, most information about the speaker’s *pretext* I provided above will be apparent for most recipients even without the long-winded examination of textual and contextual features.

3. 5 Some More Aspects of Context

3. 5. 1 A Diachronic Perspective

To conclude this exemplary analysis, I will come back to some observations regarding *contextual* features. A comparative analysis of linguistic features may be revealing (see Stubbs 1997: 7). This can be approached on a synchronic or diachronic level. With regard to CDA, diachronic perspectives are often introduced into research projects (e.g. Reisigl & Wodak 2009). Therefore, a brief look at earlier republican speeches may yield interesting comparative data. It can be assumed that such speeches can have a bearing on this particular speech of a republican presidential contender, or that certain patterns may reoccur. Consequently, it may be helpful to consider older speeches in order to reveal particular meanings in this text. As an example from the near past, I have selected a speech of the republican presidential candidate who preceded McCain.

In a speech delivered in 2004 to the House of Representatives (<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/stateoftheunion2004.htm>, 1 March 2011, see Appendix 5), the then president George W. Bush took up topics related to those of McCain’s speech. Addressing the members of Congress present, he says:

And because you acted to stimulate our economy with tax relief, this economy is strong, and growing stronger. (App. 5 line 169 f)

Following this, there is a list of measures that have been taken. As Fairclough repeatedly states, the format of lists suggests that the individual items are equivalent in some respect or other.

You have doubled the child tax credit from 500 to a thousand dollars, reduced the marriage penalty, begun to phase out the death tax, reduced taxes on capital gains and stock dividends, cut taxes on small businesses, and you have lowered taxes for every American who pays income taxes. (App. 5 line 171 ff)

The immediately preceding utterance directed at the Congress members suggests that the items of the list are the very measures by which the economy was stimulated.

This list contains both issues that are traditionally associated with neo-liberal policy, such as “reduced taxes on capital gains and stock dividends” (line 172 f) and issues which concern state regulation, such as the child tax credit. This suggests that the speaker attributes equal value to each of these measures, giving the impression that the ideological position from which this speech was devised is not entirely strictly neo-liberal.

Another quotation taken from this speech shows that republican national politicians have expressed the government’s responsibility for worker training before McCain:

[...] we must respond by helping more Americans gain the skills to find good jobs in our new economy. (App. 5 line 185 f)

Later in 2004, when the presidential elections were imminent, George W. Bush delivered another speech as part of his election campaign (<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/convention2004/georgewbush2004rnc.htm>), (March 11 2011, see Appendix 6)

. This also briefly touches briefly upon issues of employment and work.

The times in which we live and work are changing dramatically. The workers of our parents' generation typically had one job, one skill, one career often with one company that provided health care and a pension [...] Today, workers change jobs, even careers, many times during their lives, [...]. (App. 6 line 58 ff)

In the last sentence of this passage, the verb “change” is used in a neutral way, which gives the impression that the “workers change jobs, even careers” voluntarily or of their own accord. This raises the question, whether the author(s) of the speech

voluntarily refrained from using a wording like “workers are forced to change”, or similar. The significance of this particular choice is difficult to access. Still, the preceding sentences could somewhat mitigate the effect of a significant omission. The speaker states that “[t]he times [...] are changing dramatically”. Though this phrasing is not very precise, it may indicate that the workers are subject to external forces which compel them to take these measures. In any case, a definite case for a purposeful distortion of facts is hard to make.

In concordance with John McCain’s speech, language use in Bush’s speech also suggests that the creation of jobs is an actively controllable process, and that the administration can, even should take responsibility, at least partly.

To create more jobs in America, America must be the best place in the world to do business. To create jobs, my plan will encourage investment and expansion by restraining federal spending, reducing regulation, and making the tax relief permanent. To create jobs, we will make our country less dependent on foreign sources of energy. To create jobs, we will expand trade and level the playing field to sell American goods and services across the globe. (App. 6 line 71 ff)

The repetition of the formula “To create jobs” expresses this attitude clearly. Even though measures immediately concerning the employment market are covered in comparatively brief form in this speech, this paragraph can be regarded as a statement for the commitment to the active creation of new jobs.

This admittedly brief and bitty portrayal of some aspects of the socio-historical context of the speech yields results which at best can be classified as mixed. The last part of the context analysis gives an impression of the overall embeddedness of the speech and some intertextual data, which makes some aspects of the preceding considerations more graspable. With regard to the text itself, however, these considerations do not produce clearer results in terms of potential meanings or the shaping or recipients’ attitudes.

3. 5. 2 A Fellow Republican: Newt Gingrich

As a suggested improvement for the methods of CDA, Stubbs (1997: 7) demands that scholars introduce comparison more centrally into their analysis. In order to make an assertion about the Republican Party as a whole, it does not suffice to examine one single speech by one single politician. An examination of another

republican speech may provide clues about important questions. On the one hand, it is possibly that this analysis reveals patterns which hold for republican rhetoric in general. On the other hand, a conclusion about the extent to which the pretext and the immediate context of a speech determines its build-up might be possible.

The speech I selected for this purpose was delivered by another well-known republican politician, Newt Gingrich (<http://www.newt.org/newt-direct/newt-addresses-cpac-2009>, 5 April, 2011, see Appendix 2), who is currently “exploring” the possibility to run for presidential candidate in the 2012 elections in the United States (<http://www.newtexplore2012.com>, 3 April 2011). The speech itself was delivered later than McCain’s, at a time when the presidential elections had already been held, in February 2009. The speaker addresses the “Conservative Political Action Committee”, an organization that is responsible for raising funds for republican electoral campaigns (Greven 2004: 32).

3. 5. 2. 1 Terms of Address and Reference

The quotation below gives the impression that “othering” is more pronounced in this speech than it in McCain’s speech. With reference to “the left wing machine which now runs the House, the Senate, and the White House” (line 22 f), he states:

I did not believe they were arrogant enough and foolish enough to force this confrontation in the first 30 days of a new presidency. (App. 2 line 2 ff)

This choice of words and the pronoun use of “they” correspond with frequent observations in CDA research. The “out-group” is constructed by the use of the pronoun, and then attributed negative traits reflected by the adjectives “arrogant” and “foolish”.

The pronoun “you” is sometimes used in an unspecific way, referring to a general agent, as in

[...] that to govern America you had to bring people [...]. (App. 2 line 176)

More notably, albeit unsurprisingly, however, the speaker also uses the pronoun to address his listeners:

[...] how would you like for that to be 20-40% more valuable in a few weeks [sic]. (App. 2 line 207 f)

This creates an effect of great immediacy and encourages the listeners to put themselves into the position of a beneficiary of the promised measure (in this case, the abrogation of all capital gains taxes).

The strong contrast between “us” and “them” is much more frequently employed by Gingrich than by McCain. A striking example is the following passage:

[...] their bold colors of European socialism transplanted to Washington and our bold colors of American free enterprise, the American work ethic and the American vision [...]. (App. 6 line 260 ff)

The rhetoric style of this speech thus appears less inclusive than in McCain’s case. Interestingly, together with the contrasting pronouns, the adjectives “European” as opposed to “American” seem to be used to reinforce the contrast, to the effect that “European” receives a somewhat negative connotation.

A significant instance with regard to ideology is the equalisation of “the left” with “they” in the following passage:

One of the efforts of the left which they’re going to try to pass [...] they can’t possibly pass it once the country understands it [...]. (App. 2 line 288 f)

This passage evokes a strong impression of antagonism towards the “out-group”. Interestingly, the speaker undoubtedly refers to the government as “they”, and thus implies that the government is identical with “the left”.

There is one other noteworthy instance where the pronoun “you” stands out:

[...] and all we want to know is in the spirit of George Washington, are you prepared...because in our case it’s not victory or death, in our case we have the right as a free people to speak out, to stand up, to organize our neighbors, to win the argument and to bring freedom and prosperity and safety for our children and our grandchildren. (App. 2 line 426 f, my emphases)

In the co-text, the overwhelmingly dominant pronouns are 1st person plural pronouns. Within the passage, however, the reference of these seems to shift. At the beginning, “we” seems to refer to either the party or some kind of inner circle of adherents to the speaker. Then, the 2nd person pronoun “you” is used with a contrastive effect. I would argue that this effect is to catch the addressees’ attention and potentially stir them into action. From this moment on, “our” is used several times. This use, however,

implies a broadening of the construed “in-group”. It seems to include both the speaker and his affiliates and all potential addressees of “you”.

This evidence points towards the fact that Gingrich is comparable to McCain as far as “in-group” construal is concerned. He, too, seems to use pronouns with the aim of addressing a broad public, an effort which, in his case, is even made explicit by the occasional employment of the term “tri-partisan” (App. 2 lines 166, 276).

3. 5. 2. 2 Lexical Choice and Metaphor Use

An instance which contains negatively connoted language occurs in the following utterance:

[...] they can pretend that an energy tax isn't an energy tax and they can pretend that every retired American who uses electricity isn't going to pay it [...]. (App. 2 line 109 ff)

The word “pretend” adds to the negative positioning of the current government as “the other” in the first section of the speech. This practice is complemented immediately by the positive portrayal of the “in-group”:

[...] this is a nation of people courageous enough to tell the truth and this is a nation of people courageous enough to insist that we not be governed by people who won't tell us the truth. (App. 2 line 113 ff)

This passage is contrasted with the preceding one with the effect of making the distinction between the two groups explicit. In the case of the “in-group”, group membership is implicitly defined by citizenship, or membership of the “nation”, the United States. On the other side, we find members of the government, who allegedly do not belong to this “nation” group. Thus, an opposition between the government members and the citizens is artificially constructed, presumably to set listeners against the government.

Interestingly, the speaker opposes his own assertion that “they” are dishonest when he says:

They have shared openly and honestly with us their vision of higher taxes, bigger government, more bureaucracy, greater corruption, more political power by people unworthy of doing it, and a policy which will kill jobs, cripple

the economy, trap children in schools that are disasters and weaken America's future. (App. 2 line 121 ff)

A notable word choice is that of the compound "left wing machine" (line 22). The word "machine" could point towards a dehumanized portrayal of the opposing agents. The impression created is that of an inhuman force driven by left-wing ideology which governs the processes of national economic policy, whereby an image of the humanity of the opposition might be implied. This is no more than an introspectively obtained impression, however, even though it is corroborated later on by the occurrence of the phrase "robots for a left wing machine" (line 128), which is used later on referring to elected democratic Senators. Corpus data from the OANC does neither support nor contradict this speculation, because it does not list any occurrence of the compound.

Another instance where the "out-group's", that is the government's, actions are depicted as negative is the use of the verb "punish":

[The President] said we ought to punish companies that want to take jobs out of America. (App. 2 line 184 f)

The OANC lists only one occurrence of this verb with the object "companies", and in this case the agent is not the government, but potential customers of the company. It is therefore plausible to assume that this choice of words is not highly common in comparable contexts.

An interesting compound can be found in the section

[...] let's have a debate between their bold colors of European socialism transplanted to Washington and our bold colors of American free enterprise, the American work ethic, and the American vision [...]. (App. 2 line 260 ff)

The OANC is not much help for interpreting this metaphor. It does not seem to be commonly used, since the corpus contains only two instances overall, both of which refer to actual colours (in the context of graphics or design), rather than a political programme. I would guess that the use of "bold colors" suggests that both groups display their political agenda openly and clearly. Gingrich thus mitigates allusions to the dishonesty of the antagonist group he makes at the beginning of the speech.

When referring to the government, that is, the political antagonists, we find a striking number of negatively connoted lexical items in Gingrich's speech. Consider the following example:

[...] they're going to try to pass in a stealth manner [...] is the effort to deprive American workers of the right to a private ballot [...]. (App. 2 line 288 ff)

The verb “deprived” stands out in particular, since it is repeated shortly afterwards, in connection with the decidedly negative word “coerce”:

It's an effort to deprive you of the right to vote in secret, to ensure that they can coerce socially, [...]. (App. 2 line 292 f)

Both “deprive” and “coerce” imply negative effects implemented by force or even violence. The effect of antagonizing the opposing party becomes increasingly marked. I would argue that it is a key theme in the entire speech.

However, there is also some mitigation of this impression in the speech. Evidently, the speaker seeks to stylise himself as a candidate that can be supported by people regardless of their party affiliations. This is expressed by the adjective “tri-partisan” (lines 166, 276). This unusual word seems to have been coined recently, possibly by the speaker or his authors, on the basis of the more common “bipartisan”. The OANC, at any rate, does not list a single instance of the word.

3. 5. 2. 3 Repetition

I wonder how dumb they think we are [...]. (App. 2 line 75 f)

Particularly in the first part of the speech, the tone employed is strikingly belligerent compared to McCain's. The phrase quoted above, which is repeated four times in slightly altered forms, is symptomatic for this impression. Again, the pronoun “they” refers to the current democratic administration.

Another phrase which repeatedly occurs is

[...] we're not going to raise taxes on anyone below 250,000 a year unless you [...]. (App. 2 line 99 ff)

This is likely to be done with the aim of reinforcing the message. Cutting taxes seems to be a central issue in the speech, and it is also an important criticism raised against the incumbent administration. The speaker thus stylises his own party as the relatively better choice. This topic echoes McCain's speech with regard to content.

Later, Gingrich uses a repetitive structure of three parts, presumably also to reinforce the effect he is trying to create:

I just want to take the position of being against stupid spending. It's bold. It's out on the edge. It's daring. (App. 2 line 222 f)

The three short phrases in parallel structures are given without intermittent conjunctions. Their purpose is probably to emphasise the speaker's self-stylisation as a courageous politician.

Further on, the device of repetition is used again to strengthen the opposition to the political antagonists once more. Both the positive and the negative groups are portrayed concisely in perfectly parallel sentences.

If you believe the best way to create jobs is to give more money to bureaucracies in Washington and more power to politicians in the congress, you have a team. And you if [sic] think the best way to create jobs is to lower taxes on business, encourage small business, make life easier for people who want to work hard and create jobs, you have a team. (App. 2 line 225 ff, my emphasis)

This technique of directly contrasting two groups of people and two political programmes, regardless of how accurately they are being portrayed, creates a strong effect. Also note that, in the second sentences, the three part structure reoccurs. There are three measures given which the speaker proposes in order to create jobs.

Another occurrence of this three-part repetitive structure is the following:

[...] our bold colors of American free enterprise, the American work ethic, and the American vision [...]. (App. 2 line 261 f)

Implicitly, the three concepts are equalised by the parallelism of the structure, implying that "free enterprise", "work ethic" and "vision" somehow belong together. The concept of "the American vision" may allude to the common phrase "the American dream", the myth that any person could achieve economic advancement in the United States, which is strongly connected with the neo-liberal ideal of the self-regulating market.

Another repetitive structure can be found in the following passage:

[...] when the alternative is a big tax, big bureaucracy, big politics, big corruption alternative. (App. 2 line 384 f)

Later on, the central word "big" is again repeated, followed by the adjective "arrogant". By equalising these two adjectives, a negative connotation to "big" is implied, which is not necessarily there:

[...] Americans who are being served badly by big bureaucracy, big government, and arrogant politicians. (App. 2 line 423 f)

Evidently, the word “big” is used here to describe harmful measures taken by the government and present those as potentially threatening.

3. 5. 2. 4 Presuppositions

At the beginning of Gingrich’s speech, the speaker construes the current government under President Obama as the “out-group”. The utterance

[...] we now have more than enough evidence of what this administration thinks of the American people. (App. 2 line 32 f)

bears witness to this construal. It is presumably a conscious act of presenting imputations as facts in order to discredit this “out-group”. This is of course not the only instance where this technique is employed.

[...] entrepreneurs created wealth, [...]. (App. 2 line 17)

This passage suggests that, in the eyes of Gingrich, it is not “us” who create wealth, nor workers or the government. The stylization of the “entrepreneur” as the promoter of the economy matches the neoliberal ideology quite well. It is also consistent with McCain’s speech where implications are made about “barriers” which hinder the creativity of the people, who would otherwise create jobs of their own accord (see above) (<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/07/07/AR2008070701672.html>, 24 February, 2011).

Gingrich utters a number of supposed facts about the feelings of “people” towards the government:

People are sick and tired of the negative, they’re sick and tired [...] and people are genuinely frightened for the country, they are frightened for our national security, they are frightened for the very nature of our culture, they are frightened about our economy, they want to see a movement that has positive solutions that would work better than the failed policies of the left. (App. 2 line 140 ff)

In this passage, the speaker simply suggests that potentially all people living in America feel this way. It is unlikely that this is true, of course. It seems pointless to speculate whether a significant percentage of people feel addressed by these assertion. Again, we find a similar instance in McCain’s “Jobs for America” speech,

but the device is much less pronounced there, as it occurs only once, and the language use in the context is not as strongly negative (see above).

There are a few instances where Gingrich makes his belief in free market forces explicit, for example the following:

[...] you want to put lots of money back into this economy? Put it back with the American people and let them decide which companies ought to survive and which companies ought to grow. That's called being a customer and not being a bureaucrat. (App. 2 line 179 ff)

In this construction, “the American people” are in the position of agents. The growth of companies becomes a matter of conscious decision. This can be interpreted as reflecting what is critically referred to as the self-regulation of the market, meaning that supply and demand are kept in an equilibrium of their own accord if unfettered by regulations.

As we shall see in the next chapter, the overall tone of this speech is more comparable to that of McCain's opponent in the 2008 presidential elections, the later President Obama. The same holds true for Gingrich's tendency to refer directly to the opponent's actions and programme in a negative way.

The speaker often blatantly opposes “left wing” ideology, probably to demarcate his own neo-liberal perspective. These instances touch upon matters of economic policy, albeit indirectly. In the second half of the speech, Gingrich refers to the government as “the left”:

One of the efforts of the left which [...] they're going to try to pass in a stealth manner [...]. (App. 2 line 288 f)

It is likely that many viewers/listeners would perceive the allusion to left-wing politics as negative, or even offensive. The OANC, though offering an ambiguous picture, lists a few instances where the term “left-wing” is directly linked to former communist regimes, which, I would argue, are generally regarded as undesirable by US citizens. The connection is even made explicit in the speech itself later on.

And then [...] we were told the left was going to be dominant, that the Soviet Union was going to be dominant, that freedom was going to diminish, and that we should just accept malaise because that was our future. (App. 2 line 415 ff)

The speaker refers back to the Cold War situation, equalising “the left” with “the Soviet Union” by using a parallel structure. Thus, one could argue, a connection is created to earlier references to “the left” (see above). Potentially, recipients may get the impression that Gingrich is trying to imply that the Obama administration is on a par with the Soviet regime. In how far this impression is likely to shape people’s perception either Obama’s administration or the Soviet Union remains unclear. Some recipients may endorse this portrayal, whilst others may not share this opinion.

The overall impression that Newt Gingrich gives is slightly different from McCain’s “Jobs for America” speech. Gingrich uses much more belligerent language such as negatively connoted words with reference to the government, which sheds a more aggressive light on the speaker. On the other hand, there are also significant similarities: the broad and inclusive construal of the “in-group”, for example, is prominent in both texts.

It is plausible that the difference in tone between the speakers is a result of the different situations in which the speeches were delivered. McCain was the republican presidential candidate at a time where a republican was incumbent president as well. Gingrich very clearly demonstrates his opposition to the democratic administration. However, it is equally possible that the different styles can be attributed to temperament or public image of the speakers themselves, McCain presenting himself in a staid manner, whereas Gingrich acts rather fierce in comparison.

3. 5. 3 The Opponent: Barack Obama

According to Wodak’s categorisation of context components (2009: 586), the discourse of other political parties should also be integrated into the contextual analysis. This aspect appeared to be better placed after the actual textual analysis of the central text. It can be expected that contrasting discourse practices reveal insight into peculiarities of the initial research object. Ideally, an extensive account of the discourse coming from the Democratic Party on related issues of economic policy would be desirable. As this would go beyond the scope of this paper, a superficial examination must suffice for illustrative purposes.

To provide material for a direct comparison, speeches delivered by McCain’s opponent, Barack Obama, are a manifest choice in that they are most likely to give

some insight into other perspectives on matters of economy, employment and unemployment. As exemplary speeches about related topics, I selected the speech Obama gave after having been nominated Democratic candidate for the presidential elections in 2008

(<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/barackobamademocraticnominationvictoryspeech.htm>, 1st March 2011, see Appendix 3), and another speech from his electoral campaign, delivered in the same year

(http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/09/us/politics/09transcript-obama.html?pagewanted=6&_r=1, March 8 2011, see Appendix 4). The first speech does not centrally deal with economy, but covers a wider variety of topics, whereas the second deals more explicitly with topics relevant to the research question. An analysis of both speeches will possibly reveal patterns in related discourse strategies of democratic politicians. Let us first look at Obama's victory speech.

3. 5. 3. 1 Terms of Address and Reference

In terms of in-group construal, one might expect similar findings in the elections speeches of both candidates, since both are speaking to a wide public under similar conditions. Yet, the terms of address used in Obama's first speech give a slightly different impression from McCain's. Obama frequently uses State names, presumably to address the inhabitants of these states. It is unclear why Obama would want to focus the recipients' attention on individual states, since the occasion would justify addressing people from the United States in general. Still, the use of state names constitutes a means of generalisation that has already been observed in McCain's speech (see above). When the speaker addresses "Minnesota", the implication is that every inhabitant should feel addressed, although predications will seldom apply to all people of Minnesota. It can only be guessed why the speaker selected a narrower general reference, rather than, for example, addressing "America". Possibly, the place of delivery has a particular significance. This speculation can currently not be verified, however.

Moving on, the use of the pronoun "you" is used much more frequently in this speech than in McCain's. In the beginning, this pronoun occurs in a formula which attributes an active role to the addressee:

[...] because of what you said, because you decided that change must come to Washington, because you believed that this year must be different than all the rest, because -- because you chose to listen not to your doubts or your fears, but to your greatest hopes and highest aspirations [...]. (App. 3 line 19 ff)

Here, Obama addresses his own supporters exclusively, rather than the nation at large, concluding a large section that is dedicated to acknowledgements. This is a peculiarity rooted in the occasion for the speech.

Later on in the speech, the pronoun “we” is used extensively, for example in imperative structures. By the use of this pronoun, a group identity is created. It is not clear how broad the constructed in-group is intended to be in this section. Possibly, the speaker still speaks only to his own followers whose allegiance to the Democratic Party is already clear. Yet, there is no certainty as to this point. The call for action in the following passage could also be directed at the entire nation.

[...] we cannot afford to keep doing what we’ve been doing. We owe our children a better future. We owe our country a better future. [...] I say: Let us begin the work together. Let us unite in common effort to chart a new course for America. (App. 3 line 67 ff)

In this, as well as other instances where the pronoun “we” repeatedly occur the in-group is not clearly determined. Generally, the speaker might include the recipients of his speech in the category, as becomes clear in the above mentioned “Let us [...]”. Other instances are less suggestive in this respect. The possibility that this ambiguous use of the pronoun is deliberate cannot be ruled out. In any case, it demonstrates the same broad and inclusive “in-group” construal which is also visible in McCain’s “Jobs for America” speech.

[...] We must be as careful getting out of Iraq as we were careless getting in, but we -- but start leaving we must. (App. 3 line 97 f)

This is a passage in which the agent (or agent group) is not so clearly definable. Obama may refer to the government here. But it is also plausible that he addresses ordinary citizens to evoke their feelings of identification with this government and its actions, implying that the decision as to whether American troops will leave Iraq were a common endeavour of all Americans.

More often than not, however, the speaker addresses potentially all American citizens and probably attempts to create a common identity for all of them, similarly to his opponent. The following passage supports this view.

[...] where America stands and what we stand for. We must once again have the courage and the conviction to lead the free world. [...] (App. 3 line 106 f)

The use of “America” and “we” in parallel clauses which are connected by the conjunction “and” equalises the two concepts, though this impression is blurred shortly afterwards, when the speaker contrasts “we must [...]” with “That’s what the American people demand” (line 108 f), vaguely implying that there is a potential difference between the two categories.

All in all, the use of pronouns appears much less straight-forward than in the republican speech. To draw conclusions this concerning ideological influences, however, is challenging. In this context, one might point out that CD analysts generally regard clear and straightforward formulations as favourable to obscure ones, as recipients are in a better position to assess what has been said. Following this line of argument, McCain’s speech would appear in a more favourable light than his opponent’s.

3. 5. 3. 2 Lexical Choice and Metaphor Use

An important lexical item in the speech is the word “change”, a keyword of Obama’s primary election campaign. The formula “It’s not change when” is repeated three times with regard to McCain’s programme (lines 79, 81, 86). “Change” is not used as a neutral word in this speech. Implicitly, there is a positive connotation to it, as if “change” necessarily were “change for the better”. This pointed use of the term is expressed in the passage

[...] change is a foreign policy that doesn’t begin and end with a war that should’ve never been authorized and never been waged. (App. 3 line 92 f)

Furthermore, the speaker uses the same wording in two consecutive sentences: “That’s what the American people demand. That’s what change is.” (line 109 f). As they occupy the corresponding positions in these parallel sentences, the phrases “what the American people demand” and “what change is” can be interpreted as

equalized. What this might mean to individual viewers or listeners is, of course, far from clear, particularly since the meaning of “change” remains rather vague.

Incidentally, Obama seems to apply tactics here which have been examined by Fairclough in his book *Discourse and Social Change* (1992), and which he has termed *strategic interdiscursivity*. By “highlight[ing] different senses”, a speaker can “[establish] particular hierarchies of salience relationships”, thereby causing a “revaluation” of a particular lexical item (1992: 188). In this case, this is achieved by implicitly stressing those aspects of semantic meaning in the word “change” which are positive. This is a common rhetorical device, of course. The term is thus given a central role for Obama’s electoral campaign and contributes to his created image of innovator.

3. 5. 3. 3 Repetition

Conversely to McCain’s speech, the opponent has a central theme which reoccurs frequently throughout the victory speech, namely the key word “change” (see above). In connection with this key term Obama frequently employs the device of repetition. The formula “It’s not change when” (line 79 ff) which has already been mentioned, has a counterpart. It is given in the subsequent section, which repeats “Change is” (lines 110, 117) that commences paragraphs which deal with key issues of the speakers’ electoral platform. All these examples contribute to the impression that slogan-like language is employed more extensively by Obama than by McCain.

Another repeated phrase is “maybe if John McCain” (or “maybe if he”) (lines 121, 128, 135). It is used four times, referring to Obama’s opponent. The paragraphs following this formula deal with personal experiences of individual American people, although recipients cannot be sure whether these people are real or fictitious. McCain also uses this technique, but refers to the people he mentions by name (e.g. Beth, Andrew Emmett) (App. 1 lines 8 ff; line 44). Each of the passages, which begin with the phrase “maybe if John McCain”, are concluded with another formula, the sequence “he’d understand that we/she can’t afford [...]” (App. 3 lines 129 f, 136). The choice of the wording “can’t afford” suggests an urgency in the message.

At one point, the speech uses contrast in a striking manner: the phrase “That’s the change we need” occurs three times, the first two of which it is followed by and

address, “Minnesota” (lines 127, 134 f) . The last time, however, it is followed by “in America” (line 141 f), thus widening the scope of the message, even though the speaker does not address “America” directly.

3. 5. 3. 4 Presuppositions

In terms of economic policy, Obama implies an active role to government policies by assigning them the position of subject.

[...] Bush economic policies [...] have failed to create well-paying jobs, or insure our workers, or help Americans afford the skyrocketing cost of college, policies that have lowered the real incomes of the average American family, and widened the gap between Wall Street and Main Street, and left our children with a mountain of debt. (App. 3 line 81 ff)

This structure suggests that the responsibility for income development, insurance and the creation of jobs lies with the government. In this respect, Obama’s speech parallels McCain’s, with the possible exception of the insurance issue, which McCain is more likely to regard as lying in the responsibility of each individual citizen.

On the other hand, also similarly to McCain, Obama’s speech constructs the American “workers” as the source of the prosperity of the nation, as is expressed in the passage

Change is building an economy that rewards not just wealth, but the work and the workers who created it. (App. 3 line 110)

This observation is highly relevant for the research topic of this thesis. However, in order not to anticipate the conclusion, I can only offer a tentative assertion: at least in the texts surveyed in this paper, the opposing politicians do not demonstrate clear distinctions in their construal of the working people. It could have been expected that the republican exponent would demonstrate less solidarity or understanding and describe their role as rather passive. In the light of this direct comparison with his democratic rival, this expectation so far cannot be verified.

There are some more presuppositions in Obama’s speech that may be relevant with regard to McCain’s speech. In a series of parallel clauses, Obama enumerates apparent facts as follows:

[...] our military is overstretched, our nation is isolated, and nearly every other threat to America is being ignored. (App. 3 line 96 f)

The presuppositions here are that the nation is indeed isolated, and that there are other “threats to America” which should be tackled but are not. These are later specified as the

[...] common threats of the 21st century: terrorism and nuclear weapons, climate change and poverty, genocide and disease. (App. 3 line 102 f)

In how far these threats affect the world, and whether the government’s actions to deal with them are satisfactory or not, are matters of perspective.

Further on in the speech, Obama comments on the failings of the administration of then President, George W. Bush, imputing that these will continue under the presidency of McCain. He lists grievances that are, allegedly, currently at work, such as “our crumbling infrastructure” (line 113). Again, the speaker simply states that the infrastructure is indeed deteriorating, an assertion whose truth value is difficult to assess.

3. 5. 3. 5 Cross-Reference

Interestingly, with regard to content, Obama picks up a number of topics that are identical with those in McCain’s speech about the “Jobs for America” programme. The creation of new jobs, too high prices for petrol and energy independence are issues covered by both speeches. Naturally, the opponents offer slightly different solutions, and impute to each other a lack of problem awareness, presumably to discredit one another.

Generally, Obama seems to refer to his opponent’s campaign platform very frequently, at least by implication. In the following passage, we can assume that, by describing his concept of “change”, the speaker delineates the opponent’s programme, casting a negative light upon it and delineating his own position more favourably:

Change is building an economy that rewards not just wealth, but the work and the workers who created it. (App. 3 line 110 f)

The aforesaid particularly applies to the phrasing “not just wealth, but [...]”, which implies that the “other”, namely John McCain, is the one seeking to reward “just wealth”, and that this is undesirable. Similarly, the statement that

[...] the struggles facing working families can't be solved by spending billions of dollars on more tax breaks for big corporations and wealthy CEOs, but by [...]. (App. 3 line 111 f)

can be taken to implicitly refer to the opposing candidate. The extensive passage mentioned above that comments on McCain's failure to understand the problems of American people (beginning with "but maybe if he spent") confirms this impression. In comparison, McCain's speech refers to the opponent's platform to a more moderate extent.

Obama's homing in on his opponent's positions is perhaps understandable under the circumstances of the looming elections. It may also be fortified by the differences in position between the two opponents. The incumbent president at the time was a republican; therefore the democratic candidate might find himself in the role of challenger, which offers an explanation for the more belligerent tone of his speech.

3. 5. 4 Opposing Ideologies? Some More Comments on Obama

The analysis of Obama's victory speech has revealed some information about the rhetoric used by the opposing party members in general. With regard to the research question, yet deeper insight into specificities of democratic economic policy may be gleaned from the second of Obama's speeches (<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/09/us/politics/09transcript-obama.html?pagewanted=6&r=1>, 8 March 2011, see Appendix 4), which deals explicitly with the economic policy of the democratic electoral platform and was delivered roughly at the same time as McCain's speech in 2008. The following analysis is rather selective. The intention behind it is, again by comparing McCain with his opponent Obama, to illustrate the potential relationship between ideological background of the speaker and rhetoric particularities in greater detail. This time the focus is on the central topics of work, employment and economic policy.

3. 5. 4. 1 Terms of Address and Reference

With regard to the ideological differences between the speakers, the way in which they construe agency and "in-group" identity with regard to economic processes can be relevant. In the case of Obama's second speech, the resulting picture is not clear-cut.

Consider the following example, which follows the passage above:

[...] and each time we've kept our economy strong and competitive by making the decision to expand opportunity outward; to grow our middle-class; to invest in innovation, and most importantly, to invest in the education and well-being of our workers. (App. 4 line 64 ff)

In this passage, several measures are listed by which the subject “we” influences the success of “our economy”, that is, evidently, the national economy of the United States. The pronoun is introduced in the preceding sentence: “We live in a more competitive world [...]” (line 62 f), implying that it refers to the nation at large. The speaker ascribes an active and powerful role to this “we”-group. They have the power to “grow our middle-class” (line 66), for instance. Moreover, long passages of the speech are dedicated to describing measures by which such processes can be influenced. Thus, the impression that the economy is driven by unalterable and inaccessible forces is blurred. The position of the speaker, or his party, towards this issue is not immediately deducible from the textual evidence.

The use of pronouns seems to be more straight-forward in this speech than in the last one. “We” is most frequently used to refer to action located in the domain of the government, presumably the hypothetical future administration under the speaker himself as President.

The pronoun “they” occurs with similar frequency in both Obama’s speeches, as well as in McCain’s. In his victory speech, for comparison, Obama uses it to identify the opposing political party, thus creating a dichotomy between himself and McCain.

Much more frequently, though, “they” refers to a certain part of the population, namely veterans (App. 6 line 347), “working families” (App. 4 line 169), or “Americans” in general. Comparing these data to McCain’s speech shows a similar result. McCain uses this pronoun exclusively to refer to “Americans” or to “workers of a certain age” (App. 1 line 81). The pronoun use, in these cases, hardly qualifies as negative out-group construal in the sense that is often detected by CDA scholars. It can be said that both speakers use pronouns in a broad and inclusive way that remains unchanged by their respective backgrounds. They seem to seek to include ideally all recipients, hardly ever resorting to negative demarcation against “others”.

3. 5. 4. 2 Word Choice and Structures

In some respects, I would argue, the two speakers reveal noticeable similarities. Again, Obama demonstrates problem awareness with regard to energy dependence, using the phrase “our addiction on foreign oil” (line 115). McCain’s wording is comparable: he calls it “our strategic dependence on foreign oil”.

Another analogy to McCain’s speech can be found in the phrasing

It’s an agenda that will require us first and foremost to train and educate our workforce [...]. (App. 4 line 109 f)

We find a similar construction in the “Jobs for America” speech, giving the impression that the government or the public are required to be active for the training of workers, and thus removing this responsibility from the people concerned (see above). This finding seems to justify the conclusion that the choice of this structure cannot be related to ideological background directly. Moreover, the use of “workforce” (line 110), rather than “workers”, in Obama’s wording, may point to a depersonalising portrayal of the persons concerned. In terms of this connotation, OANC data is difficult to interpret. Instances where “workforce” is used to denote a group of people, rather than more abstract concepts, seem to be quite frequent, but the distinction is not always clear in the items listed in the corpus.

There are other formulations which are strongly reminiscent of McCain’s language, such as “the hard work and ingenuity of our people” (App. 4 line 69 f). Conversely to McCain, though, Obama deduces from this different conclusions, indicated by the phrase “That’s why”, which gives a causal relationship between the individual notions.

[...] it has been the hard work and ingenuity of our people that’s served as the wellspring of our economic strength. That’s why we built a system of free public high schools [...]. That’s why we sent my grandfather’s generation to college, and declared a minimum wage for our workers, and promised to live in dignity after they retire through the creation of Social Security. That’s why we’ve invested in the science and research [...]. (App. 4 line 69 ff)

In McCain’s speech, there is no such causal relationship between the “hard work and ingenuity” and the implementation of institutions of a social state. The ideological

division thus becomes apparent. Even more, it seems to be made apparent with a purpose, as is suggested by Obama's announcement that he intended to

[...] lay out the very real and very serious differences on the economy between myself and Senator McCain. (App. 4 line 81 f)

This ideological distinction is not mirrored in the formal texture of the language used by either of the speakers.

3. 5. 4. 3 Presuppositions and Ideological Statements

Somewhat ambiguously, the passage given below could be read as an acknowledgement of the view that "free markets" are desirable from the speaker's point of view. But Obama contradicts this statement immediately by associating "such special-interest driven policies" and "lax regulation" with the use of the conjunction "and".

And for all of George Bush's professed faith in free markets, the markets have hardly been free [...]. As a result of such special-interest driven policies and lax regulation, we haven't seen prosperity trickling down to Main Street. (App. 4 line 52 ff)

Implicitly, this passage advocates less "lax" regulations on the part of the state, a demand which is incompatible with neo-liberal policies. This does not justify the conclusion, however, that Obama – or the Democratic Party, for that matter – opposes neo-liberal ideas as such. There are several instances which equalize a "strong" economy with a "competitive" economy by use of the conjunction "and". Competition as a fundamental regulating force of the market is an essential concept in free-market policy. In Obama's speech, this idea is expressed as follows.

[...] we've kept our economy strong and competitive [...]. (App. 4 line 64)

[...] that will fuel a bottom-up prosperity to keep America strong and competitive in the 21st century. (line 294 f)

In this respect, the comparison between the major parties in the United States political system does not reveal a bias on the part of republicans so much as a consent amongst important exponents of these parties.

Nevertheless, Obama denounces the current policy as the source of the economical crisis in his utterance

It was the logical conclusion of a tired and misguided that has dominated Washington for far too long. (App. 4 line 43 f)

Further on, the phrase “the challenges facing our economy” (line 58) stands out. Here, “the challenges” occupy the position of subject and agent, whereas “our economy” is the object of the action. This may give the impression that those challenges exist outside the system and are not subject to anybody’s control. However, in the passage quoted earlier, Obama portrays the current negative developments as “the logical conclusion of a tired and misguided philosophy” (line 44).

This explicit statement rules out the interpretation that the “challenges” are perceived as natural and uncontrollable. It is true that data extracted from the OANC confirms the expectation that “challenges” are more commonly constructed as objects in the function of patients (13 out of 15 occurrences). However, the same data suggests that the less common choice of structure cannot clearly be attributed to a particular intention. Presumably, both structures are eligible for equal purposes. There are two more instances in the same speech which construe “challenges” as object and patient of the respective clause.

When Fairclough (2000: 69) examined the language of New Labour, he observed that the former US President Bill Clinton, too, depicted forces of economic change as inevitable and unchangeable. One instance of Obama’s speech seems to echo his predecessor.

We live in a more competitive world, and that is a fact that cannot be reversed. (App. 4 line 62 f)

Though the verb “reversed” implicitly suggests that a world that is not as competitive as the world of the present may have existed at some point in the past, the inevitability of the status quo is implied in this sequence.

A similar attitude may be read from statements like the following, which presents “costs” and “wages” as agents, functioning of their own accord in a particular way, rather than as phenomena which can be shaped by intervention.

[...] Americans who are struggling under skyrocketing costs and stagnant wages that are pushing working families towards a debt spiral [...]. (App. 4 line 165 f)

But although statements like these provide evidence that the Democratic Party seems to support the opinion that globalizing and other forces in the market economy are simply naturally occurring phenomena, other extracts in Obama's speech may give a different impression.

Summing up, it can be noted that striking differences in language use between the opponents are rare. Indeed, there are quite a few similarities to be found in language use. This may be a result of the fact that the texts all belong to the same genre and that they were devised and delivered under similar circumstances. However, this observation may also give an impression of the extent to which the producer(s) of these speeches responded to the same public mood that may have been dominant at the time.

3. 5. 5 Observations

The intertextual and interdiscursive dimensions proved particularly problematic in practice. Leaving aside the problem that both terms are usually vaguely defined, the analysis of other texts confronts the analyst with largely the same problems faced in the initial textual analysis above. Even more, the choice of the texts for comparison reaches a level of arbitrariness that is difficult to justify, since the sheer range of options becomes unmanageable. A full account of this level of context features would require the analysis of other text types related to the topic of the speech, the abundance of which renders it practically impossible to make an informed selection.

Repeatedly, particularly in the analysis of Obama's speeches, it became clear that individual textual features could not logically be interpreted in the way which initially appeared to be the most salient one, because their content was mitigated or downright thwarted in other passages taken from the same speech. These observations show how difficult it is to draw definite conclusions or assign definite meanings to any structure or lexical choice. The only deduction which appears justified from this comparison is that the discourse of both politicians appears to be equally manipulative or persuasive.

A closer look at the discourse by the opposing party was revealing in several ways. Apart from the generally more belligerent impression given by McCain's opponent, the analysis did not reveal significant contrasts with regard to discourse practices between the opposing candidates. The same can be said about the second of Obama's speeches. Indeed, it is surprising how similar the linguistic choices were in the individual speeches, at least in some cases. One possible conclusion to be drawn from this is that text production is governed by conventions to a great extent in all the cases considered.

This impression is corroborated to some extent by the analysis of the speech given by McCain's colleague, Newt Gingrich. The tone of this speech is considerably more aggressive, and in this respect bears closer resemblance to Obama's speeches than to McCain's. In other respects, for example "in-group" construction, however, Gingrich is comparable to both other speakers. This could be due to the fact that both the text formats and the circumstances of delivery are comparable in all the cases considered in this paper. Therefore, it is not surprising that the speeches have quite a lot in common, even though they were given by politicians representing opposing parties. Most traits of the language that I scrutinised, I would argue, might as well have occurred in the respectively opposing discourse, with the exception of some *presuppositions*. Thus, my observations do not permit a definite conclusion about ideologically qualified meaning in McCain's "Jobs for America" speech. But the conclusion that convention is highly influential in this case also substantiates the assumption that ideology is not a comparably important factor of influence on usage in this case.

Looking back at Bush's second presidential election campaign, the rather rudimentary diachronic examination, also confirmed that it is difficult to establish a direct connection between ideological background and language use. Both republican politicians used similar language to a certain extent. Yet, the picture resulting from this language use cannot be regarded as non-ambiguous. In fact, tentatively confirming an observation implied by Widdowson (2004: 74) the close analysis of almost isolated language features may even have the effect of distorting some of the more likely meaning potentials in the text. From this diachronic examination, I conclude that both republican politicians do not express faith in the

unguided market forces as explicitly as may have been expected, at least with regard to the employment market. Certainly, not much responsibility for unemployment or poor job perspectives is assigned to the workers themselves by either of the republican politicians. Workers are portrayed in a positive light, structural problems are often held responsible for the loss of jobs.

After the comparative analysis of texts take from both major US parties, it has become apparent that the constraints of the analysts' limited perspective can be problematic. Looking at the object from a left-wing European perspective, the neo-liberal influence on linguistic, particularly lexical, choices could be perceived as "more marked" than the intended audience is likely to perceive them. This problem arises out of the assumption that there is generally a rather broad consent with regard to neo-liberal economic policy (Greven 2004: 17) in the United States. If this is so, even Americans who are democratically inclined will not perceive instantiations of neo-liberal ideology as peculiar to republican discourse, but might feel that these instantiations are in fact ideologically neutral. The cultural distance to the research object thus becomes a momentous problem, as long as data are chiefly obtained by introspection.

On the whole, most choices made for this analysis are hard to justify even in retrospect. The extensive study of current CDA practice in the first section of this thesis did not provide a comprehensive and practicable methodological framework in which to operate. Even the order in which different components of *context* should be analysed turned out fairly arbitrary, with different levels interrelating with each other in ways too complex to account for in detail. Results appear ambiguous and unsatisfactory, and the overall impression of the analysis is that of a sketchy, selective attempt at grasping the scope of *context*.

In the light of these difficulties, I concede that the categorical organisation of context proposed by Wodak (2009: 586) ultimately failed to make the concept more manageable. In fact, if meaningful statements are to be made about intertextual links to other texts and their implications in terms of meaning potential, the initial selection problems are given *a fortiori*. In this as well as other respects, criticism uttered against CDA practice seems to have been largely confirmed.

4. Conclusion

In retrospective, the analysis appears to largely confirm the problems anticipated in the first section of the paper. It would be euphemistic to say that the analysis did contribute significantly to any deeper understanding of ideological influences in the language of republican politicians.

One problem which persisted throughout my analytical work was that of making choices. Selecting texts for analysis, then individual language features on the level of textual analysis proved very difficult. Furthermore, I noted an even higher degree of arbitrariness on the context level. Broad and vaguely defined categories made choices difficult, and each sub-topic could only be covered incompletely, leaving too much uncertainty in the results. This problem may be related to the fact that I had only a vague pre-formed thesis about the text. This proved to be insufficient guidance for the analysis. However, it would have seemed hard to justify the formation of such a directive thesis before the analysis of the text.

As a consequence, the quality of conclusions drawn from such a more or less arbitrary selection of texts about the properties of wider discourse systems is dubious. The unclear relationship between individual texts and the presumed larger discourse structures have been discussed in the theoretical section of this paper. I was unable to provide a solution for this problem in the course of my work.

At this point, the résumé of the analysis turns out somewhat unsatisfactory. Assumptions as to how, for example, the use of a pronoun is interpretable by a vast and diverse audience appear futile to a certain degree, if so little can be said about the recipients. The question whether individual recipients will feel they are included in the category depends on many factors and can ultimately only be answered by elicitation, if at all. It is quite possible that a significant number of recipients interact with such a text in a critical manner, deliberately resisting the intended meanings, because they are sceptical towards the speaker or the party he represents.

The relationship between text and discourse structure has been identified as a problematic issue in CDA (see above). The analysis I conducted yielded some contextual information which allowed for a placement of this particular text, a more or less detailed analysis of this text and some considerations with regard to its *pretext*

(in the sense of Widdowson 2004). It remains unclear, however, whether any reliable conclusions can be drawn from these findings with regard to a larger discourse structure such as, say, determining features of American republican discourse. In fact, the comparison with democratic texts and other republican texts resulted in an ambiguous picture which, if anything, suggests that a relationship is not likely.

The notion of *intention* proved just as elusive as suggested by some of the critics quoted in the first section. Conclusions about the producer's or speaker's intentions can of course be drawn on the basis of this analysis, but it would be a mistake to attribute these conclusions more impact or importance than an interpretation by any listener or viewer. Even after an extensive analysis, the analyst appears not to be able to offer a more complete or relevant understanding of the text.

At this point, it should be noted at this stage that the importance of textual analysis as a means to understand meaning making processes has been contested as such, because "ordinary" language users do not normally interpret texts with the aid of analytic procedures. Consequently, "[t]he meanings that are constructed by linguistic analysis, then, cannot be equated with those that are constructed by language users in the discourse process" (Widdowson 2004: 74 f).

These considerations leave us with further problems with regard to the critical agenda of CDA. In this field, the portion of a discourse process that is most significant is the meaning(s) that recipients derive from a text, since they are the ones supposedly subject to manipulation and power abuse (e.g. Fairclough 1992: 91; 2009: 516; Saussure 2007: 183). The vigour of an argument for this case depends on whether the discourse recipients make of a text corresponds with the intentions of the producer(s). Widdowson states that

"[t]he discourse which the writer intends the text to record as output is [...] always likely to be different from the discourse which the reader derives from it." (2004: 12)

If we presume that this statement is true, we must conclude that, even with consideration of a broad variety of factors, it is still not possible to make a reliable statement about the discourse any recipient may have derived from McCain's speech. The analysis carried out as part of this paper does not seem to provide a

comprehensive coverage of possible pragmatic meanings. Hence, this problem remains unsolved.

It must be noted, furthermore, that even if such questions could be answered satisfactorily, this would still not account fully for some of the claims CDA scholars have made. At least implicitly, CDA assumes that the subversive use of language can subtly influence recipients' perception of the world on a subconscious level, as it were. This claim could probably not even be verified by the use of questionnaires or other tools to elicit recipients' responses or opinions, because the viewers/listeners would be unaware of this manipulative influence by definition. A small-scale investigation like this thesis cannot provide clues towards the solution of this problem, except a tentative suggestion that CDA practitioners should be aware of the unresolved nature of this problem and adjust either their methods or their research aims to this knowledge.

CDA's reliance on "informal tools" has proved to be a problem with regard to reproducibility. As I frequently pointed out in my observation sections, it was impossible to find a way to reproduce methodological procedures in a way that would allow me to compare results with other studies of a similar object. Seemingly, there is no scholarly way of verifying the results gleaned from the analysis. Furthermore, I was unable to provide formalised procedures which would allow for verification. Though scholars have proposed measures for improving CDA procedures (e.g. Stubbs 1997: 7 ff), there still seem to be quite a few open questions which, if at all, can only be answered in future research.

I would like to conclude these considerations with a more positive note, however. Regardless of the many loose ends that have been detected in the course of this paper, and the room for improvement they offer for the methods of CDA, the appeal of the approach remains unquestionably strong. The aims these scholars pursue are undoubtedly fine and deserve support. Therefore, the conclusion to be drawn from this examination should not be to compromise these aims. The relativist approach exemplified by Jäger and Maier (2009: 36), for example, is disarming in its acknowledgement of the field's constraints (see above). And even if one wishes for a more concrete approach, attempts to improve CDA methods should not be abandoned.

References

- Blommaert, Jan; Bulcaen, Chris. 2000. Critical Discourse Analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 29. 447–466.
<http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev.anthro.29.1.447> (30 November 2010).
- Cameron, Deborah. 2001. *Working with Spoken Discourse*. London: Sage.
- Cameron, Deborah. 2002. *Working with spoken discourse*, 2nd edn. London: Sage.
- Cillia, Rudolf de; Wodak, Ruth. 2009. "Restitution: Yes, but...". In Ruth Wodak & Gertraud Auer Borea (eds.), *Justice and Memory: Confronting traumatic pasts. An international comparison*, 195–212. Wien: Passagen Verlag.
- Clark, Kate. 1992. "The linguistics of blame: representation of women in The Sun's reporting of crimes of sexual violence". In Michael Toolan (ed.), *Language, text and context: essays in stylistics*. London: Routledge.
- Culpeper, Jonathan (ed.). 2009. *English Language: Description, Variation and Context*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Czyżewski, Marek. 2009. "The Polish Debate around "Fear" by Jan Tomasz Gross from the Perspective of the Intermediary Discourse Analysis". In Ruth Wodak & Gertraud Auer Borea (eds.), *Justice and Memory: Confronting traumatic pasts. An international comparison*. Wien: Passagen Verlag.
- Drew, Paul; Wootton, Anthony (eds.). 1988. *Goffman: Exploring the interaction order*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, Norman. 2000. *New Labour, New Language?*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, Norman. 2009. "A Dialectical-Relational Approach to Critical Discourse Analysis in Social Research". In Ruth Wodak & Michael Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. 2nd edn, 162–186. London: Sage.
- Fairclough, Norman. 2009. Language, Reality and Power. In Jonathan Culpeper (ed.), *English Language: Description, Variation and Context*, 512–522. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fay, Brian. 1993. "The Elements of Critical Social Science". In Martyn Hammersley (ed.), *Social Research: Philosophy, Politics and Practice*, 33–36. London: Sage.
- Fish, Stanley. 1989. *Doing What Comes Naturally: Change, Rhetoric, and Practice of Theory in Literary and Legal Studies*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Fowler, Roger. 1996. *Linguistic Criticism*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Grabe, William. 2009. *Reading in a Second Language: Moving from Theory to Practice* (The Cambridge Applied Linguistics Series). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Graddoll, David; Swann, Joan. 1989. *Gender Voices*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell

- Halliday, Michael. 1994: *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 2nd edn. London: Edward Arnold
- Hammersley, Martyn (ed.). 1993. *Social Research: Philosophy, Politics and Practice*. London: Sage.
- Hein, Norbert; Hofmann-Richter, Ulrike; Lalouschek, Johanna; Nowak, Peter; Wodak, Ruth. 1985. „Kurzfassung eines Projektberichtes über Kommunikation zwischen Arzt und Patient“. *Wiener Linguistische Gazette* (35 - 36). 51–56.
- Hodge, Robert; Kress, Gunther. 1993. *Language as Ideology*, 2nd edn. London: Routledge.
- Jäger, Siegfried; Maier, Florentine. 2009. “Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of Foucauldian Critical Discourse Analysis and Dispositive Analysis”. In Ruth Wodak & Michael Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. 2nd edn, 34–61. London: Sage.
- Johnson-Laird, Philip N. 1983. *Mental Models: Towards a cognitive Science of Language, Inference, and Consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Jupp, Victor; Norris, Clive. 1993. “Traditions in Documentary Analysis”. In Martyn Hammersley (ed.), *Social Research: Philosophy, Politics and Practice*, 35–51. London: Sage.
- Kintsch, Walter. 1998. *Comprehension: A paradigm for cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Knapp, Steven; Michaels, Walter. 1985: “Against Theory”. In W.J.T. Mitchell, (ed.), *Against Theory* (Chicago, 1985), p. 13
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1988. “Putting linguistics on a proper footing: Explorations in Goffman's participation framework”. In Paul Drew & Anthony Wootton (eds.), *Goffman: Exploring the interaction order*, 161–227. Oxford: Polity Press.
http://pubman.mpdl.mpg.de/pubman/item/escidoc:66709:9/component/escidoc:532193/1987_Putting_linguistics_on.pdf (4 April 2011)
- Paltridge, Brian. 2006. *Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Reisigl, Martin. 2009. “Spoken Silences - Bridging Breaks: The Discursive Construction of Historical Continuities and Turning Points in Austrian Commemorative Speeches by Rhetorical Tropes”. In Ruth Wodak & Gertraud Auer Borea (eds.), *Justice and Memory: Confronting traumatic pasts. An international comparison*, 213–240. Wien: Passagen Verlag
- Reisigl, Martin; Wodak, Ruth. 2009. “The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA)”. In Ruth Wodak & Michael Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. 2nd edn, 87–121. London: Sage.
- Ryan, Ann; Wray, Alison (eds.) (1997). *Evolving Models of Language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Saussure, Louis de. 2007. “Pragmatic Issues in Discourse Analysis.” *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines* 1(1). 179–195.

- http://cadaad.org/files/journal/CADAAD1-1-deSausure-2007-Pragmatic_Issues_In_Discourse_Analysis.pdf (12 November 2010)
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1994. *Approaches to Discourse*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara (ed.) (2003). *Controversies in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stubbs, Michael. 1997. "Whorf's Children: Critical Comments on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)". In Ann Ryan & Alison Wray (eds.), *Evolving Models of Language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. <http://www.uni-trier.de/fileadmin/fb2/ANG/Linguistik/Stubbs/stubbs-1997-whorfs-children.pdf> (23 March 2011). © Copyright 1997 British Association for Applied Linguistics.
- van Dijk, Teun A. 2008. *Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- van Dijk, Teun A. 2009. "Critical Discourse Studies: A Sociocognitive Approach". In Ruth Wodak & Michael Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. 2nd edn, 62–86. London: Sage.
- van Leeuwen, Theo. 2009. "Discourse as the Recontextualization of Social Practice: A Guide". In Ruth Wodak & Michael Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. 2nd edn, 144–161. London: Sage.
- Widdowson, H. G. 1998. "The Theory and Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis." *Applied Linguistics* 19(1). 136–151.
<http://applied.oxfordjournals.org/content/19/1/136.full.pdf+html> (20 January 2011)
- Widdowson, H. G. 2003. "Discourse analysis: a critical view." In Barbara Seidlhofer (ed.), *Controversies in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H. G. 2003. "Reply to Fairclough: Discourse and interpretation: conjectures and refutations". In Barbara Seidlhofer (ed.), *Controversies in Applied Linguistics*, 152–168. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H. G. 2004. *Text, Context, Pretext: Critical Issues in Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wodak, Ruth. 2009. "Language and Politics." In Jonathan Culpeper (ed.), *English Language: Description, Variation and Context*, 576–593. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wodak, Ruth; Auer Borea, Gertraud (eds.). 2009. *Justice and Memory: Confronting traumatic pasts. An international comparison*. Wien: Passagen Verlag.
- Wodak, Ruth & Michael Meyer (eds.). 2009. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. 2nd edn. London: Sage.

Sources for the Speeches

“Barack Obama: *Democratic Nomination Victory Speech - Change We Can Believe In*”

<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/barackobamademocraticnominationvictoryspeech.htm> (March 1 2011)

“George W. Bush: *2004 Republican National Convention Address*”

<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/convention2004/georgewbush2004rnc.htm>, (March 11, 2011)

“George W. Bush: *2004 State of the Union Address*”

<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/stateoftheunion2004.htm> (March 1 2011)

“Newt Gingrich: *Address to the Conservative Political Action Committee*”

<http://www.newt.org/newt-direct/newt-addresses-cpac-2009> (5 April, 2011)

“Newt Explore 2012: *Newt Gingrich Exploring Potential Candidacy*”

<http://www.newtexlore2012.com/> (April 3 2011)

„Obama Delivers Speech on Economy “

<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/09/us/politics/09transcript-obama.html?pagewanted=6&r=1> (March 8 2011)

“Remarks By John McCain On His Jobs For America Economic Plan”

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/07/07/AR2008070701672.html> (24 February 2011)

“Remarks By John McCain On His Jobs For America Economic Plan” – Video recording

<http://www.wienerzeitung.at/DesktopDefault.aspx?TabID=4898&Alias=wahlen&cob=368159> (24 February 2011)

Corpus

Open American National Corpus. (OANC)

Copyright © 2002-2009 American National Corpus Project. All rights reserved.

(Download: February 15 2011)

Appendix

Appendix 1

John McCain: Remarks By John McCain On His Jobs For America Economic Plan

July 7, 2008

ARLINGTON, VA -- U.S. Senator John McCain will deliver the following remarks as prepared for delivery at a town hall meeting in Denver, CO, today at 12:00 p.m. MDT (2:00 P.M. EDT):

10 Thank you, Beth, for the kind introduction and inspiring words. Bethany Manufacturing is one of the many small business success stories in America. Beth is rightfully proud to have created good, secure jobs. Through her and her employees' ingenuity and hard work, Bethany keeps growing. But Beth tells me it gets harder every year, not because of the market and competition, but because of government regulations, taxes and the cost of health care. Beth, I promise you, if I'm elected President, we're going to remove these obstacles to your continued success, and make government a catalyst for growth and good jobs.

Before I take your questions, I want to begin by talking about the issue in this campaign Americans worry the most about -- the American economy.

20 All of us know what is happening to the economy. It is slowing. More than 400,000 people have lost their jobs since December, and the rate of new job creation has fallen sharply. Some economists have noted that companies seem to be on a "hiring strike." Americans are worried about the security of their current job, and they're worried that they, their kids and their neighbors may not find good jobs and new opportunities in the future. To make matters worse, gas is over \$4 a gallon and the price of oil has almost doubled in the last year. The cost of everything from energy to food is rising.

I have a plan to grow this economy, create more and better jobs, and get America moving again. I have a plan to reform government, achieve energy security, and ensure that healthcare and a quality education are affordable and available for all. I believe the role of government is to unleash the creativity, ingenuity and hard work of the American people, and make it easier to create jobs.

30 At its core, the economy isn't the sum of an array of bewildering statistics. It's about where Americans work, how they live, how they pay their bills today and save for tomorrow. It's about small businesses opening their doors, hiring employees and growing. It's about giving workers the education and training to find a good job and prosper in it. It's about the aspirations of the American people to build a better life for their families; dreams that begin with a job.

40 So how are we going to create good jobs? Let's start with small businesses, which create the majority of all jobs. A recent report says small businesses have created 233,000 jobs so far this year while other sectors are losing jobs. Small businesses are the job engine of America, and I will make it easier for them to grow and create more jobs. My opponent wants to make it harder by imposing a "pay or play" health mandate on small business. This adds \$12,000 to the cost of employing anyone with a family. That means new jobs will not be created. It

means existing employees will have their wages cut to pay for this mandate. My plan attacks the real problems of healthcare -- cost, availability and portability.

Some economists don't think much of my gas tax holiday. But the American people like it, and so do small business owners. Just ask Andrew Emmett who runs Air-Tite insulation in Michigan. He has had to stop hiring new workers because of the cost of fuel for his trucks.

50 We need to keep the IRS from taking more of your income and making life harder for small business. If you believe you should pay more taxes, I am the wrong candidate for you. Senator Obama is your man (*laughs*). The choice in this election is stark and simple. Senator Obama will raise your taxes. I won't. I will cut them where I can. Jobs are the most important thing our economy creates. When you raise taxes in a bad economy you eliminate jobs. I'm not going to let that happen.

60 Senator Obama's tax increases will hurt the economy even more, and destroy jobs across this country. If you are one of the 23 million small business owners in America who files as an individual rate payer, Senator Obama is going to raise your tax rates. If you have an investment for your child's education or own a mutual fund or a stock in a retirement plan, he is going to raise your taxes. He will raise estate taxes to 45 percent. I propose to cut them to 15 percent. His plan will hurt the American worker and family. It will hurt the economy and cost us jobs. For those of you with children, I will double the child deduction from \$3,500 to \$7,000 for every dependent, in every family in America. At a time of increasing gas and food prices, American families need tax relief and I, not my opponent, will deliver it.

In addition to small business, the other bright spot in the economy are our exports, which are estimated to be growing at over seven percent. I will expand markets for our goods and services. Twenty-five percent of all the jobs in this country are linked to world trade. In five states alone -- Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin and Colorado -- over five million jobs depend on open markets.

70 My opponent believes America would be better off by refusing opportunities to sell in growing foreign markets. But protectionism not only puts a hidden tax on almost everything you buy, but it undermines American competitiveness and costs jobs. Ninety-five percent of the world's consumers live outside the U.S. Our future prosperity depends on opening more of these markets, not closing them.

Five years ago, the outdoor footwear company, Crocs, was started by a couple of entrepreneurs with a great idea, ingenuity and drive. This former small business now employs 600 people in Colorado alone, and sells over 50 percent of its products in 90 countries around the world. Building barriers to Crocs or any American company's access to foreign markets will have a devastating effect on our economy and jobs, and the prosperity of American families.

80 I understand free trade is not a positive for everyone. If a worker loses a job we must retrain them and prepare them for 21st Century jobs. That's why I have proposed a comprehensive reform of our unemployment insurance and worker retraining programs. We will use our community colleges to help train workers for specific opportunities in their communities.

And for workers of a certain age who have lost a job that won't come back, we'll help make up the difference in wages between their old job and a temporary, lower paid one until they've completed retraining and found secure new employment at a decent wage.

We must also get government's fiscal house in order. American workers and families pay their bills and balance their budgets, and I will demand the same of the government. A government that spends wisely and balances its budget is a catalyst for economic growth and the creation of good and secure jobs.

90 This Congress and this Administration have failed to meet their responsibilities to manage the government. Government has grown by 60 percent in the last eight years. That is simply inexcusable. When I'm president, I will order a stem to stern review of government, modernize how it does business and save billions of dollars. I will veto every single bill with wasteful spending. We aren't going to continue mortgaging this country's future for things Americans don't want or need. My opponent has a very different record on this issue. He has sought millions upon millions of dollars in earmarks since his election to the Senate. In 2007 alone, Senator Obama requested nearly \$100 million for earmark projects. I have never asked for a single earmark in my entire career. He supported the \$300 billion pork laden agricultural subsidy bill. I opposed it. He voted for an energy bill stuffed with giveaways to oil companies at a time of record profits. I voted against it.

100 Let me give you a little bit of straight talk on energy. Our dangerous dependence on foreign oil has been thirty years in the making, and was caused by the failure of politicians in Washington to think long term about the future of the country. If we don't act now to break our strategic dependence on foreign oil, we are putting our national security, our economy and our environment at grave risk. By 2030, America's demand for energy will rise by nearly twenty percent. Our jobs and our very way of life depend on the next President beginning to solve this challenge.

Two weeks ago, I announced the Lexington Project to secure our energy future, named for the place where Americans first fought for their independence. We will begin by producing more of our own oil and gas. Increasing our own supply will send a message to the market and result in lower prices for oil and gas.

110 We will develop more clean energy. Nuclear power is the most dependable source of zero emission energy we have. We will build at least 45 new nuclear plants that will create over 700,000 good jobs to construct and operate them.

The development of clean coal technology will create jobs in some of America's most economically disadvantaged areas. Our coal reserves are larger than Saudi Arabia's supply of oil. Clean coal demonstration projects alone will employ over 30,000 Americans. In the state of Colorado over 80 percent of the electricity comes from coal, and in Ohio it's over 90 percent.

120 My proposal to help automakers design and sell new generations of cars that don't depend on gasoline will re-invigorate that struggling industry. My plan to develop wind and solar power and renewable technologies will drive innovation and create high-tech jobs.

My opponent's answer to the Lexington Project is no; no to more drilling; no to more nuclear power; no to research prizes that help solve the problem of affordable electric cars. For a guy whose "official seal" carried the motto, "Yes, we can," Senator Obama's agenda sure has a whole lot of "No, we can't." The Lexington Project will create millions of jobs, help protect our environment, improve our security, and solve the nation's energy problems.

Americans are having a tough time. But we've been through worse, and beaten longer odds. Even in these difficult days, we must believe in ourselves. Nothing is inevitable in America. We've always been the captains of our fate. All you've ever asked of government is that it stand on your side, not in your way. I intend to do just that: to stand on your side; to help business and not government create jobs; to fight for your future and not the personal ambitions of politicians and bureaucrats.

130 We have much work to do if we are to end the self-interested partisanship that prevents us from fixing problems that need to be fixed and changing government to keep this country prosperous and at peace. I make you one promise I will always keep, no matter what.

In war and peace, I have been an imperfect servant of my country. But I have been her servant first, last and always. Whenever I faced an important choice between my country's

140 interests or my own interests, party politics or any special interest, I chose my country. Nothing has ever mattered more to me than the honor of serving America, and nothing ever will. If you elect me President, I will always put our country first. I will put its greatness; its prosperity and peace; and the hopes and concerns of the people who make it great before any personal or partisan interest. I will keep that promise every hour of every day I am in office. And I will ask you to help me convince Congress, Republicans and Democrats, to keep that promise as well. There is nothing beyond our ability to achieve. We are Americans, and we don't hide from history. We make history. All we need is to believe in ourselves as we always have, and to cherish the beautiful country we are so blessed to call home.

Appendix 2

Newt Gingrich: Address to the Conservative Political Action Committee

February 27, 2009 12am

10 First of all David, thank you and thank all of you for that remarkable welcome. I'm very glad to be here and Callista and I are delighted to have a chance to share with you the great work that David has done recently working with us which at 1 is going to be right here and will be in the Ambassador Ballroom. And so we're delighted to share with you Ronald Reagan: Rendezvous with Destiny. Which I think is a particularly important film in light of today's New York Times headline.

Now I don't always start my talks by quoting the New York Times. (Laughter) In fact this may be a first. The New York Times this morning said quote, "Obama's budget plan sweeps away Reagan ideas." Let me say, first of all, that is of course what the New York Times devoutly hopes for and would rival only the resurrection of the Soviet Empire and other things that they've missed. (Laughter/Applause)

20 It was a hard quarter century for the New York Times, the Soviet Union disappeared, freedom worked, entrepreneurs created wealth, technologies were invented, they lost readership. It was a great 25 years. (Laughter/Applause) But when Callista and I first talked with Dave about doing this film we thought it would generally be helpful just as when we worked with Marji Ross on developing first Winning the Future and then Real Change. We thought it was moving in the right direction.

I don't think we realized the degree to which the combination of the left wing machine which now runs the house, the senate, and the white house, would create the perfect moment to revisit the 70s and 80s and I thought maybe we would get here in May or June.. I did not believe they were arrogant enough and foolish enough to force this confrontation in the first 30 days of a new presidency.

But let me say, I came here today first of all to thank everybody who organized this CPAC because this is the largest, most enthusiastic CPAC in history with over 8,500 people. (Applause)

30 And I wanted to take a few minutes to answer the President and answer his attorney general and comment on the machine which currently runs the congress. Let me say first of all that we now have more than enough evidence of what this administration thinks of the American people.

If you look at Attorney General Holder's recent speech in which he described us as quote a nation of cowards. Let me say to Attorney General Holder I welcome an opportunity to have a dialogue with you about cowardice anywhere, anytime. (Applause)

40 Why don't we have the dialogue in Detroit and see if Attorney General Holder has the courage to talk about the failure of the Detroit school system, the failure of the Detroit teachers union, the betrayal of the futures of thousands of young people. Why don't we have the dialogue, I didn't say debate, now dialogue, lets have a dialogue, lets talk together, lets be above partisanship.

Lets discuss the total failure of the Detroit political system which has taken a city of 1.8 m which had the high per capita in the us and has driven it into the ground so that there are now fewer than 900,000 people living there with a per capita income that is 62nd in the United States. That is the function of bad government, bad politicians, bad bureaucracy, bad ideas, and let's talk about that. (Applause)

50 I would be prepared to go to the poorest neighbor in Detroit with the most abandoned houses, with the highest crime rate, with the greatest betrayal of the American people and I'd be glad to talk about the idea that the Declaration of Independence applies to every person in Detroit.

That we have all been endowed by our creator with certain unalienable rights which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And that we should be committed to eliminating bad government, bad bureaucracies and bad policy to liberate the people of Detroit. (Applause)

So I hope that Attorney General Holder will indicate that he doesn't want to belong to a nation of cowards and that he's willing to have this honest dialogue about the failures of the institutions he supports, the failures of the unions he supports, and the failures of the policies he supports and lets talk about it in one of the cities in which the policies he supports has betrayed so sadly and most tragically.

60 Now I listened carefully to the President's speech the other night. I think that it is the boldest effort to create a European socialist model we have seen. I think it's quite clear what his values and his attitude is. But what I was truly struck by was that if his Attorney General thinks we are a nation of cowards, his admin thinks that we are just plain dumb. (Laughter)

So suggest to us that he is opposed to ear marks, (Laughter) when the very next day the democrats are going to bring up a bill with 8 thousand ear marks in it and then to suggest that one doesn't count because they started all the pork before he got here. I was looking for change we can believe in. (Laughter/Applause)

70 I was looking for the courage to take on the old politics. I was prepared to support a veto of the bill and to say the President is showing enormous courage by taking on Speaker Pelosi and taking on appropriations chairman Obey. I think the country would rally with the President if he had the courage to take on the democratic machine.

And so I was startled that he was saying to us that he opposed to ear marks and then they were saying but of course these ear marks don't count because he's opposed to later ear marks which aren't here now but they'll be here later, later he'll really oppose them because he's really very courageous but the courage doesn't come until later, because after all you heard Holder's speech. (Applause) And so. I thought to myself I wonder how dumb they think we are that we wouldn't notice 8 thousand ear marks.

80 Then he had a second part of the speech which I think should become a youtube video. That he attacked ceo's which used private planes. And Speaker Pelosi as was her habit that night. She was in this pattern where she would hyperactively jump up before he finished it. (Laughter) If you go back and watch he doesn't even get to finish the sentence before she's

applauding and here she is, she's like here I am I'm speaker and I get to applaud and it's very exciting. (Laughter/Applause)

And so she jumped up and she applauded his attack on private planes. (Laughter) And I thought to myself how dumb do they think we are. (Laughter) Do they think we don't realize that she's getting every single person in this room to pay taxes so that the US government can fly her around in a private plane.

The fact that you paint US Air Force on it doesn't mean it's not private; it's the plane she uses. And why would the speaker of the house have a private plane. She should have the same opportunity to encounter TSA as the rest of us. (Laughter)

90 And I wondered how dumb they thought we were. But then the final educational lesson of the evening came when the President having promised that he would not raise taxes on anyone making under 250,000, mentioned in passing using code word so that none of us would recognize it that he is for an energy tax and I began to think about this and in the budget it became clear to me, I wasn't quite sure from his speech because after all his speech was one of those truly artful as we are told by the elite media everyday he is so stunningly articulate, such a great master of language, so thoroughly capable of communicating that I didn't quite understand what he was saying. (Laughter/Applause)

100 But then I looked at the budget yesterday which has a 640 billion dollar revenue item from energy tax. I thought to myself; let me get this straight, we're not going to raise taxes on anyone below 250,000 a year unless you use electricity. And we're not going to raise taxes on anyone under 250,000 a year unless you buy gasoline, and we're not going to raise taxes on anyone under 250,000 unless you buy heating oil, and we're not going to raise taxes on anyone under 250,000 a year unless you use natural gas.

I tried to think to myself even in the left wing of the Democratic Party where there are some people who are fairly unusual, (Laughter) how many of them don't use heating oil, natural gas, gasoline, or electricity. I believe there is a small contingent in northern Idaho in a commune who are actually doing that. (Laughter) I actually believe the group that will be least taxed under the new plan are the Amish in central Pennsylvania. (Laughter/Applause)

110 I thought to myself how dumb do they think we are that they can pretend that an energy tax isn't an energy tax and they can pretend that every retired American who uses electricity isn't going to pay it and every person in New Hampshire who uses heating oil isn't going to pay it and every person who drives a car isn't going to pay it.

And you know, I just want to report to Attorney General holder and President Obama- this is a nation of people courageous enough to tell the truth and this is a nation of people courageous enough to insist that we not be governed by people who won't tell us the truth. (Powerful Applause)

120 Now a month ago, I would not have said what I'm about to say but I've watched carefully the first month of the left wing machine. And I believe that we should leave here with two goals. The first is to make the election of 2010 and this fall's elections in Virginia and in New Jersey among the most consequential in American history. (Applause)

They have shared openly and honestly with us their vision of higher taxes, bigger government, more bureaucracy, greater corruption, more political power by people unworthy of doing it, and a policy which will kill jobs, cripple the economy, trap children in schools that are disasters and weaken America's future. They have every right to have that vision and we have every right to go to the polls and defeat it. Now that is clear who they are. (Applause)

In addition, we should set out to find representative government by electing people who actually are willing to read the bills before they vote on them. (Applause) We do not elect robots for a left wing machine in this country. We ask members to swear to uphold the

130 Constitution and if you have no idea what is in the bill you voted on how could you possibly be doing your Constitutional duty. And every person who voted yes on a bill that they had not seen, did not understand, had no time to read which is going to spend 780 billion dollars in ways they did not understand. Every person who voted that way deserves to be defeated, and they deserve to be defeated... (Applause)

Let me be clear this is not a partisan comment. In districts which are overwhelming democrat, the conservative movement should recruit candidates in the democratic primary across the country and we should have as a goal 435 campaigns in this country of people dedicated to representative government, to lower taxes, to less power in Washington and to taking back from the bureaucracy the power it can't possibly use over the American economy. (Applause) We will not achieve this by being an opposition movement.

140 People are sick and tired of the negative, they are sick and tired of politicians only fight without solutions and people are genuinely frightened for the country, they are frightened for our national security, they are frightened for the very nature of our culture, they are frightened about our economy, they want to see a movement that has positive solutions that would work better than the failed policies of the left. And those failed policies let me be quite clear, are bipartisan failures.

The great irony of where we are today is that we have a Bush-Obama big spending program that was bipartisan in its nature. Last year the bush Obama plan had a 180 billion stimulus package in the spring which failed. It came back with a 345 billion housing package in the summer which failed. It then had a 700 billion Wall Street bailout in October which failed. It had a 4 trillion dollar Federal Reserve guaranty which failed.

150 The Bush-Obama plan was continued. We didn't get real change. We got Geithner in between evading taxes who had been part of the Bush group and now he's part of the Obama group. We got big spending under Bush, now we have big spending under Obama, and so we have two new failures. (Applause)

The lesson I draw from this is that there's a party of the American people and that party in many ways grew out of CPAC and was led by Ronald Reagan and in the legislative side reached its peak with the Contract with America and the election of a majority actually dedicated to reforming welfare, cutting taxes, and balancing the budget. And there's a party of big government and political elites and tragically in the last few years the Republican party became the right wing of the party of big government and political elites. And that's why there's a Bush-Obama continuity in economic policy which is frankly a disaster for this country and cannot work. (Applause)

And so it is time to recreate the party of the American people and to recognize that that is a much bigger party than the Republican party. In every major speech Ronald Reagan reached out to democrats, independents, as well as republicans. He was a former democrat and he understood that to govern America you had to bring people together into a tri-partisan majority. And we should take that attitude from this convention.

170 We are bigger than the Republican party. We stand for principles that transcend the Republican party, and we're going to fight for the principles that lead to economic growth and jobs. (Applause)

You can find the first phase of those principles if you go to American Solutions and you look at 12 American Solutions for jobs and prosperity. It is fundamentally different from the Bush-Obama plan of higher taxes, bigger bureaucracy, more power for politicians and bigger government.

The American Solutions 12 steps towards jobs and prosperity starts with a simple premise- You want to stimulate the American Economy? The first step is easy. Don't give any money to politicians and bureaucrats. Have a 50% offset on the FICA tax, the social security tax,

180 and Medicare tax for every American and every small business and self employed person and over night, you want to put lots of money back into this economy? Put it back with the American people and let them decide which companies ought to survive and which companies ought to grow. That's called being a customer and not being a bureaucrat. (Applause)

You want economic growth and jobs? The President had it exactly wrong the other night. Not even close. He said we ought to punish companies that want to take jobs out of America. Exactly the wrong attitude. We ought to reward companies that want to bring jobs to America. (Applause)

190 The President doesn't understand that when you tell businesses and you tell capital we are going to punish you for "A" everybody who's smart, and most the people who create jobs are smart...a lot smarter than the current politicians who are trying to lecture them, almost none of whom have ever created a job. (Laughter)

Now let's not pick on Chris Dodd or Barney Frank or any of these, (Laughter) I'm not picking on individuals. I'm talking about a general group of individuals who probably would not survive very long if they had to run a business. (Laughter)

200 When politicians tell you they're going to punish you for something you have to wonder about whether they have the power to punish you for something else. And that doesn't encourage anybody to open a new factory, it doesn't encourage anybody to invest in a new job, it doesn't encourage anybody to put money back in the stock market. But if you tell people we're going to reward them, because we like jobs enough we're actually willing to help job creators. We think it's good to have businesses because businesses actually create jobs. Permanent jobs, not extended unemployment. Permanent jobs. Then all the sudden people say gosh, that's a country I'd like to be in.

Now what would it be like to have a strategy to create jobs in the world market. I'll give you a couple examples that are in the American Solutions 12 steps for economic growth and jobs:

210 One- Why don't we match the Chinese and have zero capital gains tax. (Applause) Now, when you go back home to try to explain this you don't have to explain anything complicated. Just find people with a 401K or a pension plan, or a savings account for they children to go to college and say to them- how would you like for that to be 20-40% more valuable in a few weeks. That's what eliminating the capital gains tax would do. Because suddenly, people put capital back in the market, the market would rise in value, all of our savings would be worth more and virtually every American who had savings would suddenly be better off.

Now I know, that's a bold idea to say instead of giving the money to the bureaucracy and instead of allowing Mr. Geithner who couldn't figure how to pay his own taxes to look over all the rest of us, we're actually going to let you be in charge of your own savings and give you a bigger value. You'd have an overnight increase in savings. Overnight. And capital would flow in from around the world.

Second- You want to create jobs in America? Let's match the Irish corporate tax rate of 12.5%. (Applause)

220 You know, in one of the first great CPAC moments Ronald Reagan came here and he said that we had to have bold colors, not pale pastels. And let me give you this example of fighting over corporate tax as an example of bold colors. I am totally uninterested in an Obama like Oh I could be for a 400 billion dollar package of stupid spending because that's not as bad as a 700 billion dollar package of stupid spending. I just want to take the position of being against stupid spending. It's bold. It's out on the edge. It's daring. (Applause) And I want to have it a national debate for the next two years.

If you believe the best way to create jobs is to give more money to bureaucracies in Washington and more power to politicians in the congress, you have a team. And you if think the best way to create jobs is to lower taxes on business, encourage small business, make life easier for people who want to work hard and create jobs, you have a team.

230 Now let the American people choose which of these two approaches do you think is going to give you a better job, a more stable job, and a better economic future and lets have it out. And if the American people want to choose higher taxes, more bureaucracies, and more power to politicians that's their right.

But I'll tell you a secret- we've been down this road three times. Lyndon Johnson went down this road, it lasted two years and they got crushed. We did not elect a liberal, an openly liberal president for 40 years. They came back after Watergate with Jimmy Carter who was utterly totally confused, did not run as a liberal. (Laughter/Applause) And let me tell you, I'm not being unkind.

240 If you get a chance to see Rendezvous with Destiny you will realize this guy was just not there. (Laughter) There's a great moment when he explains that we all feel bad and have malaise because you know it's a really bad time and we feel malaise. And his idea of presidential leadership is to share with you, the first person to actually shared pain, he said I feel the pain that you feel about how painful it is to have me as President.

Some of you will remember by the way, this is a perfect test for liberals and conservatives. Some of you will remember that under Carter we had gas rationing and you could only buy gas every other day based on the last number of your license tag. You remember this? I had a guy come up to me recently when I was talking about this. He said to me he was 13 at the time and his father would give him the screwdriver and send him out back every morning to change the license plate so that, are you the one that told me this? (Looks at David Bossie) Okay, I didn't want to get him arrested retroactively by the new attorney general.
250 (Laughter/Applause)

All I can tell you is that if Holder sends the FBI now that you've admitted that you were violating the gas rationing law. They're not going to go after your Dad, David because you're more irritating. (Laughter) They're going to go after you.

So here's my test to take back home and test with your friends. Because I've thought about this for a couple weeks.

And it occurred to me, conservatism is when if you have a law so dumb that we're teaching 13 year olds to break it, you probably ought to change the law. Liberalism is when you believe that Dave Bossie swapping license plates is proof that you need license plate police at every gas station to check and make sure. (Laughter/Applause)

260 So let's have a debate between their bold colors of European socialism transplanted to Washington and our bold colors of American free enterprise, the American work ethic and the American vision that every American of every background in every community ought to have the right to pursue happiness, ought to have a genuine education from a school that actually functions and ought to have the most limited government possible to have the most efficient country in order to be able to compete in the world market and be able to win decisively for our children and grandchildren. (Applause)

And let me encourage you to join us at American Solutions on April 15 and in your own community and in your own neighborhood with deliberately. In 1994 I actually helped write a book on the Boston Tea Party. And we did have a lot of fun that year with the Clinton tax increase. But 15 years later I think one of the things that went wrong is that all too many of
270 my colleagues forgot that being opposed isn't enough.

We need more than a protest. I think that we need to outline the beginnings of a positive, clear, alternative series of solutions. We need to say to every representative of both parties and every senator of both parties you get a year to pass it and then we get a year to beat you. (Applause) And so you're either with us or we're going to try to do everything we can to replace you and we're going to do it on a tri-partisan level.

280 We want every democrat who believes in lower taxes and more jobs, every independent who believes in lower taxes and more jobs, and every republican who believes in lower taxes and more jobs to join a nationwide movement to fundamentally reform government, to fundamentally get us into a future where we can compete economically.

And April 15, you can go to American Solutions and sign up and we'll get you information so that everybody we can find everywhere in America who is worried about this economy who wants to create a better future and who knows that more big government and more power to politicians isn't the answer can come join us. And one of the topics we're going to talk about that day is going to be "Freedom versus Fear" which is a project which I'm delighted to announce that Saul Anuzis, many of you know as the Michigan State Republican Chair has agreed to head up for us at American Solutions. (Applause)

290 One of the efforts of the left which they're going to try to pass in a stealth manner because they can't possibly pass it once the country understands it is the effort to deprive American workers of the right to a private ballot and the right to negotiate economic prosper. I just want all of you to know that this fight, they call it card check. That's not really what it is, it's an innocuous term. That's not what it is. It's an effort to deprive you of the right to vote in secret, to ensure that they can coerce socially, and here's what they would do we have a little project I know a number of you, several thousand of you have filled this win a Wii card and we're going to give away one Wii today and we're going to give away another Wii tomorrow so you can still fill this out.

But in order to educate you on this whole idea of the challenge we face to our freedoms, down here in print you can't quite read it says you just agreed to join the union and pay the dues and this is our effort to unionize CPAC. (Laughter)

300 And what we want all of you to understand, this is why this is so dangerous, what we want you all of you to understand is that if this law passes, they can go into any hospital, any company, any small bus, any college and they can start getting this and when you sign these you have voted. You don't get a secret vote later. This is the vote. And they only need to get 50% plus one to sign it and it's over.

310 Now this is the greatest threat to freedom in the workplace I think in American history. And I think it's very important for all of you to help us, in every single state that we get all representatives and both senators to understand this is a mortal threat to American freedom and we will never forgive somebody who votes for cloture or who votes for final passage. Because they will have said they are owned by the unions and they are against, an overwhelming majority- 82% of the country have said bluntly in the most recent survey they do not want to belong to the union. That 82% should not be exposed to coercive behavior on the behalf of people who want their money as dues that could then be spent by bosses without any accountability. So we need your help. (Applause)

Saul asked me to announce that Eric Hobbs won the first of the Wiis. We'll give another one away tomorrow. So Eric, if you'll see Saul you are now the owner of a Wii.

320 Um let me say one last thing about foreign policy because I think it's very, very important. There is a new novel out by Alex Berensen who is a reporter for the New York Times and I recommend it to you highly. It's a novel about an effort by Islamic fanatics to acquire two Russian nuclear weapons and take them apart because they can't figure out how to break the codes and then use the material in the weapons to create a Hiroshima size bomb to be

used in Washington during the State of the Union. One of the projects I'm gonna ask be done is to draw the size of the perimeter you would need to protect the capital from a Hiroshima sized bomb and you're going to be staggered by how far that perimeter would be.

The point that Alex Berensen makes in this novel is that we are faced with a genuine crisis of people who really want to kill us. By the way it wouldn't have to Russian nuclear weapon- It could be Pakistani, North Korean, Iranian. The second novel, and I'm going to write an op-ed and encourage the President to read these two novels.

330 Alex Berensen's novel about an attack on America by a nuclear weapon and the second novel which will come out next month by my co-author Bill Forstchen is called "One Second After" and it's about what happens in a North Carolina town immediately after an Electromagnetic Pulse attack, eliminates all the electricity producing capability of the country. And it's horrifying. The reason I hope President Obama reads these two is to understand something that has never really been as true as it is now. And that is that we are not developing national security and homeland security at the margins. This is not about stopping two snipers or three car bombers... or 5 airplanes.

340 We live in a world where if we gamble wrong, and the current proposed defense budget is much too small, if we gamble wrong whether it is a major power like China or Russia, a medium sized power like North Korea, Pakistan, and Iran, and North Korea is a medium sized power by possession of nuclear weapons. Or it is a fanatic group willing to die in the process of killing us.

We live in a world where there are weapons capable of ending civilization as we know it. And we need to be prepared in a very militant and aggressive way to defend America from having a catastrophic disaster of the first order. (Applause)

Let me also say that in many ways this administration has been better than I would have guessed at the team they've assembled for national security and more responsible than I would have guessed in their policies.

But there is one thing they've announced that I think we should very aggressively question and challenge. And that is their proposal to spend hundreds of millions of dollars rebuilding the Gaza strip through agencies infiltrated by terrorists.

350 And let me be very clear there are still missiles being fired everyday from Gaza. We did not start rebuilding Germany in the middle of 1943 on the grounds that if we could only find good Germans we could work with they would take care of the bad Nazis. And we did not start rebuilding Japan in 1943 on the grounds that if only we could find good Japanese they would convince the militarists to be pleasant. We understood that when you have opponents who want to destroy you, you have to first win the war and then you can rebuild. (Applause)

The war does not have to involve American troops and the war does not actually have to involve much violence. Ronald Reagan, as you'll see in our movie, defeated the Soviet Empire in 10 years with a grand strategy and collaboration with Pope John Paul II and Prime Minister Thatcher. (Applause)

360 North Korea, Iran, and Hamas are mortal threats to the survival of Western Civilization and it is absolutely irresponsible to believe that those regimes can stay in power and we can find a negotiated agreement. In all three cases we need non-military, but very sophisticated efforts at regime replacement and we need to say to the planet- somebody who threatens to destroy one of our cities is somebody we are not going to tolerate. And we're not going to say well, we'll get even after you take out our city.

The idea of trading Tehran for Washington was abhorrent to Ronald Reagan and it should be abhorrent to every American. Mutual assured destruction is, I think an immoral strategy and is not one that we can tolerate particularly against suicide bombers, who would be thrilled to

370 swap their capital for our capital and so I think we have to understand and this administration had better learn pretty quickly.

We may not be interested in war, but our enemies are. And our enemies are dangerous and some of these threats can be mortal. And so I think this is a very important component.

Let me say by the way that you have your first great opportunity to set the stage for next year. It's happening right now in New York 20. Because the Governor of New York picked a Democrat from a very Republican district, there is now a special election at the end of March. Jim Tedisco is a very competent, very capable candidate. He has a particular program, Tedisco for Congress, which is 20 for 20- Asking people to give 20 dollars to help win the 20th congressional seat.

380 It will be an enormous step. You know we won the first House Special Election after the election of President Obama. And it was a breakthrough that almost no normal Republican consult thought possible. We were in an African-American seat in the middle of New Orleans and our candidate was a South Vietnamese-American. And he won decisively. (Applause)

And congressman Cao is the first example of the fact that if we reach out to everyone, and we recruit everyone you can compete everywhere when the alternative is a big tax, big bureaucracy, big politics, big corruption alternative. And so we have to continue down that road. And we have a great candidate in New York 20 in Jim Tedisco, I hope all of you will decide to join his \$20 for 20 club and if we can spread that word across the country we will be amazed how many resources he'll have, we'll be delighted how decisive the victory will be, and that will be step 2 back towards making sure that Speaker Pelosi no longer has her plane under any circumstances because she'll no longer be Speaker. (Applause)

390 Let me just close with one last comment. We write novels as educational efforts and Bill Forstchen and Steve Hanser and I who are the three historians who work together on these, have a novel that will be out at the end of October that I want to share with you for a second because I want you to go back home and every time somebody starts to complain to you I want you to tell them this story.

Our novel is about George Washington crossing the Delaware on Christmas Day. David Hackett Fisher has written a brilliant non-fiction history book called Washington's Crossing which I recommend to all of you. And when you read it you'll begin to understand why we're doing this novel.

400 Bill Forstchen, my colleague actually grew up 20 miles from the crossing site and as a young man was a re-enactor and every Christmas day there was a small group that would re-enact the crossing and one year he decided he didn't really understand it and so he did the re-enactment with no boots, wearing burlap bags. He said you cannot imagine how painful it was and how hard it was. And this is what I want to imprint in closing and I want each of you to go back home.

I have a very dear friend who spent 7 years in a prisoner of war camp in Vietnam; we have young men and women across this planet today risking their lives for us. If you hear somebody who tells you well it's too hard, or I can't do it, or I can't win, or I'm so disappointed, I want you to look them in the eye and say, Once upon a time there men who

410 believed so passionately in freedom, believed so deeply in America that, although they were outnumbered, one-third of them had no boots, they were going to cross an icy river at night to take on a professional, German military unit. And their commander said to them- the password tonight is victory or death. We live in the free-est, country in the world.

This organization, 35 years ago heard Ronald Wilson Reagan begin to explain freedom at a time when Republicans were collapsing because of Watergate. And then it heard Ronald Wilson Reagan explain freedom all through a period when we were told the left was going to

be dominant, that the Soviet Union was going to be dominant, that freedom was going to diminish, and that we should just accept malaise because that was our future.

420 Because of CPAC and the message that Ronald Reagan carried across this country, the Soviet Union disappeared, the American economy rebounded, and I'm Proud to be an American was a very popular song because it made sense once again.

430 From now until Election Day of 2010 and from now until Election Day of 2012, we should reach out to every one of the 310 million Americans who are being served badly by big bureaucracy, big government, and arrogant politicians. And we should say to them- there is a people's party and a people's movement. That people's party includes democrats, it includes independents, it includes republicans, and all we want to know is in the spirit of George Washington, are you prepared...because in our case it's not victory or death, in our case we have the right as a free people to speak out, to stand up, to organize our neighbors, to win the argument and to bring freedom and prosperity and safety for our children and our grandchildren.

Thank you, good luck, and God Bless you. (Applause)

Appendix 3

Barack Obama: Democratic Nomination Victory Speech - Change We Can Believe In

3 June 2008, Saint Paul, Minnesota

Thank you....Thank you. What a -- What a wonderful reception. Thank you, Saint Paul. Thank you, Minnesota.

Thank you, [JoAnn Syverson](#), for the wonderful introduction.

10 Thank you, Michelle Obama and Malia Obama and Sasha Obama. Thank you to my brothers and sisters. Thank you to -- Thank you to my staff. Thank you to our volunteers. Thank you to my political team. Thank you to our campaign manager, [David Plouffe](#), who never gets any credit, but has built the best political organization in the country.

Thank you to my grandmother, who helped raise me, and is sitting in Hawaii somewhere right now because she can't travel, but who poured everything she had into me, and who helped to make me the man I am today. Tonight is for her.

Tonight, Minnesota, after 54 hard-fought contests, our primary season has finally come to an end. Sixteen -- Sixteen months have passed since [we first stood together on the steps of the Old State Capitol](#) in Springfield, Illinois. Thousands of miles have been traveled; millions of voices have been heard.

20 And because of what you said, because you decided that change must come to Washington, because you believed that this year must be different than all the rest, because -- because you chose to listen not to your doubts or your fears, but to your greatest hopes and highest aspirations, tonight we mark the end of one historic journey with the beginning of another, a journey -- a journey that will bring a new and better day to America.

Because of you, tonight I can stand here and say that I will be the Democratic nominee for the President of the United States of America.

I want to -- I want to thank -- I want to thank -- I want to thank all those in Montana and South Dakota who stood up for change today. I want to thank every American who stood with us over the course of this campaign, through the good days and the bad, from the snows of Cedar Rapids to the sunshine of Sioux Falls.

And, tonight, I also want to thank the men and woman who took this journey with me as fellow candidates for President. You know, at this defining moment -- At this defining moment for our nation, we should be proud that our Party put forth one of the most talented, qualified field of individuals ever to run for office. I have not just competed with them as rivals. I've learned from them as friends, as public servants, and as patriots who love America and are willing to work tirelessly to make this country better. They are leaders of this Party and leaders that America will turn to for years to come.

And that is particularly true for the candidate who has traveled further on this journey than anyone else: Senator Hillary Clinton has made history in this campaign. She has made history not -- not just because she's a woman who has done what no woman has done before, but because she is a leader who inspires millions of Americans with her strength, her courage, and her commitment to the causes that brought us here tonight. I congratulate her on her victory in South Dakota, and I congratulate her on the race that she has run throughout this contest.

We've certainly had our differences over the last 16 months. But as someone who's shared a stage with her many times, I can tell you that what gets Hillary Clinton up in the morning -- even in the face of tough odds -- is exactly what sent her and Bill Clinton to sign up for their first campaign in Texas all those years ago, what sent her to work at the Children's Defense Fund and made her fight for health care as first lady, what led her to the United States Senate and fueled her barrier-breaking campaign for the presidency: an unyielding desire to improve the lives of ordinary Americans, no matter how difficult the fight may be.

And you can rest assured that when we finally win the battle for universal health care in this country -- and we will win that fight -- she will be central to that victory. When we transform our energy policy and lift our children out of poverty, it will be because she worked to help make it happen. Our Party and our country are better off because of her, and I am a better candidate for having had the honor to compete with Hillary Rodham Clinton.

There are those who say that this primary has somehow left us weaker and more divided. Well, I say that, because of this primary, there are millions of Americans who've cast their ballot for the very first time. There are -- There are Independents and Republicans who understand this election isn't just about a change of Party in Washington, but also about the need to change Washington. There are -- There are young people, and African-Americans, and Hispanic-Americans, and women of all ages who have voted in numbers that have broken records and inspired a nation.

All of you chose to support a candidate you believe in deeply. But at the end of the day, we aren't the reason you came out and waited in lines that stretched block after block to make your voice heard. You didn't do that -- You didn't do that because of me or Senator Clinton or anyone else. You did it because you know in your hearts that at this moment, a moment that will define a generation, we cannot afford to keep doing what we've been doing. We owe our children a better future. We owe our country a better future. And for all those who dream of that future tonight, I say: Let us begin the work together. Let us unite in common effort to chart a new course for America.

In just -- In just a few short months, the Republican Party will arrive in St. Paul with a very different agenda. They will -- They will come here to nominate John McCain, a man who has served this country heroically. I honor, we honor the service of John McCain, and I respect his many accomplishments, even if he chooses to deny mine. My -- My differences with him - - My differences with him are not personal. They are with the policies he has proposed in this

campaign, because while John McCain can legitimately tout moments of independence from his Party in the past, such independence has not been the hallmark of his presidential campaign.

80 It's not change when John McCain decided to stand with George Bush 95 percent of the time, as he did in the Senate last year.

It's not change when he offers four more years of Bush economic policies that have failed to create well-paying jobs, or insure our workers, or help Americans afford the skyrocketing cost of college, policies that have lowered the real incomes of the average American family, and widened the gap between Wall Street and Main Street, and left our children with a mountain of debt.

90 It's not change when he promises to continue a policy in Iraq that asks everything of our brave men and women in uniform and nothing of Iraqi politicians, a policy where all we look for are reasons to stay in Iraq, while we spend billions of dollars a month on a war that isn't making the American people any safer. So -- So, I'll say this: There are many words to describe John McCain's attempt to pass off his embrace of George Bush's policies as bipartisan and new, but "change" is not one of them. "Change" is not one of them, because change is a foreign policy that doesn't begin and end with a war that should've never been authorized and never been waged.

100 I won't stand here and pretend that there are many good options left in Iraq, but what's not an option is leaving our troops in that country for the next hundred years, especially at a time when our military is overstretched, our nation is isolated, and nearly every other threat to America is being ignored. We -- We must be -- We must be as careful getting out of Iraq as we were careless getting in, but we -- but start leaving we must. It's time for Iraqis to take responsibility for their future. It's time to rebuild our military and give our veterans the care and the benefits they deserve when they come home.

It's time -- It's time to refocus our efforts on Al Qaida's leadership and Afghanistan, and rally the world against the common threats of the 21st century: terrorism and nuclear weapons, climate change and poverty, genocide and disease. That's what change is.

110 Change -- Change, Minnesota, is realizing that meetings [sic] today's threats requires not just our firepower, but the power of our diplomacy: tough -- tough, direct diplomacy, where the President of the United States isn't afraid to let any petty dictator know where America stands and what we stand for. We must once again have the courage and the conviction to lead the free world. That is the legacy of Roosevelt and Truman and Kennedy. That's what the American people demand. That's what change is.

Change is building an economy that rewards not just wealth, but the work and the workers who created it. It's understanding that the struggles facing working families can't be solved by spending billions of dollars on more tax breaks for big corporations and wealthy CEOs, but by giving a middle-class tax break to those who need it, and investing in our crumbling infrastructure, and transforming how we use energy, and improving our schools, and renewing our commitment to science and innovation. It's understanding that fiscal responsibility and shared prosperity can go hand-in-hand, as they did when Bill Clinton was President.

120 John McCain has spent a lot of time talking about trips to Iraq in the last few weeks, but maybe if he spent some time taking trips to the cities and towns that have been hardest hit by this economy -- cities in Michigan, and Ohio, and right here in Minnesota -- he'd understand the kind of change that people are looking for.

Maybe if he went to Iowa and met the student who works the night shift after a full day of class and still can't pay the medical bills for a sister who's ill, he'd understand she can't afford four more years of a health care plan that only takes care of the healthy and the wealthy. She

needs us to pass health care right now, a plan that guarantees insurance to every American who wants it and brings down premiums for every family who needs it. That's the change we need, Minnesota.

130 Maybe -- Maybe if John McCain went to Pennsylvania and he met the man who lost his job, but can't even afford the gas to drive around and look for a new one, he'd understand we can't afford four more years of our addiction to oil from dictators. That man needs us to pass an energy policy that works with automakers to raise fuel standards, and makes corporations pay for their pollution, and oil companies invest their record profits in a clean energy future, an energy policy that will create millions of new jobs that pay well and can't be outsourced. That's the change we need, Minnesota.

140 And maybe if John McCain spent some time in the schools of South Carolina or St. Paul, Minnesota, or [where he spoke tonight in New Orleans, Louisiana](#), he'd understand that we can't afford to leave the money behind for [No Child Left Behind](#); that we owe it to our children to invest in early-childhood education; and recruit an army of new teachers and give them better pay and more support; and finally decide that, in this global economy, the chance to get a college education should not be a privilege for the few, but a birthright of every American. That's the change we need in America. That's why I'm running for President of the United States.

150 Now -- Now, the other side will come here in September and offer a very different set of policies and positions, and that is a good thing. That is a debate I look forward to. It is a debate that the American people deserve on the issues that will help determine the future of this country and the future for our children. But what you don't deserve is another election that's governed by fear, and innuendo, and division. What you won't hear from this campaign or this Party is the kind of politics that uses religion as a wedge and patriotism as a bludgeon. What you won't see from this campaign or this Party is a politics that sees our opponents not as competitors to challenge, but enemies to polarize, because we may call ourselves Democrats and Republicans, but we are Americans first. We are always Americans first.

160 Despite -- Despite what the good senator from Arizona may have said tonight, I've seen people of differing views and opinions find common cause many times during my two decades in public life, and I've brought many together myself. I've walked arm-in-arm with community leaders on the south side of Chicago and watched tensions fade as black and white and Latino fought together for good jobs and good schools. I've sat across the table from law enforcement officials and civil rights advocates to reform a criminal justice system that sent 13 innocent people to death row. I've worked with friends in the other Party to provide more children with health insurance and more working families with a tax break, to curb the spread of nuclear weapons and ensure that the American people know where their tax dollars are being spent, and to reduce the influence of lobbyists who have all too often set the agenda in Washington.

In our country -- In our country, I have found that this cooperation happens not because we agree on everything, but because, behind all the false labels and false divisions and categories that define us, beyond all the petty bickering and point-scoring in Washington, Americans are a decent, generous, compassionate people, united by common challenges and common hopes.

170 And every so often, there are moments which call on that fundamental goodness to make this country great again. So it was for that band of patriots who declared in a Philadelphia hall the formation of a more perfect union, and for all those who gave on the fields of Gettysburg and Antietam their last full measure of devotion to save that same union. So it was for the greatest generation that conquered [fear itself](#), and liberated a continent from tyranny, and made this country home to untold opportunity and prosperity. So it was for the workers who stood out on the picket lines, the women who shattered glass ceilings, the

children who braved a Selma bridge for freedom's cause. So it has been for every generation that faced down the greatest challenges and the most improbable odds to leave their children a world that's better and kinder and more just.

And so it must be for us.

180 America, this is our moment. This is our time, our time to turn the page on the policies of the past, our time to bring new energy and new ideas to the challenges we face, our time to offer a new direction for this country that we love.

The journey will be difficult. The road will be long. I face this challenge -- I face this challenge with profound humility and knowledge of my own limitations, but I also face it with limitless faith in the capacity of the American people.

Because if we are willing to work for it, and fight for it, and believe in it, then I am absolutely certain that, generations from now, we will be able to look back and tell our children that this was the moment when we began to provide care for the sick and good jobs to the jobless.

190 This was the moment when the rise of the oceans began to slow and our planet began to heal.

This was the moment when we ended a war, and secured our nation, and restored our image as the [last, best hope](#) on Earth.

This was the moment, this was the time when we came together to remake this great nation so that it may always reflect our very best selves and our highest ideals.

Thank you, Minnesota. God bless you.

God bless the United States of America.

Appendix 4

Barack Obama: Obama Delivers Speech on Economy

June 9, 2008

The following is the text of Barack Obama's speech in Raleigh, N.C., as prepared for delivery and provided by his campaign.

10 Before we begin, I just want to take a minute to thank Senator Clinton for the kind and generous support she offered on Saturday. She ran an historic campaign that shattered barriers on behalf of my daughters and women everywhere who now know there are no limits to their dreams. And more, she inspired millions of women and men with her strength, her courage, and her unyielding commitment to the causes that brought us here today – the hopes and aspirations of working Americans.

Our party and our country are stronger because of the work she has done throughout her life, and I look forward to working with her in these coming months and years to lay out the case for change and set a new course for this country.

I've often said that this election represents a defining moment in our history. On major issues like the war in Iraq or the warming of our planet, the decisions we make in November and over the next few years will shape a generation, if not a century.

That is especially true when it comes to our economy.

20 We have now lost jobs for five straight months – more than 320,000 since the beginning of this year. Last month we saw the biggest rise in the unemployment rate in more than twenty years. The percentage of homes in foreclosure and late mortgage payments is the highest since the Great Depression. The price of oil has never been higher and set a record on Friday for the largest one-day spike in history. The costs of health care and college tuition and even food have all hit record levels, while family incomes have fallen and the wages of our workers have stayed the same.

You don't have to read the stock tickers or scan the headlines in the financial section to understand the seriousness of the situation we're in right now. You just have to go to Pennsylvania and listen to the man who lost his job but can't even afford the gas to drive
30 around and look for a new one. Or listen to the woman from Iowa who works the night shift after a full day of class and still can't pay the medical bills for a sister who's ill. Or talk to the worker I met in Indiana who worked at the same plant his father worked at for thirty years until they moved it to Mexico and made the workers actually pack up the equipment themselves so they could send it to China.

Go to Janesville, Wisconsin or Moraine, Ohio and talk to the workers at General Motors who just found out the plants they labored their entire lives at will be closed forever; or the thousands of truck drivers and airline workers who will lose their jobs because of the debilitating cost of fuel. Or just ask any family in North Carolina who will sit around their kitchen table tonight and wonder whether next week's paycheck will be enough to cover next
40 month's bills – who will look at their children without knowing if they'll be able to give them the same chances that they had.

We did not arrive at the doorstep of our current economic crisis by some accident of history. This was not an inevitable part of the business cycle that was beyond our power to avoid. It was the logical conclusion of a tired and misguided philosophy that has dominated Washington for far too long.

George Bush called it the Ownership Society, but it's little more than a worn dogma that says we should give more to those at the top and hope that their good fortune trickles down to the hardworking many. For eight long years, our President sacrificed investments in health care, and education, and energy, and infrastructure on the altar of tax breaks for big corporations and wealthy CEOs – trillions of dollars in giveaways that proved neither compassionate nor
50 conservative.

And for all of George Bush's professed faith in free markets, the markets have hardly been free – not when the gates of Washington are thrown open to high-priced lobbyists who rig the rules of the road and riddle our tax code with special interest favors and corporate loopholes. As a result of such special-interest driven policies and lax regulation, we haven't seen prosperity trickling down to Main Street. Instead, a housing crisis that could leave up to two million homeowners facing foreclosure has shaken confidence in the entire economy.

I understand that the challenges facing our economy didn't start the day George Bush took office and they won't end the day he leaves. Some are partly the result of forces that have
60 globalized our economy over the last several decades – revolutions in communication and technology have sent jobs wherever there's an internet connection; that have forced children in Raleigh and Boston to compete for those jobs with children in Bangalore and Beijing. We live in a more competitive world, and that is a fact that cannot be reversed.

But I also know that this nation has faced such fundamental change before, and each time we've kept our economy strong and competitive by making the decision to expand opportunity outward; to grow our middle-class; to invest in innovation, and most importantly, to invest in the education and well-being of our workers.

We've done this because in America, our prosperity has always risen from the bottom-up. From the earliest days of our founding, it has been the hard work and ingenuity of our people that's served as the wellspring of our economic strength. That's why we built a system of free public high schools when we transitioned from a nation of farms to a nation of factories. That's why we sent my grandfather's generation to college, and declared a minimum wage for our workers, and promised to live in dignity after they retire through the creation of Social Security. That's why we've invested in the science and research that have led to new discoveries and entire new industries. And that's what this country will do again when I am President of the United States.

We will begin this general election campaign by traveling across the country for the next few weeks to talk about what specifically we need to do to build a 21st economy that works for working Americans. I will speak with economic experts and advisors at the end of the tour, but first I want to speak with you, and hear about your thoughts and your struggles in the places where you live and work. And at each stop, I will take the opportunity to lay out the very real and very serious differences on the economy between myself and Senator McCain.

As I've said before, John McCain is an American hero whose military service we honor. He can also legitimately tout moments of independence from his party, and on some issues, such as earmark reform and climate change, he and I share goals, even if we may differ on how to get there.

But when it comes to the economy, John McCain and I have a fundamentally different vision of where to take the country. Because for all his talk of independence, the centerpiece of his economic plan amounts to a full-throated endorsement of George Bush's policies. He says we've made "great progress" in our economy these past eight years. He calls himself a fiscal conservative and on the campaign trail he's passionate critic of government spending, and yet he has no problem spending hundreds of billions of dollars on tax breaks for big corporations and a permanent occupation of Iraq – policies that have left our children with a mountain of debt.

George Bush's policies have taken us from a projected \$5.6 trillion dollar surplus at the end of the Clinton Administration to massive deficits and nearly four trillion dollars in new debt today. We were promised a fiscal conservative. Instead, we got the most fiscally irresponsible administration in history. And now John McCain wants to give us another. Well we've been there once, and we're not going back. It's time to move this country forward.

I have a different vision for the future. Instead of spending twelve billion dollars a month to rebuild Iraq, I think it's time we invested in our roads and schools and bridges and started to rebuild America. Instead of handing out giveaways to corporations that don't need them and didn't ask for them, it's time we started giving a hand-up to families who are trying pay their medical bills and send their children to college. We can't afford four more years of skewed priorities that give us nothing but record debt – we need change that works for the American people. And that is the choice in this election

My vision involves both a short-term plan to help working families who are struggling to keep up and a long-term agenda to make America competitive in a global economy.

A week from today, I'll be talking about this long-term agenda in more detail. It's an agenda that will require us first and foremost to train and educate our workforce with the skills necessary to compete in a knowledge-based economy. We'll also need to place a greater emphasis on areas like science and technology that will define the workforce of the 21st century, and invest in the research and innovation necessary to create the jobs and industries of the future right here in America. One place where that investment would make an enormous difference is in a renewable energy policy that ends our addiction on foreign oil, provides real long-term relief from high fuel costs, and builds a green economy that could create up to five million well-paying jobs that can't be outsourced. We can also create

millions of new jobs by rebuilding our schools, roads, bridges, and other critical infrastructure that needs repair.

120 And because we know that we can't or shouldn't put up walls around our economy, a long-term agenda will also find a way to make trade work for American workers. We do the cause of free-trade – a cause I believe in – no good when we pass trade agreements that hand out favors to special interests and do little to help workers who have to watch their factories close down. There is nothing protectionist about demanding that trade spreads the benefits of globalization as broadly as possible.

That's what we need to do in the long-term. But today I want to focus on what we must do in the short-term to lift up our workers, ease the struggle that so many families are facing right now, and restore a sense of fairness and balance to our economy.

130 Such relief that can't wait until the next President takes office. In January, well before the administration seemed to discover ordinary Americans were struggling, I called for a fiscal stimulus plan to get checks in the hands of hard-working families and seniors. Congress passed such a plan and the first checks are now arriving. But since then hundreds of thousands more people have lost their jobs, and so we must do more.

That's why I've called for another round of fiscal stimulus, an immediate \$50 billion to help those who've been hit hardest by this economic downturn – Americans who have lost their jobs, their homes, and are facing rising costs and cutbacks in state and local services like education and health care. We need to expand unemployment benefits and extend them for those who can't find another job right away – especially since the long-term unemployment rate is nearly twice as high as it was during the last recession. And we must help the millions of homeowners who are facing foreclosure through no fault of their own.

140 As late as December, John McCain told a newspaper in New Hampshire that he'd love to offer a solution to the housing crisis, but he just didn't have one. It took him three different tries to figure it out, and in the end, his plan does nothing to help 1.5 million homeowners who are facing foreclosure, even as he supported spending billions to bail out Wall Street. President Bush told the American people he thought the biggest danger arising from this housing crisis was the temptation to do something about it. Now Senator McCain wants to turn Bush's policy of 'too little, too late' into a policy of 'even less, even later'. That's not the change we need right now. That's what got us into this mess in the first place.

150 In contrast, I offered a proposal to crack down on mortgage fraud almost two years ago, and in this campaign I've called for the immediate creation of a \$10 billion Foreclosure Prevention Fund to provide direct relief to victims of the housing crisis. We'll also help those who are facing foreclosure refinance their mortgages so they can stay in their homes at rates they can afford. I'll provide struggling homeowners relief by offering a tax credit to low- and middle-income Americans that would cover ten percent of their mortgage interest payment every year.

The principle is simple – if the government can bail out investment banks on Wall Street, we can extend a hand to folks who are struggling on Main Street. As President, I'll get tough on enforcement, raise the penalties on lenders who break the rules, and implement a new Home Score system that will allow consumers to find out more about mortgage offers and whether they'll be able to make payments. This kind of transparency won't just make our homeowners more secure, it will make our markets more stable, and keep our economy strong and competitive in the future. That's the change Americans need, and that's what I'll do as President.

160 As the housing crisis spills over into other parts of the economy, we also need to help the millions of Americans who are struggling under skyrocketing costs and stagnant wages that are pushing working families towards a debt spiral from which they can't escape. We have to

give them a way out by lowering costs, putting more money in their pockets, and rebuilding a safety net that's becoming badly frayed over the last few decades.

170 When it comes to reliving these economic anxieties that working families feel, nothing matches the burden they face from crushing health care costs. John McCain's approach to health care mirrors that of George Bush. He's promising four more years of a health care plan that only takes care of the healthy and the wealthy – a plan that will actually make it easier – easier – than it already is for insurance companies to deny coverage to the elderly or the sick or those with pre-existing conditions. It may lead millions to lose the coverage they already have and millions more to have to pay even more than they do right now.

We can't afford that. Not when 47 million Americans are already uninsured, a number that is growing by the day. Not when families and businesses across the country are being crushed by the growing burden of health care costs and when half of all personal bankruptcies are caused by medical bills.

180 When I am President, we'll take a different approach. We will give every American the chance to get the same kind of health care that Members of Congress give themselves. We'll bring down premiums by \$2500 for the typical family, and we'll prevent insurance companies from discriminating against those who need care most. And we won't just lower costs for families, we'll lower costs for the entire country by making our health care system more efficient through better technology and more emphasis on prevention. That's the choice in this election, and that's the change I'll bring as President.

190 Just as we need to reform our health care system, we also have to reform a tax code that rewards wealth over work – a 10,000-page monstrosity that high-priced lobbyists have rigged with page after page of special interest loopholes and tax shelters; a tax code that continues George Bush's billion-dollar giveaways to big corporations and wealthy CEOs; a tax code that has plunged this country deeper and deeper into debt.

John McCain takes great pride in saying that he's a fiscal conservative, and he's already signaled that he will try to define me with the same old tax-and-spend label that his side has been throwing around for decades. But let's look at the facts.

200 John McCain once said that he couldn't vote for the Bush tax breaks in good conscience because they were too skewed to the wealthiest Americans. Later, he said it was irresponsible to cut taxes during a time of war because we simply couldn't afford them. Well, nothing's changed about the war, but something's certainly changed about John McCain, because these same Bush tax cuts are now his central economic policy. Not only that, but he is now calling for a new round of tax giveaways that are twice as expensive as the original Bush plan and nearly twice as regressive. His policy will spend nearly \$2 trillion on tax breaks for corporations, including \$1.2 billion for Exxon alone, a company that just recorded the highest profits in history.

Think about that. At a time when we're fighting two wars, when millions of Americans can't afford their medical bills or their tuition bills, when we're paying more than \$4 a gallon for gas, the man who rails against government spending wants to spend \$1.2 billion on a tax break for Exxon Mobil. That isn't just irresponsible. It's outrageous.

210 If John McCain's policies were implemented, they would add \$5.7 trillion to the national debt over the next decade. That isn't fiscal conservatism, that's what George Bush has done over the last eight years. Not only can working families not afford it, future generations can't afford it. And we can't allow it to happen in this election.

I'll take a different approach. I will reform our tax code so that it's simple, fair, and advances opportunity instead of distorting the market by advancing the agenda of some lobbyist or oil company. I'll shut down the corporate loopholes and tax havens, and I'll use the money to help pay for a middle-class tax cut that will provide \$1,000 of relief to 95% of workers and

their families. I'll make oil companies like Exxon pay a tax on their windfall profits, and we'll use the money to help families pay for their skyrocketing energy costs and other bills. We'll also eliminate income taxes for any retiree making less than \$50,000 per year, because every senior deserves to live out their life in dignity and respect. And while John McCain

220

wants to pick up where George Bush left off by trying again to privatize Social Security, I will never waver in my commitment to protect that basic promise as President. We will not privatize Social Security, we will not raise the retirement age, and we will save Social Security for future generations by asking the wealthiest Americans to pay their fair share.

Now, contrary to what John McCain may say, every single proposal that I've made in this campaign is paid for – because I believe in pay-as-you-go. Senator McCain is right that there's waste in government, and I intend to root it out as President. But his suggestion that the earmark reforms that we're both interested in implementing will somehow make up for his enormous tax giveaway indicates that John McCain was right when he said that he doesn't understand the economy as well as he should. Either that or he's hoping you just won't notice. Whatever it is, it's not the kind of change we need in Washington right now.

230

I'll be talking in more detail next week about how we can make our workforce more competitive by reforming our education system, but there's also an immediate squeeze we need to deal with, and that's college affordability.

I know how expensive this is from firsthand experience. At the beginning of our marriage, Michelle and I were spending so much of our income just to pay off our college loans. And that was decades ago. The cost of a college education has exploded since then, pricing hundreds of thousands of young Americans out of their dream every year, or forcing them to begin their careers in unconscionable debt. So I'll offer this promise to every student as President – your country will offer you \$4,000 a year of tuition if you offer your country community or national service when you graduate. If you invest in America, America will invest in you.

240

As far as we can tell, John McCain doesn't have a plan to make college more affordable. And that means he isn't listening to the struggles facing a new generation of Americans.

Finally, we need to help those Americans who find themselves in a debt spiral climb out. Since so many who are struggling to keep up with their mortgages are now shifting their debt to credit cards, we have to make sure that credit cards don't become the next stage in the housing crisis. To make sure that Americans know what they're signing up for, I'll institute a five-star rating system to inform consumers about the level of risk involved in every credit card. And we'll establish a Credit Card Bill of Rights that will ban unilateral changes to credit card agreements; ban rate hikes on debt you already had; and ban interest charges on late fees. Americans need to pay what they owe, but you should pay what's fair, not just what fattens profits for some credit card company and they can get away with.

250

The same principle should apply to our bankruptcy laws. When I first arrived in the Senate, I opposed the credit card industry's bankruptcy bill that made it harder for working families to climb out of debt. John McCain supported that bill – and he even opposed exempting families who were only in bankruptcy because of medical expenses they couldn't pay.

When I'm President, we'll reform our bankruptcy laws so that we give Americans who find themselves in debt a second chance. We'll make sure that if you can demonstrate that you went bankrupt because of medical expenses, you can relieve that debt and get back on your feet. And I'll make sure that CEOs can't dump your pension with one hand while they collect a bonus with the other. That's an outrage, and it's time we had a President who knows it's an outrage.

260

This is the choice you will face in November. You can vote for John McCain, and see a continuation of Bush economic policies – more tax cuts to the wealthy, more corporate tax

breaks, more mountains of debt, and little to no relief for families struggling with the rising costs of everything from health care to a college education.

270 But I don't think that is the future we want. The Americans I've met over the last sixteen months in town halls and living rooms; on farms and front porches – they may come from different places and have different backgrounds, but they hold common hopes and dream the same simple dreams. They know government can't solve all their problems, and they don't expect it to. They believe in personal responsibility, and hard work, and self-reliance. They don't like seeing their tax dollars wasted.

But we also believe in an America where unrivaled prosperity brings boundless opportunity – a place where jobs are there for the willing; where hard work is rewarded with a decent living; where no matter how much you start with or where you come from or who your parents are, you can make it if you try.

We believe in the country that gave my grandfather and a generation of heroes the chance to go to college on the GI Bill when they came home from World War II – a GI Bill that helped create the largest middle-class in history.

280 We believe in the country that made it possible for my mother – a single parent who didn't have much – to send my sister and me to the best schools in the country with the help of scholarships.

We believe in the country that allowed my father-in-law – a city worker at a water filtration plant on the South Side of Chicago – to provide for his wife and two children on a single salary. He was diagnosed with multiple sclerosis at age thirty, but that didn't stop him from going to work every day – often with the help of a walker – so that could send my wife and her brother to one of the best colleges in the nation.

290 His job didn't just give him a paycheck; it gave him a sense of dignity and self-worth. His country didn't just reward wealth, but the work and the workers who created it. And that is the America we believe in.

That is the choice we face right now – a choice between more of the same policies that have widened inequality, added to our debt, and shaken the foundation of our economy, or change that will restore balance to our economy; that will invest in the ingenuity and innovation of our people; that will fuel a bottom-up prosperity to keep America strong and competitive in the 21st century.

It is not left or right – liberal or conservative – to say that we have tried it their way for eight long years. And it has failed. It is time to try something new. It is time for change.

300 The challenges we face are great, and we may not meet them in one term or with one President. But history tells us we have met greater challenges before. And the seriousness of this moment tells us we can't afford not to try.

So as we set out on this journey, let us also forge a new path – a path that leads to unrivaled prosperity; to boundless opportunity; to the America we believe in and a dream that will always endure. Thank you, and may God Bless America.

Appendix 5

George W. Bush: 2004 State of the Union Address

20 January 2004

Mr. Speaker, Vice President Cheney, Members of Congress, distinguished guests, and fellow citizens:

America this evening is a Nation called to great responsibilities. And we are rising to meet them.

- 10 As we gather tonight, hundreds of thousands of American servicemen and women are deployed across the world in the war on terror. By bringing hope to the oppressed, and delivering justice to the violent, they are making America more secure.

Each day, law enforcement personnel and intelligence officers are tracking terrorist threats; analysts are examining airline passenger lists; the men and women of our new Homeland Security Department are patrolling our coasts and borders. And their vigilance is protecting America.

Americans are proving once again to be the hardest working people in the world. The American economy is growing stronger. The tax relief you passed is working.

- 20 Tonight, Members of Congress can take pride in the great works of compassion and reform that skeptics had thought impossible. You're raising the standards for our public schools; and you're giving our senior citizens prescription drug coverage under Medicare.

We have faced serious challenges together, and now we face a choice. We can go forward with confidence and resolve, or we can turn back to the dangerous illusion that terrorists are not plotting and outlaw regimes are no threat to us. We can press on with economic growth, and reforms in education and Medicare, or we can turn back to old policies and old divisions.

We've not come all this way -- through tragedy, and trial, and war -- only to falter and leave our work unfinished. Americans are rising to the tasks of history, and they expect the same from us. In their efforts, their enterprise, and their character, the American people are showing that the state of our Union is confident and strong.

- 30 Our greatest responsibility is the active defense of the American people. Twenty-eight months have passed since September the 11th, 2001 -- over two years without an attack on American soil -- and it is tempting to believe that the danger is behind us. That hope is understandable, comforting -- and false. The killing has continued in Bali, Jakarta, Casablanca, Riyadh, Mombassa, Jerusalem, Istanbul, and Baghdad. The terrorists continue to plot against America and the civilized world. And by our will and courage, this danger will be defeated.

- 40 Inside the United States, where the war began, we must continue to give our homeland security and law enforcement personnel every tool they need to defend us. And one of those essential tools is the [PATRIOT Act](#), which allows Federal law enforcement to better share information, to track terrorists, to disrupt their cells, and to seize their assets. For years, we have used similar provisions to catch embezzlers and drug traffickers. If these methods are good for hunting criminals, they are even more important for hunting terrorists. Key provisions of the PATRIOT Act are set to expire next year. The terrorist threat will not expire on that schedule. Our law enforcement needs this vital legislation to protect our citizens. You need to renew the PATRIOT Act.

America is on the offensive against the terrorists who started this war. Last March, Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, a mastermind of September the 11th, awoke to find himself in the custody of U.S. and Pakistani authorities. Last August the 11th brought the capture of the terrorist Hambali, who was a key player in the attack in Indonesia that killed over 200 people.

50 We're tracking al-Qaida around the world, and nearly two-thirds of their known leaders have now been captured or killed. Thousands of very skilled and determined military personnel are on the manhunt, going after the remaining killers who hide in cities and caves, and, one by one, we will bring these terrorists to justice.

As part of the offensive against terror, we are also confronting the regimes that harbor and support terrorists, and could supply them with nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons. The United States and our allies are determined: We refuse to live in the shadow of this ultimate danger.

The first to see our determination were the Taliban, who made Afghanistan the primary training base of al-Qaida killers. As of this month, that country has a new constitution, guaranteeing free elections and full participation by women. Businesses are opening, health care centers are being established, and the boys and girls of Afghanistan are back in school.

60 With the help from the new Afghan Army, our coalition is leading aggressive raids against surviving members of the Taliban and al-Qaida. The men and women of Afghanistan are building a nation that is free, and proud, and fighting terror -- and America is honored to be their friend.

Since we last met in this chamber, combat forces of the United States, Great Britain, Australia, Poland, and other countries enforced the demands of the United Nations, ended the rule of Saddam Hussein, and the people of Iraq are free. Having broken the Baathist regime, we face a remnant of violent Saddam supporters. Men who ran away from our troops

70 in battle are now dispersed and attack from the shadows.

These killers, joined by foreign terrorists, are a serious, continuing danger. Yet we're making progress against them. The once all-powerful ruler of Iraq was found in a hole, and now sits in a prison cell. Of the top 55 officials of the former regime, we have captured or killed 45. Our forces are on the offensive, leading over 1,600 patrols a day, and conducting an average of 180 raids a week. We are dealing with these thugs in Iraq, just as surely as we dealt with Saddam Hussein's evil regime.

The work of building a new Iraq is hard, and it is right. And America has always been willing to do what it takes for what is right. Last January, Iraq's only law was the whim of one brutal man. Today our coalition is working with the Iraqi Governing Council to draft a basic law, with

80 a bill of rights. We're working with Iraqis and the United Nations to prepare for a transition to full Iraqi sovereignty by the end of June. As democracy takes hold in Iraq, the enemies of freedom will do all in their power to spread violence and fear. They are trying to shake the will of our country and our friends, but the United States of America will never be intimidated by thugs and assassins. The killers will fail, and the Iraqi people will live in freedom.

Month by month, Iraqis are assuming more responsibility for their own security and their own future. And tonight we are honored to welcome one of Iraq's most respected leaders: the current President of the Iraqi Governing Council, Adnan Pachachi. Sir, America stands with you and the Iraqi people as you build a free and peaceful nation.

Because of American leadership and resolve, the world is changing for the better. Last

90 month, the leader of Libya voluntarily pledged to disclose and dismantle all of his regime's weapons of mass destruction programs, including a uranium enrichment project for nuclear weapons. Colonel Qadhafi correctly judged that his country would be better off, and far more secure, without weapons of mass murder. Nine months of intense negotiations involving the United States and Great Britain succeeded with Libya, while 12 years of diplomacy with Iraq

did not. And one reason is clear: For diplomacy to be effective, words must be credible -- and no one can now doubt the word of America.

100 Different threats require different strategies. Along with nations in the region, we are insisting that North Korea eliminate its nuclear program. America and the international community are demanding that Iran meet its commitments and not develop nuclear weapons. America is committed to keeping the world's most dangerous weapons out of the hands of the most dangerous regimes.

When I came to this rostrum on September 20th, 2001, I brought the police shield of a fallen officer, my reminder of lives that ended, and a task that does not end. I gave to you and to all Americans my complete commitment to securing our country and defeating our enemies. And this pledge, given by one, has been kept by many. You in the Congress have provided the resources for our defense, and cast the difficult votes of war and peace. Our closest allies have been unwavering. America's intelligence personnel and diplomats have been skilled and tireless.

110 And the men and women of the American military -- they have taken the hardest duty. We've seen their skill and their courage in armored charges, and midnight raids, and lonely hours on faithful watch. We have seen the joy when they return, and felt the sorrow when one is lost. I've had the honor of meeting our servicemen and women at many posts, from the deck of a carrier in the Pacific, to a mess hall in Baghdad. Many of our troops are listening tonight. And I want you and your families to know: America is proud of you. And my Administration, and this Congress, will give you the resources you need to fight and win the war on terror.

120 I know that some people question if America is really in a war at all. They view terrorism more as a crime, a problem to be solved mainly with law enforcement and indictments. After the World Trade Center was first attacked in 1993, some of the guilty were indicted and tried and convicted, and sent to prison. But the matter was not settled. The terrorists were still training and plotting in other nations, and drawing up more ambitious plans. After the chaos and carnage of September the 11th, it is not enough to serve our enemies with legal papers. The terrorists and their supporters declared war on the United States, and war is what they got.

130 Some in this chamber, and in our country, did not support the liberation of Iraq. Objections to war often come from principled motives. But let us be candid about the consequences of leaving Saddam Hussein in power. We're seeking all the facts. Already the [Kay Report](#) identified dozens of weapons of mass destruction-related program activities and significant amounts of equipment that Iraq concealed from the United Nations. Had we failed to act, the dictator's weapons of mass destruction programs would continue to this day. Had we failed to act, Security Council resolutions on Iraq would have been revealed as empty threats, weakening the United Nations and encouraging defiance by dictators around the world. Iraq's torture chambers would still be filled with victims -- terrified and innocent. The killing fields of Iraq, where hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children vanished into the sands, would still be known only to the killers. For all who love freedom and peace, the world without Saddam Hussein's regime is a better and safer place!

140 Some critics have said our duties in Iraq must be internationalized. This particular criticism is hard to explain to our partners in Britain, Australia, Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, Italy, Spain, Poland, Denmark, Hungary, Bulgaria, Ukraine, Romania, the Netherlands, Norway, El Salvador, and the 17 other countries that have committed troops to Iraq. As we debate at home, we must never ignore the vital contributions of our international partners, or dismiss their sacrifices. From the beginning, America has sought international support for our* operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, and we have gained much support. There is a difference, however, between leading a coalition of many nations, and submitting

to the objections of a few. America will never seek a permission slip to defend the security of our country.

150 We also hear doubts that democracy is a realistic goal for the greater Middle East, where freedom is rare. Yet it is mistaken, and condescending, to assume that whole cultures and great religions are incompatible with liberty and self-government. I believe that God has planted in every human heart the desire to live in freedom. And even when that desire is crushed by tyranny for decades, it will rise again.

As long as the Middle East remains a place of tyranny, despair, and anger, it will continue to produce men and movements that threaten the safety of America and our friends. So America is pursuing a forward strategy of freedom in the greater Middle East. We will challenge the enemies of reform, confront the allies of terror, and expect a higher standard from our friend [sic]. To cut through the barriers of hateful propaganda, the Voice of America and other broadcast services are expanding their programming in Arabic and Persian -- and soon, a new television service will begin providing reliable news and information across the region. I will send you a proposal to double the budget of the National Endowment for Democracy, and to focus its new work on the development of free elections and free markets, free press, and free labor unions in the Middle East. And above all, we will finish the historic work of democracy in Afghanistan and Iraq, so those nations can light the way for others, and help transform a troubled part of the world.

160 America is a Nation with a mission, and that mission comes from our most basic beliefs. We have no desire to dominate, no ambitions of empire. Our aim is a democratic peace -- a peace founded upon the dignity and rights of every man and woman. America acts in this cause with friends and allies at our side, yet we understand our special calling: This great Republic will lead the cause of freedom.

170 In these last three years, adversity has also revealed the fundamental strengths of the American economy. We have come through recession, and terrorist attack, and corporate scandals, and the uncertainties of war. And because you acted to stimulate our economy with tax relief, this economy is strong, and growing stronger.

You have doubled the child tax credit from 500 to a thousand dollars, reduced the marriage penalty, begun to phase out the death tax, reduced taxes on capital gains and stock dividends, cut taxes on small businesses, and you have lowered taxes for every American who pays income taxes.

180 Americans took those dollars and put them to work, driving this economy forward. The pace of economic growth in the third quarter of 2003 was the fastest in nearly 20 years. New home construction: the highest in almost 20 years. Home ownership rates: the highest ever. Manufacturing activity is increasing. Inflation is low. Interest rates are low. Exports are growing. Productivity is high. And jobs are on the rise.

These numbers confirm that the American people are using their money far better than government would have, and you were right to return it.

America's growing economy is also a changing economy. As technology transforms the way almost every job is done, America becomes more productive, and workers need new skills. Much of our job growth will be found in high-skilled fields like health care and biotechnology. So we must respond by helping more Americans gain the skills to find good jobs in our new economy.

190 All skills begin with the basics of reading and math, which are supposed to be learned in the early grades of our schools. Yet for too long, for too many children, those skills were never mastered. By passing the No Child Left Behind Act, you have made the expectation of literacy the law of our country. We are providing more funding for our schools -- a 36 percent increase since 2001. We're requiring higher standards. We are regularly testing every child

on the fundamentals. We are reporting results to parents, and making sure they have better options when schools are not performing. We are making progress toward excellence for every child in America.

But the status quo always has defenders. Some want to undermine the No Child Left Behind Act by weakening standards and accountability. Yet the results we require are really a matter of common sense: We expect third graders to read and do math at the third grade level - and that's not asking too much. Testing is the only way to identify and help students who are falling behind.

This Nation will not go back to the days of simply shuffling children along from grade to grade without them learning the basics. I refuse to give up on any child, and the No Child Left Behind Act is opening the door of opportunity to all of America's children.

At the same time, we must ensure that older students and adults can gain the skills they need to find work now. Many of the fastest-growing occupations require strong math and science preparation, and training beyond the high school level. So tonight I propose a series of measures called Jobs for the 21st Century. This program will provide extra help to middle and high school students who fall behind in reading and math, expand Advanced Placement programs in low-income schools, invite math and science professionals from the private sector to teach part-time in our high schools. I propose larger Pell Grants for students who prepare for college with demanding courses in high school. I propose increasing our support for America's fine community colleges. I do so, so they can train workers for industries that are creating the most new jobs. By all these actions, we will help more and more Americans to join in the growing prosperity of our country.

Job training is important, and so is job creation. We must continue to pursue an aggressive, pro-growth economic agenda.

Congress has some unfinished business on the issue of taxes. The tax reductions you passed are set to expire. Unless you act -- unless you act -- unless you act, the unfair tax on marriage will go back up. Unless you act, millions of families will be charged 300 dollars more in Federal taxes for every child. Unless you act, small businesses will pay higher taxes. Unless you act, the death tax will eventually come back to life. Unless you act, Americans face a tax increase. What Congress has given, the Congress should not take away: For the sake of job growth, the tax cuts you passed should be permanent.

Our agenda for jobs and growth must help small business owners and employees with relief from needless federal regulation, and protect them from junk and frivolous lawsuits.

Consumers and businesses need reliable supplies of energy to make our economy run, so I urge you to pass legislation to modernize our electricity system, promote conservation, and make America less dependent on foreign sources of energy.

My administration is promoting free and fair trade to open up new markets for America's entrepreneurs and manufacturers and farmers -- to create jobs for American workers. Younger workers should have the opportunity to build a nest egg by saving part of their Social Security taxes in a personal retirement account. We should make the Social Security system a source of ownership for the American people. And we should limit the burden of government on this economy by acting as good stewards of taxpayers' dollars.

In two weeks, I will send you a budget that funds the war, protects the homeland, and meets important domestic needs, while limiting the growth in discretionary spending to less than 4 percent. This will require that Congress focus on priorities, cut wasteful spending, and be wise with the People's money. By doing so, we can cut the deficit in half over the next five years.

240 Tonight, I also ask you to reform our immigration laws so they reflect our values and benefit our economy. I propose a new temporary worker program to match willing foreign workers with willing employers when no Americans can be found to fill the job. This reform will be good for our economy because employers will find needed workers in an honest and orderly system. A temporary worker program will help protect our homeland, allowing Border Patrol and law enforcement to focus on true threats to our national security.

I oppose amnesty, because it would encourage further illegal immigration, and unfairly reward those who break our laws. My temporary worker program will preserve the citizenship path for those who respect the law, while bringing millions of hardworking men and women out from the shadows of American life.

250 Our nation's health care system, like our economy, is also in a time of change. Amazing medical technologies are improving and saving lives. This dramatic progress has brought its own challenge, in the rising costs of medical care and health insurance. Members of Congress, we must work together to help control those costs and extend the benefits of modern medicine throughout our country.

Meeting these goals requires bipartisan effort, and two months ago you showed the way. By strengthening Medicare and adding a prescription drug benefit, you kept a basic commitment to our seniors: You are giving them the modern medicine they deserve.

260 Starting this year, under the law you passed, seniors can choose to receive a drug discount card, saving them 10 to 25 percent off the retail price of most prescription drugs -- and millions of low-income seniors can get an additional \$600 to buy medicine. Beginning next year, seniors will have new coverage for preventive screenings against diabetes and heart disease, and seniors just entering Medicare can receive wellness exams.

In January of 2006, seniors can get prescription drug coverage under Medicare. For a monthly premium of about \$35, most seniors who do not have that coverage today can expect to see their drug bills cut roughly in half. Under this reform, senior citizens will be able to keep their Medicare just as it is, or they can choose a Medicare plan that fits them best -- just as you, as members of Congress, can choose an insurance plan that meets your needs. And starting this year, millions of Americans will be able to save money tax-free for their medical expenses in a health savings account.

270 I signed this measure proudly, and any attempt to limit the choices of our seniors, or to take away their prescription drug coverage under Medicare, will meet my veto.

On the critical issue of health care, our goal is to ensure that Americans can choose and afford private health care coverage that best fits their individual needs. To make insurance more affordable, Congress must act to address rapidly rising health care costs. Small businesses should be able to band together and negotiate for lower insurance rates, so they can cover more workers with health insurance. I urge you to pass association health plans. I ask you to give lower-income Americans a refundable tax credit that would allow millions to buy their own basic health insurance.

280 By computerizing health records, we can avoid dangerous medical mistakes, reduce costs, and improve care. To protect the doctor-patient relationship, and keep good doctors doing good work, we must eliminate wasteful and frivolous medical lawsuits. And tonight I propose that individuals who buy catastrophic health care coverage, as part of our new health savings accounts, be allowed to deduct 100 percent of the premiums from their taxes.

A government-run health care system is the wrong prescription.

By keeping costs under control, expanding access, and helping more Americans afford coverage, we will preserve the system of private medicine that makes America's health care the best in the world.

290 We are living in a time of great change -- in our world, in our economy, in science and medicine. Yet some things endure -- courage and compassion, reverence and integrity, respect for differences of faith and race. The values we try to live by never change. And they are instilled in us by fundamental institutions, such as families and schools and religious congregations. These institutions, these unseen pillars of civilization, must remain strong in America, and we will defend them. We must stand with our families to help them raise healthy, responsible children. When it comes to helping children make right choices, there is work for all of us to do.

300 One of the worst decisions our children can make is to gamble their lives and futures on drugs. Our government is helping parents confront this problem with aggressive education, treatment, and law enforcement. Drug use in high school has declined by 11 percent over the last two years. Four hundred thousand fewer young people are using illegal drugs than in the year 2001. In my budget, I proposed new funding to continue our aggressive, community-based strategy to reduce demand for illegal drugs. Drug testing in our schools has proven to be an effective part of this effort. So tonight I proposed an additional \$23 millions [sic] for schools that want to use drug testing as a tool to save children's lives. The aim here is not to punish children, but to send them this message: We love you, and we don't want to lose you.

310 To help children make right choices, they need good examples. Athletics play such an important role in our society, but, unfortunately, some in professional sports are not setting much of an example. The use of performance-enhancing drugs like steroids in baseball, football, and other sports is dangerous, and it sends the wrong message -- that there are shortcuts to accomplishment, and that performance is more important than character. So tonight I call on team owners, union representatives, coaches, and players to take the lead, to send the right signal, to get tough, and to get rid of steroids now.

To encourage right choices, we must be willing to confront the dangers young people face even when they're difficult to talk about. Each year, about 3 million teenagers contract sexually-transmitted diseases that can harm them, or kill them, or prevent them from ever becoming parents. In my budget, I propose a grassroots campaign to help inform families about these medical risks. We will double federal funding for abstinence programs, so schools can teach this fact of life: Abstinence for young people is the only certain way to avoid sexually-transmitted diseases.

320 Decisions children now make can affect their health and character for the rest of their lives. All of us -- parents and schools and government -- must work together to counter the negative influence of the culture, and to send the right messages to our children.

A strong America must also value the institution of marriage. I believe we should respect individuals as we take a principled stand for one of the most fundamental, enduring institutions of our civilization. Congress has already taken a stand on this issue by passing the [Defense of Marriage Act](#), signed in 1996 by President Clinton. That statute protects marriage under federal law as a union of a man and a woman, and declares that one state may not redefine marriage for other states.

330 Activist judges, however, have begun redefining marriage by court order, without regard for the will of the people and their elected representatives. On an issue of such great consequence, the people's voice must be heard. If judges insist on forcing their arbitrary will upon the people, the only alternative left to the people would be the constitutional process. Our nation must defend the sanctity of marriage.

The outcome of this debate is important, and so is the way we conduct it. The same moral tradition that defines marriage also teaches that each individual has dignity and value in God's sight.

It's also important to strengthen our communities by unleashing the compassion of America's religious institutions. Religious charities of every creed are doing some of the most vital work in our country -- mentoring children, feeding the hungry, taking the hand of the lonely. Yet government has often denied social service grants and contracts to these groups, just because they have a cross or a Star of David or a crescent on the wall. By executive order, I have opened billions of dollars in grant money to competition that includes faith-based charities. Tonight I ask you to codify this into law, so people of faith can know that the law will never discriminate against them again.

In the past, we've worked together to bring mentors to children of prisoners, and provide treatment for the addicted, and help for the homeless. Tonight I ask you to consider another group of Americans in need of help. This year, some 600,000 inmates will be released from prison back into society. We know from long experience that if they can't find work, or a home, or help, they are much more likely to commit crime and return to prison. So tonight, I propose a four-year, 300 million dollar prisoner re-entry initiative to expand job training and placement services, to provide transitional housing, and to help newly released prisoners get mentoring, including from faith-based groups. America is the land of second chance, and when the gates of the prison open, the path ahead should lead to a better life.

For all Americans, the last three years have brought tests we did not ask for, and achievements shared by all. By our actions, we have shown what kind of nation we are. In grief, we have found the grace to go on. In challenge, we rediscovered the courage and daring of a free people. In victory, we have shown the noble aims and good heart of America. And having come this far, we sense that we live in a time set apart.

I've been witness to the character of the people of America, who have shown calm in times of danger, compassion for one another, and toughness for the long haul. All of us have been partners in a great enterprise. And even some of the youngest understand that we are living in historic times. Last month a girl in Lincoln, Rhode Island, sent me a letter. It began, "Dear George W. Bush. If there's anything you know, I, Ashley Pearson, age 2, age 10 [sic], can do to help anyone, please send me a letter and tell me what I can do to save our country." She added this P.S.: "If you can send a letter to the troops, please put, 'Ashley Pearson believes in you.'"

Tonight, Ashley, your message to our troops has just been conveyed. And, yes, you have some duties yourself. Study hard in school, listen to your mom or dad, help someone in need, and when you and your friends see a man or woman in uniform, say, "thank you." And, Ashley, while you do your part, all of us here in this great chamber will do our best to keep you and the rest of America safe and free.

My -- My fellow citizens, we now move forward, with confidence and faith. Our nation is strong and steadfast. The cause we serve is right, because it is the cause of all mankind. The momentum of freedom in our world is unmistakable -- and it is not carried forward by our power alone. We can trust in that greater power who guides the unfolding of the years. And in all that is to come, we can know that His purposes are just and true.

May God continue to bless America.

Appendix 6

George W. Bush: 2004 Republican National Convention Address

2 September 2004

Mr. Chairman! Mr. Chairman, delegates, fellow citizens: I'm honored by your support, and I accept your nomination for President of the United States.

When I -- When I said those words four years ago, none of us could have envisioned what these years would bring. In the heart of this great city, we saw tragedy arrive on a quiet morning. We saw the bravery of rescuers grow with danger. We learned of passengers on a doomed plane who died with a courage that frightened their killers. We have seen a shaken economy rise to its feet. And we have seen Americans in uniform storming mountain strongholds, and charging through sandstorms, and liberating millions, with acts of valor that would make the men of Normandy proud.

Since 2001, Americans have been given hills to climb, and found the strength to climb them. Now, because we have made the hard journey, we can see the valley below. Now, because we have faced challenges with resolve, we have historic goals within our reach, and greatness in our future. We will build a safer world and a more hopeful America and nothing will hold us back.

In the work we have done, and the work we will do, I am fortunate to have a superb Vice President. I have counted on Dick Cheney's calm and steady judgment in difficult days, and I'm honored to have him at my side.

I am grateful to share my walk in life with Laura Bush. Americans -- Americans have come to see the goodness and kindness and strength I first saw 26 years ago, and we love our First Lady.

I'm a fortunate father of two spirited, intelligent, and lovely young women.

I'm blessed with a sister and brothers who are my closest friends. And I will always be the proud and grateful son of George and Barbara Bush.

My father served eight years at the side of another great American: Ronald Reagan. His -- His spirit of optimism and goodwill and decency are in this hall, and are in our hearts, and will always define our Party.

Two months from today, voters will make a choice based on the records we have built, the convictions we hold, and the vision that guides us forward. A presidential election is a contest for the future. Tonight I will tell you where I stand, what I believe, and where I will lead this country in the next four years.

I believe -- I believe every child can learn, and every school must teach, so we passed the most important federal education reform in history. Because we acted, children are making sustained progress in reading and math, America's schools are getting better, and nothing will hold us back.

I believe we have a moral responsibility to honor America's seniors, so I brought Republicans and Democrats together to strengthen Medicare. Now seniors are getting immediate help buying medicine. Soon every senior will be able to get prescription drug coverage, and nothing will hold us back.

I believe in the energy and innovative spirit of America's workers, entrepreneurs, farmers, and ranchers, so we unleashed that energy with the largest tax relief in a generation. Because we acted, our economy is growing again, and creating jobs, and nothing will hold us back.

I believe the most solemn duty of the American president is to protect the American people. If America shows uncertainty or weakness in this decade, the world will drift toward tragedy. This will not happen on my watch.

50 I'm running for President with a clear and positive plan to build a safer world, and a more hopeful America. I'm running with a compassionate conservative philosophy: that government should help people improve their lives, not try to run their lives. I believe this Nation wants steady, consistent, principled leadership and that is why, with your help, we will win this election.

The story -- The story of America is the story of expanding liberty: an ever-widening circle, constantly growing to reach further and include more. Our Nation's founding commitment is still our deepest commitment: In our world, and here at home, we will extend the frontiers of freedom.

60 The times in which we live and work are changing dramatically. The workers of our parents' generation typically had one job, one skill, one career often with one company that provided health care and a pension. And most of those workers were men. Today, workers change jobs, even careers, many times during their lives, and in one of the most dramatic shifts our society has seen, two-thirds of all Moms also work outside the home.

This changed world can be a time of great opportunity for all Americans to earn a better living, support your family, and have a rewarding career. And government must take your side. Many of our most fundamental systems -- the tax code, health coverage, pension plans, worker training -- were created for the world of yesterday, not tomorrow. We will transform these systems so that all citizens are equipped, prepared, and thus truly free to make your own choices and pursue your own dreams.

70 My plan begins with providing the security and opportunity of a growing economy. We now compete in a global market that provides new buyers for our goods, but new competition for our workers. To create more jobs in America, America must be the best place in the world to do business. To create jobs, my plan will encourage investment and expansion by restraining federal spending, reducing regulation, and making the tax relief permanent. To create jobs, we will make our country less dependent on foreign sources of energy. To create jobs, we will expand trade and level the playing field to sell American goods and services across the globe. And we must protect small business owners and workers from the explosion of frivolous lawsuits that threaten jobs across our country.

80 Another drag on our economy is the current tax code, which is a complicated mess filled with special interest loopholes, saddling our people with more than six billion hours of paperwork and headache every year. The American people deserve and our economic future demands a simpler, fairer, pro-growth system. In a new term, I will lead a bipartisan effort to reform and simplify the federal tax code.

Another priority in a new term will be to help workers take advantage of the expanding economy to find better and higher-paying jobs. In this time of change, many workers want to go back to school to learn different or higher-level skills. So we will double the number of people served by our principal job training program and increase funding for our community colleges. I know that with the right skills, American workers can compete with anyone, anywhere in the world.

90 In this time of change, opportunity in some communities is more distant than in others. To stand with workers in poor communities and those that have lost manufacturing, textile, and other jobs we will create American opportunity zones. In these areas, we will provide tax relief and other incentives to attract new business, and improve housing and job training to bring hope and work throughout all of America.

100 As I've traveled the country, I've met many workers and small business owners who have told me that they are worried they cannot afford health care. More than half of the uninsured are small business employees and their families. In a new term, we must allow small firms to join together to purchase insurance at the discounts available to big companies. We will offer a tax credit to encourage small businesses and their employees to set up health savings accounts, and provide -- and provide direct help for low-income Americans to purchase them. These accounts give workers the security of insurance against major illness, the opportunity to save tax-free for routine health expenses, and the freedom of knowing you can take your

account with you whenever you change jobs. We will provide low-income Americans with better access to health care: In a new term, I will ensure every poor county in America has a community or rural health center.

As I've traveled our country, I've met too many good doctors, especially OBGYNs, who are being forced out of practice because of the high cost of lawsuits. To make health care more affordable and accessible, we must pass medical liability reform now. And in all we do to improve health care in America, we will make sure that health decisions are made by doctors and patients, not by bureaucrats in Washington, DC.

110 In this time of change, government must take the side of working families. In a new term, we will change outdated labor laws to offer comp-time and flex-time. Our laws should never stand in the way of a more family-friendly workplace.

Another priority for a new term is to build an ownership society, because ownership brings security, and dignity, and independence. Thanks to our policies, homeownership in America is at an all-time high. Tonight we set a new goal: seven million more affordable homes in the next 10 years so more American families will be able to open the door and say welcome to my home.

120 In an ownership society, more people will own their health care plans, and have the confidence of owning a piece of their retirement. We'll always keep the promise of Social Security for our older workers. With the huge Baby Boom generation approaching retirement, many of our children and grandchildren understandably worry whether Social Security will be there when they need it. We must strengthen Social Security by allowing younger workers to save some of their taxes in a personal -- personal account, a nest egg you can call your own, and government can never take away.

130 In all these proposals, we seek to provide not just a government program, but a path -- a path to greater opportunity, more freedom, and more control over your own life. And the path begins with our youngest Americans. To build a more hopeful America, we must help our children reach as far as their vision and character can take them. Tonight, I remind every parent and every teacher, I say to every child: No matter what your circumstance, no matter where you live, your school will be the path to promise of America.

We are transforming our schools by raising standards and focusing on results. We are insisting on accountability, empowering parents and teachers, and making sure that local people are in charge of their schools. By testing every child, we are identifying those who need help -- and we are providing a record level of funding to get them that help. In northeast Georgia, Gainesville Elementary School is mostly Hispanic and 90 percent poor -- and this year 90 percent of its students passed state tests in reading and math. The principal -- The principal expresses the philosophy of his school this way: "We don't focus on what we can't do at this school; we focus on what we can do. And we do whatever it takes to get kids across the finish line." See, this principal is challenging the soft bigotry of low expectations, and that is the spirit of our education reform, and the commitment of our country: No dejaremos a ningún niño atrás. "We will leave no child behind."

140 We are making progress -- We are making and there is more to do. In this time of change, most new jobs are filled by people with at least two years of college, yet only about one in four students gets there. In our high schools, we will fund early intervention programs to help students at risk. We will place a new focus on math and science. As we make progress, we will require a rigorous exam before graduation. By raising performance in our high schools, and expanding Pell grants for low and middle income families, we will help more Americans start their career with a college diploma.

150 America's children must also have a healthy start in life. In a new term, we will lead an aggressive effort to enroll millions of poor children who are eligible but not signed up for the government's health insurance programs. We will not allow a lack of attention, or information, to stand between these children and the health care they need.

Anyone who wants more details on my agenda can find 'em online. The web address is not very imaginative, but it's easy to remember: GeorgeWBush.com.

These changing times can be exciting times of expanded opportunity. And here, you face a choice. My opponent's policies are dramatically different from ours. Senator Kerry opposed Medicare reform and health savings accounts. After supporting my education reforms, he now wants to dilute 'em. He opposes legal and medical liability reform. He opposed reducing the marriage penalty, opposed doubling the child credit, opposed lowering income taxes for all who pay them. (Wait a minute. Wait a minute.) To be fair, there are some things my opponent is for. He's -- He's proposed more than two trillion dollars in federal spending so far, and that's a lot, even for a senator from Massachusetts. And to pay for that spending, he is runnin' on a platform of increasing taxes, and that's the kind of promise a politician usually keeps.

His tax and -- His policies of tax and spend, of expanding government rather than expanding opportunity are the politics of the past. We are on the path to the future and we're not turning back.

In this world of change, some things do not change: the values we try to live by, the institutions that give our lives meaning and purpose. Our society rests on a foundation of responsibility and character and family commitment.

Because family and work are sources of stability and dignity, I support welfare reform that strengthens family and requires work. Because a caring society will value its weakest members, we must make a place for the unborn child. Because -- Because religious charities provide a safety net of mercy and compassion, our government must never discriminate against them. Because the union of a man and woman deserves an honored place in our society, I support the protection of marriage against activist judges. And I will continue to appoint federal judges who know the difference between personal opinion and the strict interpretation of the law.

My opponent recently announced that he's the conservative -- the candidate of "conservative values." Must have come as a surprise to a lot of his supporters. There are some problems with this claim. If you say the heart and soul of America is found in Hollywood, I'm afraid you are not the candidate of conservative values. If -- If you voted against the bipartisan Defense of Marriage Act, which President Clinton signed, you are not the candidate of conservative values. If you gave a speech, as my opponent did, calling the Reagan presidency eight years of "moral darkness," then you may be a lot of things, but the candidate of conservative values is not one of them.

This election will also determine how America responds to the continuing danger of terrorism. And you know where I stand. Three days after September the 11th, I stood where Americans died, in the ruins of the Twin Towers. Workers in hard hats were shouting to me, "Whatever it takes." A fellow grabbed me by the arm and he said, "Do not let me down." Since that day, I wake up every morning thinking about how to better protect our country. I will never relent in defending America whatever it takes.

So we have fought the terrorists across the earth not for pride, not for power, but because the lives of our citizens are at stake. Our strategy is clear. We've tripled funding for homeland security and trained a half a million first responders, because we're determined to protect our homeland. We're transforming our military and reforming and strengthening our intelligence services. We are staying on the offensive, striking terrorists abroad, so we do not have to face them here at home. And we are working to advance liberty in the broader Middle East, because freedom will bring a future of hope, and the peace we all want. And we will prevail.

Our strategy is succeeding. Four years ago, Afghanistan was the home base of al-Qaida; Pakistan was a transit point for terrorist groups; Saudi Arabia was fertile ground for terrorist fundraising; Libya was secretly pursuing nuclear [nuclear] weapons; Iraq was a gathering threat; and al-Qaida was largely unchallenged as it planned attacks. Today, the government of -- of a free Afghanistan is fighting terror; Pakistan is capturing terrorist leaders; Saudi Arabia is making raids and arrests; Libya is dismantling its weapons programs; the army of a free Iraq is fighting for freedom; and more than three-quarters of al-Qaida's key members

and associates have been detained or killed. We have led; many have joined; and America and the world are safer.

210 This progress involved careful diplomacy, clear moral purpose, and some tough decisions. And the toughest came on Iraq. We knew Saddam Hussein's record of aggression and support for terror. We knew his long history of pursuing, even using, weapons of mass destruction. And we know that September the 11th requires our country to think differently: We must, and we will, confront threats to America before it is too late.

220 In Saddam Hussein, we saw a threat. Members of both political parties, including --. Members of both political parties, including my opponent and his running mate, saw the threat, and voted to authorize the use of force. We went to the United Nations Security Council, which passed a unanimous resolution demanding the dictator disarm, or face serious consequences. Leaders in the Middle East urged him to comply. After more than a decade of diplomacy, we gave Saddam Hussein another chance, a final chance, to meet his responsibilities to the civilized world. He again refused, and I faced the kind of decision that comes only to the Oval Office, a decision no president would ask for, but must be prepared to make. Do I forget the lessons of September the 11th and take the word of a madman, or do I take action to defend our country? Faced with that choice, I will defend America every time.

230 Because we acted to defend our country, the murderous regimes of Saddam Hussein and the Taliban are history, more than 50 million people have been liberated, and democracy is coming to the broader Middle East. In Afghanistan, terrorists have done everything they can to intimidate people, yet more than 10 million citizens have registered to vote in the October presidential election -- a resounding endorsement for democracy. Despite ongoing acts of violence, Iraq now has a strong Prime Minister, a national council, and national elections are scheduled for January. Our Nation is standing with the people of Afghanistan and Iraq, because when America gives its word, America must keep its word.

As importantly, we are serving a vital and historic cause that will make our country safer. Free societies in the Middle East will be hopeful societies, which no longer feed resentments and breed violence for export. Free governments in the Middle East will fight terrorists instead of harboring them, and that helps us keep the peace. So our mission in Afghanistan and Iraq is clear: We will help new leaders to train their armies, and move toward elections, and get on the path of stability and democracy as quickly as possible. And then our troops will return home with the honor they have earned.

240 Our troops know the historic importance of our work. One Army Specialist wrote home: "We are transforming a once sick society into a hopeful place. The various terrorist enemies we are facing in Iraq," he continued, "are really aiming at you back in the United States. This is a test of will for our country. We soldiers of yours are doing great and scoring victories in confronting the evil terrorists." That young man is right -- our men and women in uniform are doing a superb job for America.

250 Tonight I want to speak to all of them and to their families: You are involved in a struggle of historic proportion. Because of your service and sacrifice, we are defeating the terrorists where they live and plan, and you're making America safer. Because of you, women in Afghanistan are no longer shot in a sports stadium. Because of you, the people of Iraq no longer fear being executed and left in mass graves. Because of you, the world is more just and will be more peaceful. We owe you our thanks, and we owe you something more. We will give you all the resources, all the tools, and all the support you need for victory.

Again -- Again my opponent and I have different approaches. I proposed, and the Congress overwhelmingly passed, 87 billion dollars in funding needed by our troops doing battle in Afghanistan and Iraq. My opponent and his running mate voted against this money for bullets, and fuel, and vehicles, and body armor. When asked to explain his vote, the Senator said, "I actually did vote for the 87 billion dollars before I voted against it." Then he said -- Then he said he was "proud" of his vote. Then, when pressed, he said it was a "complicated" matter. There's nothing complicated about supporting our troops in combat.

260 Our allies also know the historic importance of our work. About 40 nations stand beside us in Afghanistan, and some 30 in Iraq. I deeply appreciate the courage and wise counsel of leaders like Prime Minister Howard, President Kwasniewski, Prime Minister Berlusconi and, of course, Prime Minister Tony Blair.

Again, my opponent takes a different approach. In the midst of war, he has called American allies, quote, a "coalition of the coerced and the bribed." That would be nations like Great Britain, Poland, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Denmark, El Salvador, Australia, and others -- allies that deserve the respect of all Americans, not the scorn of a politician.

I respect every soldier, from every country, who serves beside us in the hard work of history. America is grateful, and America will not forget.

270 The people we have freed won't forget either. Not long ago, seven Iraqi men came to see me in the Oval Office. They had "X"s branded into their foreheads, and their right hands had been cut off by Saddam Hussein's secret police, the sadistic punishment for imaginary crimes. During our emotional visit one of the Iraqi men used his new prosthetic hand to slowly write out, in Arabic, a prayer for God to bless America. I am proud that our country remains the hope of the oppressed, and the greatest force for good on this earth.

Others understand the historic importance of our work. The terrorists know. They know that a vibrant, successful democracy at the heart of the Middle East will discredit their radical ideology of hate. They know that men and women with hope and purpose and dignity do not strap bombs on their bodies and kill the innocent. The terrorists are fighting freedom with all

280 their cunning and cruelty because freedom is their greatest fear, and they should be afraid, because freedom is on the march.

I believe in the transformational power of liberty: The wisest use of American strength is to advance freedom. As the citizens of Afghanistan and Iraq seize the moment, their example will send a message of hope throughout a vital region. Palestinians will hear the message that democracy and reform are within their reach, and so is peace with our good friend Israel. Young women across the Middle East will hear the message that their day of equality and justice is coming. Young men will hear the message that national progress and dignity are found in liberty, not tyranny and terror. Reformers and political prisoners and exiles will hear the message that their dream of freedom cannot be denied forever. And as freedom

290 advances heart by heart, and nation by nation America will be more secure and the world more peaceful.

America has done this kind of work before and there have always been doubters. In 1946, 18 months after the fall of Berlin to allied forces, a journalist in the New York Times wrote this: "Germany is a land in an acute stage of economic, political and moral crisis. European capitals are frightened. In every military headquarters, one meets alarmed officials doing their utmost to deal with the consequences of the occupation policy that they admit has failed."

End quote. Maybe that same person is still around, writing editorials. Fortunately, we had a resolute president named Truman, who, with the American people, persevered -- knowing

300 that a new democracy at the center of Europe would lead to stability and peace. And because that generation of Americans held firm in the cause of liberty, we live in a better and safer world today.

The progress we and our friends and allies seek in the broader Middle East will not come easily, or all at once. Yet Americans, of all people, should never be surprised by the power of liberty to transform lives and nations.

That power brought settlers on perilous journeys, inspired colonies to rebellion, ended the sin of slavery, and set our Nation against the tyrannies of the 20th century. We were honored to aid the rise of democracy in Germany and Japan, Nicaragua, Central Europe and the Baltics. And that noble story goes on.

310 I believe that America is called to lead the cause of freedom in a new century. I believe that millions in the Middle East plead in silence for their liberty.

I believe that given the chance, they will embrace the most honorable form of government ever devised by man.

I believe all these things because freedom is not America's gift to the world, it is the Almighty God's gift to every man and woman in this world.

This moment in the life of our country will be remembered. Generations will know if we kept our faith and kept our word. Generations will know if we seized this moment and used it to build a future of safety and peace. The freedom of many, and the future security of our Nation, now depend on us. And tonight, my fellow Americans, I ask you to stand with me.

320 In the last four years -- In the last four years, you and I have come to know each other. Even when we don't agree, at least you know what I believe and where I stand.

You may have noticed I have a few flaws, too. People sometimes have to correct my English. I knew I had a problem when Arnold Schwarzenegger started doing it. Some folks look at me and see a certain swagger, which in Texas is called "walking." Now and then I come across as a little too blunt and for that we can all thank the white-haired lady sitting right up there.

330 One thing I have learned about the presidency is that whatever shortcomings you have, people are going to notice them and whatever strengths you have, you're gonna need 'em. These four years have brought moments I could not foresee and will not forget. I've tried to comfort Americans who lost the most on September the 11th -- people who showed me a picture or told me a story, so I'd -- I would know how much was taken from them. I've learned first-hand that ordering Americans into battle is the hardest decision, even when it is right. I have returned the salute of wounded soldiers, some with a very tough road ahead, who say they were just doing their job. I've held the children of the fallen, who were told their dad or mom is a hero, but would rather just have their mom or dad.

340 I've met with the parents and wives and husbands who have received a folded flag, and said a final goodbye to a soldier they loved. I am awed that so many have used those meetings to say that I'm in their prayers -- and to offer encouragement to me. Where does that strength like that come from? How can people so burdened with sorrow also feel such pride? It is because they know their loved one was last seen doing good. Because they know that liberty was precious to the one they lost. And in those military families, I have seen the character of a great nation: decent, idealistic, and strong.

The world saw that spirit three miles from here, when the people of this city faced peril together, and lifted a flag over the ruins, and defied the enemy with their courage.

My fellow Americans, for as long as our country stands, people will look to the resurrection of New York City and they will say: Here buildings fell; here a nation rose.

We see America's character in our military, which finds a way or makes one.

We see it in our veterans, who are supporting military families in their days of worry.

We see it in our young people, who have found heroes once again.

350 We see that character in workers and entrepreneurs, who are renewing our economy with their effort and optimism.

And all of this has confirmed one belief beyond doubt: Having come this far, our tested and confident Nation can achieve anything.

To everything we know there is a season -- a time for sadness, a time for struggle, a time for rebuilding. And now we have reached a time for hope.

This young century will be liberty's century. By promoting liberty abroad, we will build a safer world. By encouraging liberty at home, we will build a more hopeful America. Like generations before us, we have a calling from beyond the stars to stand for freedom. This is the everlasting dream of America and tonight, in this place, that dream is renewed.

360 Now we go forward grateful for our freedom, faithful to our cause, and confident in the future of the greatest nation on earth.

God bless you, and may God continue to bless our great country.

Thank you all.

Lebenslauf

Persönliche Daten

Geburtsdatum: 12.4.1985

Geburtsort: Bregenz, Österreich.

Staatsbürgerschaft: Österreich

Akademische Laufbahn

1991 – 1995 Volksschule Augasse, Bregenz

1995 – 2003 Bundesgymnasiums Gallusstraße, Bregenz

2003 Matura mit sehr gutem Erfolg

2003 - 2004 Diplomstudium Architektur, Technische Universität Wien,

2004 - 2005 Diplomstudium Anglistik und Amerikanistik, Universität Wien,

ab Oktober 2004 Lehramtsstudium UF Englisch und UF Musikerziehung, Universität Wien und Universität für Musik und darstellende Kunst Wien

ab Oktober 2005 verschiedene Tätigkeiten für die Österreichische Hochschüler-Innenschaft, Universitäts- und Bundesebene

Einschlägige Tätigkeiten

Juli 2008 Assistentin für die Kinderuni Kunst, Wien

2008 – 2009 Übersetzungstätigkeit für ME-Net (Europäische Plattform für Musikpädagogik)

ab 2009 Mitwirkung am Musikvermittlungsprojekt „die kunst der stunde“, Planung und Durchführung von Workshops mit Schulklassen

Abstract

Die Arbeit entstand aus dem Versuch heraus, die kontroverse Natur der gegenwärtigen Praxis in der Kritischen Diskursanalyse aufzuzeigen und in einer praktischen Auseinandersetzung diese Erkenntnisse zu prüfen. Zu diesem Zweck wird eingangs eine detaillierte Untersuchung dieser Praxis angestellt. Komponenten dieser Untersuchung sind die verschiedenen theoretischen Ansätze, aber auch Gemeinsamkeiten, der bekanntesten ExponentInnen der Kritischen Diskursanalyse, die problematische Vielfalt in der gängigen Terminologie und deren praktische Anwendung in verschiedenen exemplarischen Forschungsprojekten. Abgeschlossen wird der theoretische Teil der Diplomarbeit mit einer umfassenden Darstellung von Kritikpunkten, die besonders von Seiten der Linguistik gegenüber der Praxis der Kritischen Diskursanalyse geäußert wurden und werden.

Im zweiten Teil der Diplomarbeit werden anhand einer beispielhaften Analyse einiger politischer Reden die Erkenntnisse aus der theoretischen Untersuchung einer Prüfung unterzogen. Die Autorin versucht, insbesondere die erhobene Kritik anhand praktischer Anwendung auf ihren Wahrheitsgehalt hin zu untersuchen. Ausgehend von einer für die kritische Diskursanalyse typischen Fragestellung nach dem sprachlichen Ausdruck neoliberaler Ideologie im Diskurs der Republikanischen Partei der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika, soll die Beantwortbarkeit der Forschungsfrage mit den gängigen Mitteln der Kritischen Diskursanalyse untersucht werden.

Abschließend wird dargelegt, dass die praktische Anwendung der Methoden die an der Kritischen Diskursanalyse geäußerte Kritik in vielerlei Hinsicht bestätigt. Im Vergleich der verschiedenen Texte wird deutlich, dass Rückschlüsse auf spezifische Eigenschaften des republikanischen Diskurses schwer zu rechtfertigen sind. Der Zusammenhang zwischen Sprachgebrauch und ideologischem Hintergrund kann aufgrund dessen nicht eindeutig bestätigt werden.