

**BRATISLAVSKÁ MEDZINÁRODNÁ ŠKOLA LIBERÁLNYCH ŠTÚDIÍ**

**The Good, the Bad and Something In-between:  
An Alternative Approach to Political Rhetoric Demonstrated Using an  
Analysis of the Rhetoric of Hitler, Thatcher and Obama**

**Bachelor Thesis**

**Bratislava 2014**

**Arnold Kiss**

**BRATISLAVA INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS**

**Bachelor Thesis**

**The Good, the Bad and Something In-between:  
An Alternative Approach to Political Rhetoric Demonstrated Using an  
Analysis of the Rhetoric of Hitler, Thatcher, and Obama**

---

**in Partial Fulfillment  
of Requirement for the Degree  
Bachelor of Science**

---

**Study Field: Political Science**

---

**Arnold Kiss**

**April 2014**

**BRATISLAVA INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS**

**The Good, the Bad and Something In-between:  
An Alternative Approach to Political Rhetoric Demonstrated Using an Analysis  
of the Rhetoric of Hitler, Thatcher, and Obama**

**Title:** The Good, the Bad and Something In-between: An Alternative Approach to Political Rhetoric Demonstrated Using an Analysis of the Rhetoric of Hitler, Thatcher, and Obama

**Name:** Arnold Kiss

**University:** Bratislava International School of Liberal Arts

**Study program:** Liberal arts

**Degree of qualification:** Bc.

**Thesis Advisor:** Ing. Egon Gál

**Bratislava, 2014**

### **Declaration of Originality**

I hereby certify that I am the sole author of this thesis and that no part of this thesis has been published or submitted for publication. I further certify that my thesis does not infringe upon anyone's copyright nor violate any proprietary rights and that any ideas, techniques, quotations, or any other material from the work of other people included in my thesis are fully acknowledge in accordance with the standard referencing practices. A list of used works can be found in the Reference section of this work.

Place:

Date:

Signature: .....

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the following people:

My girlfriend, Dominika, whom I love and without whom I would have probably finished this thesis a great deal sooner.

My family – my parents Vojtech and Alica, and my sisters Adriana, Anita and Alica, who had been tolerant about the fact that I had to miss many family reunions because of my studies.

Dagmar Kusá, who taught me the importance of deadlines and what it really means to dedicate everything to one's work and passion.

Egon Gál, who was very forthcoming and always willing to help.

Samuel Abrahám, without whom I would now probably be studying at some terrible school instead of beautiful BISLA.

To my dear classmates.

Fedor Gál, without whom I would never have engaged in political science, philosophy, or any academic subject for that matter.

## **ABSTRACT**

The main aim of this paper is to offer a look at an alternative approach to analysing political rhetoric and the components that constitute a successful political speech. The predominant presumption is that the main factors that affect the success of a political speech are not only the ones which are currently being used by linguists and political or social psychologists, but also that there are other factors of major influences which have, to a great extent, been left greatly unexplored. The elements that contribute to the success of a political speech, and subsequently an increased rate of conformity and obedience within a mass in a political system that is undergoing change, do not necessarily have to be connected with the power of arguments, features of the audience or individual characteristics of the speaker. Other aspects, such as subtle, indirect influence through the usage of rhetorical and literary devices or the concept of working with frames might have a similar or even greater impact on the efficiency of a given speech. Another major presumption is that the main actors of this dynamic, can be from very diverse surroundings, can have many obstacles set ahead of them, but using the right rhetoric, they can come to a perfect way of touching the audiences and make them submit to their will without using any form of coercion or forcible measures.

The case studies present in the thesis are the speeches given by three major political leaders representing completely different ideologies (Adolf Hitler, Margaret Thatcher and Barack Obama), appealing to three different nations, under only relatively similar political conditions. This diversity of studied and analyzed cases should emphasize the fact that indeed, no matter how diverse political environments the speaker might find himself in, given the right rhetoric, he can be successful. An ex-post judgment about the morals of the speaker does not matter either. Although the difference in what the individuals represent is great, in this study I aim at proving that these speakers have a very specific common trait – that being a distinct verbal rhetoric style and rhetorical devices that work as the universal packaging of any message and can successfully convince a significant percentage of the mass to make the whole country go along with an idea.

The theoretical background for this thesis is based on the study of socio-political theories of conformity, compliance, obedience and rhetoric of selected social psychologists throughout the twentieth century and applying their theories to concrete examples in public political speeches.

The goal of the study based on comprehensive research into the topic is to confirm both the essential role of verbal rhetoric and the relevance of theories to context even through the great span of an almost 70 years with only minor differences in how verbal rhetoric has been conducted and that that is mainly due to the current political dynamics of the particular societies the speakers are acting in.

## ABSTRAKT

Hlavným cieľom tejto práce je poskytnúť pohľad na alternatívny prístup k analýze politickej rétoriky a prvkov, ktoré tvoria úspešný politický prejav. Prevládajúca domnienka je, že hlavnými faktormi, ktoré ovplyvňujú úspech politického prejavu sú nielen tie, ktoré sú v súčasnej dobe využívané lingvistami a politickými či sociálnymi psychológmi, ale že tiež existujú iné faktory s veľkým vplyvom, ktoré do veľkej miery zostávajú nepreskúmané. Faktory, ktoré prispievajú k úspechu politického prejavu a následne k zvýšenej miere konformity a poslušnosti v mase v politickom systéme, ktorý prechádza zmenami, nemusia byť nutne spojené so silou argumentov, črtami publika či osobnostnými vlastnosťami rečníka. Iné aspekty, ako napríklad subtilné, nepriame vplyvy prostredníctvom používania rétorických a literárnych jazykových prvkov, alebo koncept využívania rečových rámcov môžu mať podobný, ba aj väčší dopad na efektivitu daného prejavu. Ďalším dôležitým predpokladom je, že hlavní aktéri tejto dynamiky môžu byť z veľmi rôznorodých prostredí a mať pred sebou postavených mnoho prekážok, avšak pri využití správnej rétoriky môžu dôjsť k dokonalému spôsobu ako sa dotknúť poslucháčov a spôsobiť ich podvolenie sa ich vôli bez použitia akéhokoľvek násilia či donucovacích prostriedkov.

Prípadové štúdie obsiahnuté v tejto práci sú prejavy prezentované tromi dôležitými politickými lídrami, ktorí predstavujú úplne odlišné ideológie (Adolf Hitler, Margaret Thatcher a Barack Obama), apelujúcimi na tri rôzne národy, za účasti iba relatívne podobných politických podmienok.

Táto rôznorodosť skúmaných a analyzovaných prípadov by mala zdôrazňovať fakt, že bez ohľadu na to v akých rôznych politických prostrediach sa rečník môže nachádzať, ak využije správnu rétoriku, môže uspieť. Na ex-post hodnotení morálky rečníka taktiež nezáleží.

Aj keď rozdiel v tom, čo daní jedinci predstavujú je obrovský, v tejto štúdii sa zameriavam na dokazovanie, že títo rečníci majú veľmi špecifický spoločný rys – tým je zreteľný verbálny rečnícky štýl a rečnícke prostriedky, ktoré slúžia ako univerzálny obal akejkol'vek správy a môžu úspešne presvedčiť významné percento masy aby spôsobili, že celá krajina bude súhlasiť s myšlienkou.

Teoretický základ pre túto prácu je založený na štúdiu sociálno-politických teórií konformity, poddajnosti, poslušnosti a rétoriky vybraných sociálnych psychológov naprieč dvadsiatym storočím

KISS: The Good, the Bad and Something In-between

a aplikovaní ich teórií na konkrétne príklady vo verejných politických prejavoch.

Cieľom štúdie založenej na komplexnom výskume témy je potvrdiť tak zásadnú úlohu verbálnej rétoriky, ako aj relevantnosť teórie ku kontext napriek veľkému rozpätiu takmer 70 rokov s iba drobnými zmenami v tom, ako je slovná rétorika vykonávaná a že to je hlavne kvôli súčasným politickým dynamikám jednotlivých spoločností, v ktorých rečníci pôsobia.

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY .....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iv
ABSTRACT .....	v
<u>INTRODUCTION.....</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>THESIS STATEMENT .....</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>LITERATURE REVIEW .....</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>CHAPTER I. – UNILATERAL COMMUNICATION AND RELEVANT THEORIES.....</u>	<u>16</u>
CHAPTER II. – WHAT IT TAKES TO MOVE A MASS .....	23
CHAPTER III. – THE BATTLEFIELDS OF POLITICAL COMMUNICATION .....	32
CHAPTER IV. – THE ART OF SPEECH.....	36
<u>CONCLUSION .....</u>	<u>45</u>
<u>RESUME.....</u>	<u>12</u>

## INTRODUCTION

Speech is the most simple and relevant direct means of both communication and idea reproduction – it creates emotion in the most simplistic manner and, in contrast with, for example, actions, misinterpretation is less likely. In terms of the human species, it was speech, language, which allowed for all evolution, revolution and history as we can now see it today. Language is the primordial difference maker between us and the ones we left behind in evolution. And as it already is with most essential and inherent things, most people do not dedicate even a fragment of their mind to, speech, too, belongs to the sphere of infinitely complex concepts constituted throughout continuing centuries of converting consciousness connected to its complication and coherent comprehension. We still do not understand how communication in general really works, how the vocal stimuli lead to reflection about what the communicator uttered. We understand how codes work and how the brain de-codes messages, but recent findings of neurologists show that there might be even more to it. One thing that we do understand and have studied though is its power if used in the right manner.

Men, people in general, are attracted to power and with that comes the necessity of putting oneself above the others and in the end, the most effective and inexpensive way of doing that is through manipulation. Thus we have arrived to the main concern of this work.

Manipulation has been the main aim of politics for centuries and an efficient speaker always had the great advantage stemming from the ability to pull the masses to his side. The very essential differences between various attitudes on how a society should be administered were basically overshadowed by the way their representative has been able to communicate his idea to its members.

The most relevant perceptions of statesmen were built not after their rule, not in history books, but in their contemporary time and by the people who experienced these individuals and were in the reach of their influence. Rhetoric can turn a failure into a success and can turn a plain victory into an act of heroism – it all depends only on how the events are being narrated by the ones who are in charge of communication with the listeners. Their role is also essential to the events because they are the ones who put the power into a leader's hands. And it is specifically the character of the mass that allows leaders to influence and manipulate and form it as if it were wet

clay. Emotions, the force, the ideas that a leader can pour into the souls of each and every individual in a mass are the shapers and determinants of how it is going to behave in reaction. Emotions, force, ideas, etc. are all just words that we have come to understand and in them we see a great variety of possibilities and potential meanings. With just one word, either uttered just once in a lifetime, or repeated often enough, one can stimulate millions of reactions and if he is the master of rhetoric, he can do it consciously and purposively just to obtain what he wants and make people conform to his idea. Using rhetorical devices, the role of which is to make his political poetry sound better or more appealing, one can sew concepts into minds without anybody really realizing it. Conformity is the silently requested reaction to this action – in our case it is the conscious or unconscious movement towards behaving as the leader requires us to without questioning it – that is how much one is manipulated. Understanding the order of events in history is a necessity for having a complete insight into the political development of the world. Nevertheless, it is only natural for us to consider events most relevant and fundamental to the current state of affairs as the most important. Thus it is natural for us to look at the twentieth century as the most influential and worth studying in terms of political change. It has been the age of progress, revolution and political struggle for probably each and every country in the world more than any other era and with that came political entities that shifted the shape of history as we see it now. It is in my interest to study the rhetorical characteristics of the leaders of these movements since they are most accessible, more than the ones of the great leaders of the past and their speeches are readily available– thus I have decided to look at the three leaders of change that have, in my opinion, influenced the flow of events more than any other and were, at the same time able to convince great masses of people to connect with them and join their cause either by presenting violent or uplifting and glorious goals in their speech. The three leaders I have decided to study are Adolf Hitler, Margaret Thatcher and Barack Obama – each one of them representing a different era within the last century, but together having certain traits that I would like to point to – strong rhetoric skills and specific rhetorical patterns. The last hundred years have to offer a new paradigm of looking at events, people, objects around us – a scientific one. Never before have people had such a critical and reflective approach to subjects of interest and never before have they also provided themselves and each other with such a variety of measurable facts. Concretely, and most interestingly for our cause, the study of human behaviour and interpersonal relations, taking the human brain and its various mechanisms into account, has opened us the possibilities of researching the events as never before – sadly, it is only the recent times that we are able to study in a detailed manner – we do not have the means to do that if looking back at

the more distant past.

And it is specifically this field, in connection with the political way of looking at things, that I will dedicate this work to – how the greatest leaders of the 20<sup>th</sup> century have been influencing the masses of people around them and in the whole world using the skilled transformation of their ideas into words, which they then conveyed out, to the people.

We are going to question how this whole process works – how come one idea succeeds in the ears of the listeners and gets through, deeper and even becomes unforgettable and why some ideas vanish forever and their mediators vanish from memory as well. Also today, we have a tendency to perceive the things we see in a bipolar manner – are things / people / ideologies / aims good or bad? - does this moral and ethical questioning and dilemma make a difference in what someone is telling if he uses the right words? What are the recurring ideas and rhetoric devices which have proven to be most efficient if one aims to motivate and/or manipulate? By understanding rhetoric, by analyzing the leader's discourse I aim to raise awareness about the real strength of the words the politicians use in order to make people comply be it with a moral or immoral goal.

## **THESIS STATEMENT**

The rise to power of political individuals as state leaders lies to a great extent on how they represent their cause via giving public speeches and communicating their ideas to the masses, thus gaining national and world-wide recognition. Rhetoric has long been the strongest device for making people conform to a political leader's will and it still is now – we can look into historical accounts of mass behaviour in reaction to individual leaders and their performance on public stage and see identical rhetoric cues even if the leaders are from our current view completely different and represent different ideas. But most importantly, to their contemporaries, it does not really matter what they have to do in order to achieve their goal if the persuader manages to convey his idea strongly enough for them to comprehend his true vision, which he does via rhetoric using rhetorical devices that have a way of appealing to people's emotions and deeper instinct.

The main argument is that now, in the age of media as well as 30 or 70 years ago, once an aspiring political leader manages to gain public attention (meaning a sufficient amount of followers to get into the country's government), the most important factor that decides the following course of

his/her career are the public speeches he gives and the way he gives them in terms of how he conveys ideas in the form of spoken word and the efficiency of rhetorical devices he uses to give the speech importance. The most important ones of these are appealing to emotions (evoking anger/empathy/sadness/enthusiasm), rhetorical and literary devices and appealing to the psychology of 'us vs. them' (distincting himself and his followers/nation from another group/society/nation). By looking at the public speeches of the 3 leaders and the public reactions following them we will be able to measure their efficiency. Using the right rhetoric and managing to make people envisage his idea a leader can transmit his even seemingly inhuman ideals and 'compel' them to do what he wills.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The key sources for this thesis are a collection of the important works from the fields of political science, social psychology and rhetorical studies by the greatest authorities in their field of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. I shall use their work to both describe the terms used in my thesis i.e. political leadership, conformity,... and to bring forth and explain the most important alternatives of looking at a political speech. Also, my aim is to explain what the speeches of the 3 mentioned leaders have in common if we study their rhetoric and what effect the rhetorical devices they tend to use have on mass behavior and how they act as mediators of incentive. An important part is played by transcripts of political speeches which will be analysed and searched for the formerly mentioned rhetorical devices and other traits.

The importance of language in political discourse is not to be doubted. Perhaps it is, on the opposite, the solid amount of similar literature that makes it difficult to see only a few works as the sources of authority in addressing this topic.

Starting with John Langshaw Austin's *How to do things with words* (1975), we will look into the theory of speech acts, which describes in what way utterances get through to people and what the possible effects are. Another important source for this work is Paul Chilton's book *Analysing political discourse: theory and practice* (2004), in which he describes the great sphere of political rhetoric, its effective tools and he describes works of previous, prominent authors. We will further take a look at most important theories described in social psychology books, such as the one of social and group identities, attitudes and the changes thereof, conformity and obedience studies, accompanied by series of examples from these studies. The main source for an overview of socio-

psychological theories will be the course book by Aronson, Wilson and Akert called *Social Psychology* (2010), which is an incredibly rich source with excellent descriptions and references to original works, from which I have often further collected.

Herbert W. Simons et al. (2001) give us a fair account of how *Persuasion in Society* works and what it is – this work also helps us define the most important concepts that are used throughout the thesis. Also, the book of John E. Joseph titled *Language and Politics* (2006) gives us a thorough insight into the realm of political and social rhetoric and the shared relationship between these. Although this book discusses the general views on these topics, if we want to understand the whole concept of mass compliance to what he is drawing upon, we need to look into other literature we can reach and if we look at conformity, obedience and compliance, the question of sources becomes quite obvious. Ever since social psychology became a distinct branch of psychology, there have been only very few persons who might even now be called authorities in their field. These people are the ones who brought the greatest changes into both the general public and scientific perception of the whole field and contributed to its being popularised. Philip G. Zimbardo's *Lucifer Effect* (2007) gives us a wonderful example of a work that is based basically on a researcher's real, empirical experience – he dedicates his whole work to the explanation “of how good people turn bad” and it includes the aspect of language and how authoritative orders make completely innocent people (in terms of violence) comply and do whatever the superior wishes. Although Zimbardo's book has been published multiple times throughout the last five decades, his work mainly relates to the years of his original publication based on the Stanford Prison Experiment, in which he studied how a group of volunteers would react to his instructions to treat other volunteers as prisoners and torture them. In his book, Zimbardo offers us a perspective on situationism – the study of importance of circumstances as opposed to internal dispositions of people in cases of extraordinary behaviour.

The idea of framing is influenced by George Lakoff by whom we'll be looking at the book *The Political Mind* (2009), in which he offers us an insight into the American electoral races and how political parties and their individual representatives have been able to push out any competition just by developing something we might call a code-speech that appeals to the primary perception of the listener and simultaneously appeals to his emotions. This same topic is also considered in the book *Talking Right* by Geoffrey Nunberg (2006), who has a similar scope of perception to Lakoff, but is also looking at the specific ways of verbal manipulation and what we call each one, and what it consists of – we shall look at the speech transcripts using Nunberg's terms which, although, he did

KISS: The Good, the Bad and Something In-between

not find, managed to collect based probably on hundreds of online source.

As a source for the speeches of Hitler, Thatcher and Obama, I have used various internet sources, mostly websites which were dedicated to the speeches of these politicians.

## CHAPTER I.

# 1.0 UNILATERAL COMMUNICATION AND RELEVANT THEORIES

---

## SPEECH ACTS AND BEYOND

In this work, the structure, importance and most essentially, influence of political rhetoric will be a recurring theme that has to be underlined and analysed over and over again in order to make the final message clear. We will take on a pragmatic approach in which speech, particularly political and public, has the most profound power to both obviously and sublimely subjugate the views of voters. The line of thought demonstrated in this thesis is, and has been supported by eminent linguists, psychologists, social psychologists, political theorists, ultimately since the emergence of social and political sciences as such. Though not explained and understood to full detail, after the Second World War, Hitler's success and his ability to persuade millions about what he thought was right could not be considered a “secret trick to success” of any kind. The ecstatic, exuberant cheers of the Volk during each one of his rhetorical pauses could not have been attributed to his aesthetic looks, the people's ignorance or the sheer excellence of his political aims, but mainly to the appeal of his words on the mass, the way how he communicated the aims and the character of a mass as such.

This chapter gives the theoretical basis necessary to understand what speech is, as it focuses on the explanations of the most influential cognitive and political linguists, such as John. L. Austin, John. R. Searle and others, who have developed and critically analysed the theories of speech acts; and the theoretical structures that lie behind these speech acts and their influence analysed by George Lakoff and other linguists dealing with the theories of framing.

But before we engage, it is necessary for me to introduce the perspective from which we will be looking at these theories. I have decided to give them a shared name – or, to be exact, to give the type of communication described in them a more accurate distinction from communication in general.

Since the theoreticians describe the actions, communication and what is further to be elaborated in this chapter using an individual approach (as opposed to the dynamic of political influence, which

will be further elaborated from this chapter), they may be promptly named the *unilateral communication*. Under this unilateral communication we will understand all that is described by the theories which does not necessarily involve a second person – that is, the production of a thought, producing a utterance and the success or failure at implementing the right measures which are necessary for successful communication. That means, under this category fall the speech acts of locution, illocution and more.

## 1.1 SPEECH ACTS AND RELEVANT THEORIES

The primary idea that underlies the thesis of this work arises when, similarly as the founder of the Theory of Speech Acts, John L. Austin, also we understand that utterances are not merely what most people think they are. While we mostly consider them to be simply means of communication, descriptions of affairs or statements of facts, in his book based on a series of his lectures, entitled *How to do things with words*, the famous Oxonian philosopher argues differently. For a light start, he encourages the interested to see sentences not as statements themselves, but as tools used for making a statement and the statement itself being a logical construction. Also, according to his theory, many statements are not 'verifiable', as they had to be during times when the idea of logical positivism had been the prevailing paradigm of language studies. Austin was very right to lead the scholars out of the wrong path when he noted that to some sentences, no verifiability can be attached, yet they still are not meaningless. The four examples that he gave were the promise of commitment in the constitution of a marriage, naming of a ship, bequeathing a personal object in a will and placing a bet on tomorrow's weather (Austin, 1962). For our purpose, we can broaden this line of thought towards political speech – promises of political action, declarations of war and peace, threats. Austin calls these speech acts 'performatives' (as opposed to constantives, which are utterances used for plain stating); for in a given, relevant situation, these do not simply constitute statements, but actions. Naturally, for this to be true, circumstances have to be met. The declaration of a war has to come from the mouth (or pen) of competent political or military leaders and has to be heard by others in order to have impact; promises of political deeds have to happen in a space that will take these words not as plain words, but as the revelation of a possible future scenario. The type of sentences that served as a counter-example to the performatives, by which the speaker performs actions are the 'directives', using which the speakers tries to change the behaviour of the

listeners.

While speech acts in general might be of utmost importance for our cause, it is a further specification and division of these that we will be most concerned with. Austin's theory in *How to do things with words* goes way beyond just saying that acts can be performative or constative. The aim is to explain the various ways of when and how the spoken words have a deeper-than-observed meaning, the possibilities of understanding them and, most importantly, the mechanism behind speech-based influence on others. Thus the further distinction between locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts.

These three categories were necessary for Austin to distinguish, so let us look at why and how he did it.

## 1.2 LOCUTIONARY ACTS

Locutionary [*loqui* – lat. *to speak*] acts, as Austin calls them, are the utterances themselves, the acts of producing sound that vibrates through our vocal chords and leaves our mouth as what we recognise as speech (if we do). The locutionary act also involves some context in which the utterance is produced and it includes meaning in itself – the locution has to have it in order for it not to be only gibberish. What is more essential for us are the remaining two categories: illocutionary and perlocutionary speech acts.

## 1.3 ILLOCUTIONARY ACTS

If we see the act of locution as the act of saying something at all, producing a sound, the act of illocution is the act in saying something. It is a lot more than just the audible product of speech. Austin defines the whole spectrum of illocutionary acts “the doctrine of ‘illocutionary forces’” (Austin, 1975, p. 100). Our utterances, statements, are not to be only taken as what is being said; the circumstances, the situation (as I will elaborate further in a subsequent chapter), the meaning – they all are of utmost importance for the comprehension of a speech act.

Nevertheless, it is clear that under illocution, as the intention of saying, meaning of saying in a given situation, we mean categories of attempts at persuasion, advice, permission, prediction, order, threat, etc.. Put into our case, if a politician performs the locutionary act of saying that he will provide financial securities for the aged, the illocutionary act we suppose he made is the attempt at persuasion. Whether or not the speaker succeeds in his attempt at influencing another person via

speech is not a matter of illocution anymore, but of the third category – perlocution. The illocutionary acts are meaning-determining (Tsohadzidis, 1994).

Notice, I used the word 'suppose' in the explanation of the persuasive attempt. Why is this? Because no one else than the author of the utterance can know certainly enough what he meant. There is a category defined by Austin and developed by Searle (1969, 1975) named 'indirect speech acts', which specifies this. We will look at Searle's work shortly, in the further elaboration on the theory of speech acts as a whole and linking it closer to politics. Temporarily, it is sufficient to say that the outcome of a speaker's utterance might not always reflect the illocutionary intention he purposed to communicate.

### **1.4 PERLOCUTIONARY ACTS**

The perlocutionary act and its specifics is the most fundamental point for this work, one around which the whole idea of rhetorical influence revolves. As could be understood from what has been written just a while ago, it is not a speech *act* per se, but it is the effect that a speech act has on the recipient, the listener. For this thesis works with precisely with the matter of the speakers' influence on his audience, we will perceive the category of perlocution and perlocutionary acts as the cornerstone of all that is to be studied further.

The success or the failure of the perlocutionary act of a speaker depends on a plurality of factors, one of them being the illocutionary force of his speech – that is, how well he can put his intention into words. Is he able to succeed at persuasion when attempting to persuade? Does it feel like a real threat when he attempts to threaten someone? Do we believe him when he promises to change things to the better?

### **1.5 INDIRECT SPEECH ACTS AND NUDGING**

As indicated in the work *Indirect speech acts* (Searle, 1975), the principle behind the term is that the speaker does not always perform the obvious speech act in his utterance. Often, in cases of sarcasm, irony, or even requests, the actor goes beyond what can be understood on the basis of simple logic, but also implies another act. A perfect example for our cause could be the act of calumny – especially in political campaigning. A defamation aimed at another politician / public person does not only consist of stating and pronouncing negative ordeals, but also aims at persuading the audience to feel dislike towards the person. This is one of the most fundamental bases of an appeal

to the “us versus them” morality, which aims at creating an identity as defined against another one, which would be perceived as the alien, often hostile one. The indirect speech acts belong to those which are very often visible and inherent in the usage of rhetorical devices. Also, connected to this is the popular idea that one should never only see one intention behind the words of politicians, because they always follow multiple goals. Although it certainly can't be generalized like that, the case is often such and if there is another intention beyond a politician's statement, we are talking about indirect speech acts.

Another case of indirect speech acts, or indirect influence in general is the one presented in Richard Thaler's *Nudge* (2008). Still relevant to Searle's theory, this theory offers an unprecedented perspective on indirect acts of influence. The underlying principle is based on the idea that if the products in a school cafeteria are placed in a certain order which highlights the healthier snacks, the consumption of these snacks (and the general health condition of students) will increase. The whole process of “nudging” people towards decisions by making petite arrangements is referred to as 'choice architecture'. By appealing to our non-reflective, Automatic system of thinking (the one which does not require us to reflect on something in order to react), a speaker is able to drag us closer to him without us even noticing – we start accepting the things that he is saying until the point when we switch our critical or reflexive thinking back again and start thinking. Even the most subtle changes in rhetoric may change completely what the crowd is feeling at the moment of speech and if a speaker realizes this and knows how to use it to his or her advantage, victory can be achieved quite simply. An example could be when a politician evokes the sense of belonging together, or a sense of national pride when he talks about the insufficiencies of another nation. In that, he also makes the people like him more, since they do not identify simply as a group, but they identify with him as their leader.

## **1.6 FRAMING AND FRAMEWORKING**

One of the most recent, relevant and generally acknowledged idea trend or movement of the last decades has been the theory of framing. Pioneered by Erving Goffman (1986) and brought to the light of public interest by George Lakoff (2004, 2008), framing (and frameworking – working with the frames) deals with the locutionary context of a speech and the theory behind it is one of mass communication. Goffman developed an idea that there are two ways of how we see things –

naturally and socially. The perfect example that he gives is found in the second chapter of the book (p.39). Quite simple – at a furniture sale, if a woman looks at a mirror as an object of trade, her perception of the original purpose of the mirror fades away; but as soon as she leans back and looks at herself or adjusts her hat, she uses the mirror as it was originally intended to be used. Also, if our friend makes a grimace of pain, we might understand it as if he was really in pain – however, if he does it when an acquaintance that we both know to be annoying shows up, the frame and our understanding of the action is completely different.

Taken further and into the sphere of communication, we simply do not perceive words as plain words and phrases as plain phrases, but we put them into certain contexts. And, even further, if this context has been built and established by a certain media or a political agent, he can communicate with us in a much more simple way than if this had not been done. If a phrase is established in a certain society, then it might have a completely different meaning than somewhere else. And here the further elaboration of Lakoff comes into notice. Lakoff is a cognitive linguist and political scientist; but also a supporter of the Democratic party in the U.S.. He argues that the problem of the past victories of the conservatives stemmed in a very well established system of frames to which the politicians could appeal simply by mentioning certain words, which would then evoke certain feelings in their supporters – mostly, these were used to maintain a negative image of their political competitors (2004). Put simply, a good frameworking can keep us in the context of certain events while persuading us to perceive them completely differently – the subtlety is quite important, because similarly to nudging, frameworking must not be too obvious in order to be effective.

The success or the failure of the illocutionary act of a speaker depends on a plurality of factors, some indeterminable and arguable. Hitler, Thatcher and Obama have all obviously had (and still do, in the case of Obama) incredible power hiding in their speeches. But how and why do some people have the ability to influence, persuade and some not? The underlying thesis is that there are many ways of achieving this; that there are many ways of increasing the illocutionary force of one's rhetoric and thus increase its perlocutionary potential. There have also been many past works describing the sources of persuasion, e.g. in *Rhetoric* by Aristotle, where he talks about working on the audiences' emotions, giving the right impression of a speaker's personality or character, or by appealing to the truth and verifiability of the presented utterances. These three modes have been denominated the “pathos, ethos and logos” in academic literature. But this alone does not suffice – there surely is also a more aesthetical way of appealing to the listeners, one which goes beyond

logic, stated facts or the emotions (although emotions *do play* an important role in this work).

Rhetorical devices, which will be among the ones later analysed, are an inseparable part of convincing rhetoric and, especially, public speaking.

In this work, what we are basically going to do is to study the illocutionary power of three political leaders who have shown an incredible skill in making people obey and conform – simply put, their illocutionary power was so strong that it had a very direct power and influence, which made the switch between illocution and perlocution extremely fast. We shall look into the ways of why it was these political speakers, what they had in common and the idea behind this research is to find the link which had connected them. Whether it was the use of certain rhetorical devices or the plain, simple choice of words through which the speakers meant to amplify the ideas behind them, we will see arguments that put forward the influence of words.

## CHAPTER II.

### 2.0 WHAT IT TAKES TO MOVE THE MASS

---

#### THE PRINCIPLE BEHIND EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION

#### SPEECH ACTS AND BEYOND

In order to be able to defend and elaborate the idea of why rhetoric proves to be the most effective tool of political influence and what were the most effective traits in the rhetoric of the 3 powerful leaders, we must understand the mechanism behind it, as well as the (socio-) psychological aspect of conformity and mass obedience. There are numerous theorists who propose a set of approaches to political rhetoric, but seemingly none of them describe the realities of political communication sufficiently for our study. Political rhetoric in our case does by no means include only argumentation – let us leave argumentation as we know it to political debates. In this work, political rhetoric is all the words spoken in the reach of; and addressed at, an audience that is later to become the ruled nation in which the politician holds power. This approach is opposed to the one of a number of scholars like Billig (1987) or Finnlayson (2007), who despite presenting admirable theses in their theories of rhetorical psychology (Billig) and rhetorical political analysis (Finnlayson), both put political arguments in the centre of their locus, which I will argue is not completely sufficient for explaining successes of politicians through speech. Instead, we will look deeper into social and political psychology to see how the dynamics of natural and self-made authority, emotions and rhetorical ornaments are important and can all be contained in a speech that is aimed at a certain type of persuasion – the persuasion including finding someone to be an attractive leader and see his solutions as the only viable ones no matter what benefit, glory or even atrocity they involve.

This work also avoids the novel trends in the studies of political rhetoric which concern the usage of maps, cartoons, photographs and images, architecture, digital communication and even food (Condor, Tileaga, Billig, 2013) as tools of political rhetoric – these ought to be considered tools of political propaganda, not rhetoric. It is necessary to understand the distinction between political rhetoric and propaganda (or anti-propaganda). Whereas political propaganda is, as its name suggests, the propagation of certain political ideas by agents who are holders of these ideas and can

truly be disseminated by many means (and the number of means and media is increasing with time), political *rhetoric*, as stemming from the Greek ῥητορ-ικός – rhētorikós – oratorical (Perseus Digital Library), here means speech and speech acts relating to the act of public speaking. Naturally then, political rhetoric will pertain to political issues, which have been analysed in the introduction of this work.

The whole problem with trying to define political rhetoric as an individual category of political and social science is that one gets too distant from the basic, original suppositions that have already been pronounced in psychology and social psychology – but then again, psychology and social psychology greatly underestimate the immediate effect and implications of mass communication. By taking a moderate, central route approach, we will try to combine the two.

## **2.1 HOW TO ACHIEVE ULTIMATE PERLOCUTIONARY POWER**

So what are the necessary constituents that make for successful political rhetoric as a perlocutionary act?

In order for a speech to be a successful illocutionary act and achieve perlocution, it must pertain to actual social and political events (see Situationism below) and persuade to offer a solution to these – the speaker must briefly explain the importance of the topic and why it is relevant to the audience. He can do this in numerous ways, but the most successful way is by evoking a certain type of thinking and most importantly, emotions that would put the speaker into the listener's liking. A certain amount of argumentation is necessary, of course, but the whole idea does not revolve around it, as I will argue. Nevertheless, the important factors hide not only in the content, but in the style of the speech act, how it is presented. Only rarely will a politician succeed if he directly says all these things – they must be implied in his speech and he needs to use rhetorical devices and wordplay in order to express himself fluently and nonintrusively – these devices also serve to capture the attention and tend to stick in the minds of the audience. In the second chapter, we will look at the specific types of these devices which the 3 political leaders used. Perhaps most importantly though, when the politician speaks, there must be a certain kind of identification not only between the audience and him as a person (although necessary), but also between the audience and what he says – they must not only hear, but live his words and he must speak as if he had lived what he says. This pertains to framing. One might notice that these are non-coercive methods of evoking obedience.

This is for the reason that if we are focusing on 20<sup>th</sup> century history, we must notice that none of the greatest inspirational or political readers achieved obedience via coercion.

For us, the only viable and credible way to evoking obedience is in **facilitating a sense of necessity, admiration and awe through speech** (note: this notion does not fully correspond with Burkean and Perelman & Olbrechts-Tytecian theory of rhetoric although it recognises the need of identification and recognition of the audience as described in their theories). What we are talking about is basically a sort of manipulation – an exceptional orator manages to put a coloured glass between the audience and him, but also between the audience and the world that he describes. A persuasive orator does not describe the world and its problem in the most realist way, but as he wants his audience to see it through his eyes – this is a fact that is general and pertains to all political speeches. The key to success hides in persuading the people that this world – a world of meanings that have often been hidden until the politician revealed them, solutions that have yet not been offered and metaphors and symbols that people will start identifying their world with – is the one that is around them.

## 2.2 A MIXTURE OF THEORIES

Many theories share the shortcoming of being too narrow. These theories are always bound to get replaced as soon as someone else offers a viable alternative to them. One-sided argumentation, such as in the current theories of political rhetoric, one that tries to explain rhetorical success only by one theory is unnecessary and does not lead us anywhere. Although the theories of Burke, who only recognizes symbolism and the identification of a speaker with a mass; McLuhan, who is extremely progressive in his study of rhetoric and focuses on the medium more than the message, Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, who say that all rhetoric and the success or failure of a speaker depends only on the audience all encompass excellent argumentation and are all right to a certain extent, they alone do not and cannot describe the whole process of influence through rhetoric due to the fact that all of these rhetorical philosophers omit the importance of the aesthetical (and literary) aspects of rhetoric and the paradigm of speech acts. It is therefore that I have decided to offer an explanation, or theory, that would both combine some of the theories of great political psychologists and add a new factor that has not been proposed yet. Linguistic theories, the theories of Austin, Searle & co. have not yet been analysed fully in this context and said writers did not work with persuasion as a perlocutionary

act.

Now we will look at the justification of my thesis by looking deeper into the matter, through social psychology.

### **2.2.1 ROUTES OF PERSUASION**

When discussing perlocutionary acts and how to achieve them, we must look into the psychology of attitudes and attitude dynamics. The perhaps most relevant theory that has been developed was the one by Petty & Cacioppo (1986) and the more recent Petty et al. (2005), who have worked out an Elaboration Likelihood Model, which tells us whether it will be the central or external route to persuasion that will have an effect on us. The central route composes of logic, arguments and appeals to the rationality of the listener, whereas the peripheral route is more superficial – when it is triggered, the listener does not pay attention to the content of the speech, but to factors such as length of speech, the speaker and his characteristics, the speech flow and aesthetic – and if these factors are satisfactory, the speech will have success. The determining factor in routes to persuasion is people's interest in the topic, motivation to pay attention to the arguments and the ability to pay attention, which means no distractions. This partially pertains to situationism, but we need not forget, it is often the speaker who is able to clarify the importance and relevance of a given situation. The importance of a feeling of relevance has been demonstrated by Petty, Cacioppo & Goldman (1981) in their study, which meant to understand the audience's motivation behind listening to speakers. The most relevant outcome for this work is that the degrees of motivation of the audience to listen carefully and be persuaded by arguments peaked in cases when the audience have been told that the topic is highly relevant to them and their immediate future. And such were also the cases in history – as will be demonstrated later, all three of our case study speakers have begun their paths to power and popularity by pointing out and raising issues, directing enough of the spotlight towards them and explaining their relevance to the people of the nation. Another argument for the central, argumentative and relational route to perlocution is that it has a longer-lasting effect – which is what the leaders usually try to achieve.

Nevertheless, the orator must not only master argumentation and the delegation of relevance to listeners. Such an orator would not make a strong leader, for a strong leader counts with the unexpected and communicates not only with the intellectual elite or with the smart people, or even people who are prone to persuasion by arguments and rational appeal (since that gives away a

certain measure of rationality), but also to the superficial, first-sight, narrow-minded and hard-headed “sheep”. That is why I stress the importance of *form* and of *presentation*. As the studies by Cacioppo and his collective show, although the peripheral route to persuasion leaves effects that last for a briefer time, it involves the “superficial” factors – and, let's not forget, we are studying the influence of speakers not on individuals as units of society, but as a mass, since that is the only relationship worth measuring in the sphere of politics (at large). And, the mass is rarely rational – the mass behaviour is not completely predictable, since a minor discrepancy, such as a minor mistake in a politician’s personal life can create great political trouble. The orator must perpetually pay attention to everything that relates to the image he gives away and the words he speaks. By paying attention to the speaker, his appearance, his fluency, word stressing, word choice, they put a potential weapon into his arms – one, that can be attained and improved as long as the rhetor realises its importance. Again, let's stress, the mass as a whole is not rational, or at least not in most instances. Thus it does not always pay attention to rational speech, but the significant role is played by form, appearance and the aesthetics of speech, as has also been stressed very much in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. To relate this to Austin, Searle and their theoretical spheres, it is not only the attempt at illocution that has importance, but the locution as an act and the way it is performed, since this can also contribute to the final, perlocutionary effect (not a speech act, *n.b.*). But let us not make the same mistake that I have criticised in other theories and their makers – one-sidedness. It is the combination of form and performance and argumentation and the right appeal on the importance of the topic for people that guarantees success of speech.

### **2.2.2 CONFORMITY AND OBEDIENCE**

Conformity is a change in the behaviour that is caused by a real or imagined influence of other people (Aronson, Wilson & Akert, 2010). There are two types of social influences that cause conformity: normative and informational. Informational social influence is basically the one we conform to when we are uncertain about our position – we look to information, we want to have an assertive image of what is going around us and if we see somebody as able to provide us with this image, we conform to them. An infamous example of informational conformity is the case when a man called a McDonald’s in Kentucky, pretended to be a police officer and had one of the employees strip-searched and sexually abused. Just by pretending to be a police officer on the phone.

The other kind of conformity is normative – normative social influence occurs when one feels the need to be accepted. People change their behaviour in order to match that of others, because we want to keep on to our group identity (explained below). A perfect example to normative social influence are numerous political regimes, such as Nazi Germany or Soviet Russia, where people had no other option but to comply to the rules and not question them if they did not want trouble.

### 2.2.3 EMOTIONS AND ATTITUDES

The inevitability of the influence of emotions on basically all aspects of social, political life and all other spheres of human action is obvious, thus we do not need to state, but only analyse the state of the interaction between emotions and people in political rhetoric. In social psychology, emotions and attitudes are connected, but while emotions and rationality are often contradictory terms, the same does not apply to attitudes. Attitudes could be defined as natural evaluations of the world around us (people, things, but most importantly for our case - situations and language) and they are affected by both our cognitive (or rational), as well as our emotive perception (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). We will focus on the attitudes which are emotion-based, *affectively based attitudes* (Breckler & Wiggins, 1989).

Plenty of research has been done on the role of emotions and the dynamics of emotions in interpersonal relations, and also, most relevant to us, in the studies of conformity and obedience. We will now look at some of the most important and relevant studies and concepts and apply them to our case – rhetoric and speech acts. In these, emotions play a vital role, probably more important than anything else. Again, in support of the thesis of this work, we have to look at various ways of how the form of rhetoric influences emotions and attitudes and, subsequently, how these increase the probability of persuasion in the audience or mass.

But why would emotions and emotionally based attitudes play a role in politics? In political science and economics, we often hear an argument about the rationality of the voters or citizens as a unit (Edlin & Gelman, 2007; Breton, 2003). Social psychology says otherwise: “... it has been estimated that one-third of the electorate knows virtually nothing about specific politicians but nonetheless has strong feelings about them (Redlawsk, 2002; Wattenberg, 1987)” (Aronson, Wilson & Akert, 2010, p. 180). One-third is a large percentage, and as already mentioned above, in the section about peripheral routes to persuasion, the speaker needs to find a way how to appeal to the 33% in a right

manner. So, how do emotions work in rhetoric? What are the main emotional influences?

Among others, partially tied to framing and relevant theories is for example classical conditioning, on which framing basically builds. It was Pavlov, who, in his famous experiment, noticed that if the process of feeding his dog was preceded by the sound of a bell, after some time, the dog would start reacting to the bell sound alone as if food was present, too (sadly, not many people know that in a less famous experiment, Edwin B. Twitmyer developed the theory of classical conditioning simultaneously to Pavlov, and on the other side of the planet). What does this tell us about the psychology of rhetoric? If connected to framing and frameworking, we again see that simply by performing a simple speech act, we might excite certain emotions, which the ones skilled in frameworking do. But out of our three studies speakers, only two lived to hear about framing as an approved way of influence through speech and out of these two, only one had the opportunity to use it. We must suppose the remaining two arrived to these conclusions by another way, or simply had the talent (we shall demonstrate that they, in fact, did work with this phenomenon).

One of the most prominent and respected models of persuasion is the Yale Attitude Change Approach as proposed by Hovland, Janis, & Kelley (1953), which looks at who says what to whom, further elaborating on the source of communication, nature of the communication and nature of the audience. From this model, perhaps most important to us is the nature of communication perspective, in which it says that people are persuaded more by messages that seem not to be aimed at persuading them, as well as offering a multitude of arguments, both for and against an idea, but with a certain refutation of the opposing side. This attitude model is absolutely incongruent with our studied cases and with the rhetoric of the studied cases of political speeches. As we will see, none of them offer two-sided argumentation and all of them are very obviously aimed at persuading the audience and due to the success of Hitler, Thatcher and Obama, we can safely refute the model.

Now, as to the most important emotional influence dynamics, we will see some models from social psychology, which are commonly present in political speech.

Since we are concerned with influencing people through speech, we are looking at perlocutionary speech acts and a perfect example is fear-arousing communication.

In Aronson, Wilson and Akert (2010), fear-arousing communication is described as one that attempts to change somebody's attitude by triggering fear in them. We see this aspect very often and

it is intertwined with the “us vs. them” model, to be described shortly.

An excellent elaboration on fear-arousing aspects of rhetoric is presented by Chilton (2004), when he describes multiple themes that serve the mentioned purpose. He divides political fears as: fears of unspecified danger, fear of future dangers, fear of blame/shame, fear of domination or invasion, fear of change, fear of threats and destruction (both present and future). In people, the reason to fear something or someone which is triggered by the speaker, calls for an automatic reaction of relief if they see the speaker as one being able to eradicate the feared object. Therefore the appeal to fear is mostly immediately followed by an offered solution, which makes the mass prone to looking up to the speaker as the only possible saviour.

Another key theory in the studies of emotional influence is the social identity theory, as proposed by Henri Tajfel (1979). According to the social identity theory, people perceive themselves in multiple ways. For us, one of the most important concept is having a group to which one belongs (it might be a social class, family, nation, etc.). Our groups give us the feeling of social identity, which makes us feel like we belong somewhere and we naturally feel fear if our group is facing trouble. This is why the fear-arousing communication as described above is so important. Once we get into the feeling of being members of a group, we start distinguishing people around us according to the “us vs. them” categories, subconsciously seeing the others as different, often as enemies. Why is this important for us? The whole idea of a nation is based on a social identity. When discussing great political leaders, they are not called leaders without a reason – they are the leaders of one of the groups and the dynamic is very important. If the leader speaks, people have a tendency to listen to them, if he criticizes “the others”, we have an even bigger tendency to oppose the others and see them as dangerous. A skilled speaker will play a very interesting game of first creating a strong sense of social belonging, then differentiating “the others” and thus creating a bond of belonging. Just by playing with these 2 concepts, the “us vs. them” and fear-arousing communication, the speaker can manipulate the mass according to his will and obedience will ensue in all cases in which the audience sees themselves as members of the group. As we will see later, the rhetoric really relies on these concepts, especially when it comes to national rhetoric, propaganda and campaigning. Let us look at a citation from Zimbardo’s work: “When a power elite wants to destroy an enemy nation, it turns to propaganda experts to fashion a program of hate. It requires a "hostile imagination," a psychological construction embedded deeply in their minds by propaganda that transforms those others into "The Enemy. " The image of a dreaded enemy threatening one's

personal well-being and the society's national security emboldens mothers and fathers to send sons to war and empowers governments to rearrange priorities to turn plowshares into swords of destruction. It is all done with words and images. To modify an old adage: Sticks and stones may break your bones, but names can sometimes kill you.” (Zimbardo, 2007, p. 11)

## 2.3 CONCLUSION

How does all this relate to our topic? Well naturally, the influence of rhetoric touches upon all of these social psychology theories. Words are the most useful way of conveying emotions and influencing emotions in big masses, especially if the communicated message can reach many people. Informational social influence is precisely what rhetorical influence is about – the political leader is able to manipulate people according to his will by appearing to be the most informed person and the person most capable of doing something with the information. In speech, political leaders are also able to appeal to people’s social identities, thus calling on the normative social influence factor. It is precisely the flexibility and multi-utility of speech that makes it a perfect weapon for manipulation, creating conformity and obedience. It is the least intrusive one, too. If one does not want to listen, he does not have to. It is the purest form of getting people to obey. After this part, a part that explains situationism and its importance in this thesis is coming up. Afterwards, we will return to the study of conformity, social identity and the like in the analyses of the 3 speeches by Adolf Hitler, Margaret Thatcher and Barack Obama.

## CHAPTER III.

### 3.0 THE BATTLEFIELDS OF POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

---

#### SITUATIONISM AS A SUPPORTING PILLAR OF RHETORIC

Although this work elaborates and analyses the idea that it is the form and the content of rhetoric which occupies the capital position in the dynamic of political communication and success in the views of the public, we must not omit the context, the general situation, nor lose sight of what circumstances surround the rise of a politician to power. Every studied force, every researched factor needs a certain setting in which it can achieve the climax of its effect and as already mentioned, there is a certain environment in which rhetoric proves to be most successful, or, to put it in another way, more successful than any other factor. Every asset of political communication has to be set into an environment, where the aspects that are being analysed can be highlighted as the notable ones. For political communication in general, it is the interaction between political figures and interest groups; the process of comprehending this includes great deals of conformity studies and group dynamics. This work focuses on the interaction of an individual political leader, especially a strong one, and a group that is to become the ruled nation. Nevertheless, the whole scope, or perspective of this study, does not include the whole image of a politician's career and the ups and downs of the interactions with the mass. This work focuses on the initial success, all that is needed for a politician and orator to be propelled towards popularity and a general respect of his abilities. The conformity which he is able to cause within a mass of millions is the fuel for his further career and it keeps him going for as long as he maintains it. This sole process and timeframe include insights and mechanics that could be analysed within a dozen of books, yet we will focus on a short period of the political orator's life; the period, when he evolves from a popular politician, to a generally, widely respected leader with incredible influence and with the power to manipulate millions. These are the situations and environments that the subjects of the study cases have found themselves in.

From these timeframes of our three politicians' lives we are also going to extract the speeches, analysing their most important ones.

As the famous psychologist, Philip Zimbardo (2007) wrote, it is necessary to study not only interpersonal dynamics as such, but what the situational forces in a given context bring forward.

It is especially from Zimbardo's *The Lucifer Effect* that we have learned of the situational forces in

cases of obedience and conformity.

### 3.1 WHY SITUATIONISM

To begin with, for example Philip Zimbardo, perhaps the most prominent researcher who has looked into the importance of situational forces, is a defender of the theory that situational power plays a more important role than individual power in given contexts (such as the Stanford Prison Experiment) (Zimbardo, 2007). This reasoning may sound perfectly logical in certain contexts, as I will refer to Zimbardo's examples, however, I propose the idea that the situation is constructed out of a series of influences and certain individuals have a bigger and some a lesser power, to transmit their influence into the situation. In leader figures, this effect is great and they have a great say in the course of at least their countries' societies and they can do this by either performing an action or even before that, performing a speech act. An individual alone can simply not become such a powerful person, if he or she is not able to build up a strong structure of supporters. In order to do that, he needs persuasion, and in order to be persuasive – speech.

So how is the 'situational force' described in social psychology? After coming upon the problem of the term not being well defined in neither the work of Aronson, Wilson & Akert (2010), nor in the work of Zimbardo (2007), I was forced to look into how else the term could be expressed, arriving upon 'external force' and 'external attribution', which is defined as an explanation of behaviour as the result of external (situational) influences, as opposed to one dependent on individual characteristics (boundless.com). The closest to a definition that we get in the Social Psychology course book (2010) is the differentiation between internal attributions (about a person's character or personality) and all other events and variables that make up someone's life.

It seems like there is a missing link – is the effect of rhetoric on a mass an external force or an individual force? In order to eradicate all misunderstanding, the best thing is to describe it as an external or situational force of an individual. The individual political leader thus becomes a major force among the situational powers to influence the decision-making process of individuals who are organised in a mass.

But there is more to the 'situation' being analysed in this thesis. As mentioned above, it would be a

mistake to underestimate the situation in our studied cases, there is a need to clarify it clearly. For our case, it is therefore important to define a setting, to explain the circumstances in which the rhetoric of an emerging political leader has the biggest possible impact and explain why it is assumed to have it - based on already mentioned socio-psychological explanations for conformity.

### **3.2 INTRODUCTION INTO STUDIED SITUATIONS**

In our studied cases, in the cases of chancellor Adolf Hitler, prime minister Baroness Margaret Thatcher and president Barack Obama, the situation has always been as following: States, facing major problems in their internal political setting, both concerning effective policies and effective economy, lacking integrity and a strong link that would bind the people together. The previous political events caused controversy and dislike in the eyes of the public which is discontent with the politicians and it is awaiting a change – it is inevitable that something happens. The soon-to-be world-historical individual (term coined by Hegel, 1977) now has to grab the public's attention and hearts and motivate them to move onwards for a common cause.

So what were the aspects of the situations that contributed to the rises to power from our 3 studied politicians?

During the Weimar Republic period, Germany was burning. The people were burning with a sense of injustice and the country with economic struggle. The War Guilt Clause in the Treaty of Versailles left Germany in a desperate state of not being able to move in any direction, being under the baton of France and England and being the black sheep of Europe. When the Great Depression hit, the desperation became even deeper. The scapegoat were the paralysed Weimar representatives and, unfortunately, the Jewish population, which mostly lived a life of success and bourgeoisie even during the Depression. The doors for a new leader were open and from our perspective it is beginning to be clear why it was Hitler to bring a change.

In Britain, the workers were striking, led by the unions, the country was simply impotent and union leaders were even accused of being paid by the USSR to decay the country – the escalation of all this was the infamous Winter of discontent. The scapegoat – James Callaghan (pm) and the Labour party he had chaired were unpopular enough to get replaced – the question was only who was to become this person. I shall elaborate on why it was Thatcher.

In 2008, the situation in the U.S. was tense, too. The popularity of G.W. Bush Jr. has rapidly fallen,

as has the popularity of the Iraq war. Also, the gradual onset of the second greatest financial crisis since the Great Depression that started in the States meant fear and disillusionment about the old government and the republican rule.

Without these situations, the relevant politicians would probably not have emerged in the respective countries. Or, to say the least, they would have had a smaller chance; but it is hard to give a retrospective prognosis. Being the great speakers they are, they would have been able to accustom their speech to the needs of any situation. And although on a strictly theoretical level, this is where my thesis is partially hidden – it should not matter what the situation, given a right speaker (as will most strongly be demonstrated in the case of both Obama and Hitler), the person should be able to rise among other politicians and win the necessary votes. We do not need to attribute the victory to their qualification in some topic, or being predisposed to solve some issue – no, it is about being able to persuade the people about having the predisposition and qualification to solve a specific problem.

### **3.3 CONCLUSION**

This chapter served to give credit to the theories of social psychologists, especially Zimbardo, who, through studying the most famous experiments done on conformity supposed the importance of the situational factors in experiments such as Milgram's Peer shock administration, in which individuals were willing to cause severe trauma, or death to subjects of teaching under the influence and orders of an experimenter; Asch's group conformity experiment, in which people were willing to be subject to the opinion of a group majority in visual tests and thus completely discard obvious facts in the judgement of the length of 3 lines; and his own, Stanford Prison Experiment, in which people (including Zimbardo himself) were willing to express inhuman behaviour towards other subjects of the experiment due to their roles and feelings of superiority and power in an experiment of a group of guards and prisoners in jail.

The difference between the thesis related to this work and the one proposed by Zimbardo only stands in the fact that Zimbardo is persuaded that the power of a number situational forces is stronger than anything else without attributing a main role to a specific one, while this work aims at proving that there is one – and it is the power of a strong individual displayed and put into practice through rhetoric included in a given situation.

## CHAPTER IV.

### 4.0 THE ART OF SPEECH

---

#### AN ANALYSIS OF CASE STUDIES

Since this whole work has been revolving around the theory that rhetoric proves to be the most important factor in a politician's way up the political ranks and we have not yet come upon specific demonstrations of the cause-and-effect motion in the discourse, the time has come to look at specific political speeches made by our 3 studied politicians in 3 different political environments analyze them and pinpoint their effect on the masses, the by them soon-to-be-ruled people. Once again, I have chosen Hitler, Thatcher & Obama to demonstrate that there seem to be universal rules which if one studies no matter in what period of our time, and no matter what the real underlying aim hiding underneath the cover of campaign and verbal propaganda is, he or she can become a great orator with great influence. The two latter case studies underline the importance of eloquence even more than how it might seem. Both Thatcher and Obama find themselves in a very challenging circumstance – they are both applying for a political role that has never before been played by anyone of their social status – Baroness Thatcher was to become the first female Prime Minister and Barack Obama was to become the first Afroamerican president. We can only imagine that the demands which had been pushed upon them were higher than those of the people who do not have a natural disadvantage of being the firsts to try something. Had they made a mistake in their speech (or any other treat of political representation, for that matter), they would probably not have survived in the rough political environments.

What will we be looking for in the speeches? First of all, a common pattern of speech acts, rhetorical devices and literary techniques that goes hand in hand with what social psychology describes as an effective tool of conformity-aimed action. There are a handful of these and the accumulation of these in a speech is supposed to give the speech an extremely persuasive force. As we shall see, 3 of the most distinguished politicians of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, although all being extremely diverse in their politics, ideas, backgrounds, social statuses and political aims, share a rhetoric of success which is determined to a great extent by these patterns. Furthermore, these patterns are

notable not only in the speeches of these 3 politicians, but in the speeches of a great majority of politicians that have proved to be successful in persuading the people to join and support their cause. So, in collaboration with the findings described in the second unit, we will now look at what more specifically constitutes the most successful speeches.

#### **4.1 RHETORICAL DEVICES AND LITERARY TECHNIQUES**

Rhetorical devices serve the purpose of improving the flow of words, highlighting certain notions, contributing to the aesthetics of a speech and they have a tendency of sticking in the mind (a notable example might be e.g. “I have a dream ...” by Martin Luther King Jr.). They are simply an effective way of conveying an idea to the audience and combined with specific, touching themes, as described by Aaronson, Wilson & Akert (2010) and Chilton (2004), they appeal to the emotional centres of the brain, which is connected with the aesthetic factor. People mostly remember them as the annoying part of their literature studies at high school that they had to memorise in order to be able to identify them in a written work. Finding out their importance years later, after having finished high school, might be a surprise for many people – that is, finding out that they are not insignificant, purely poetic means of colouring language and a necessity for literary ornamentation, but, right usage provided, one of the most efficient tool in manipulating people. Also, as demonstrated in the earliest part of this work, they are a great tool for the implementation of an indirect speech act, or subtle persuasion. Rhetorical devices are not dependant on ideas – just the cunning of the speaker. Thus, they are the ultimate weapon of conveying both glorious, as well as terrifying ideas – they themselves have no preference.

Our studied politicians have used a variety of rhetorical devices, but the one who was noted to have used the most of them was Barack Obama, owing perhaps to either a team of public relations professionals or his own rhetorical skills.

So what are the most common rhetorical devices and literary techniques used in speeches by our three studied politicians?

A list of common literary techniques and rhetorical devices:

*Imagery*: It is the use of figurative language to create visual representations so that the ideas appeal to our physical senses. Such examples are ones of colour, size, smell, form, etc. (a great dark river of threat is coming towards us)

KISS: The Good, the Bad and Something In-between

*Similes and Metaphors:* They draw a similarity between two distinct objects (love is like a red rose, the room is as hot as hell ...).

*Hyperbole:* It is deliberate exaggeration of actions and ideas for the sake of emphasis, such as “I have got a million things to do.”

*Personification:* It gives inanimate objects a power usually ascribed to living things (the nation will rise).

*Alliteration:* The same group of consonants close together in a sentence (a shocking, sickening sound).

*Allusion:* The reference to some other person, place, event or occasion when mentioning another thing (“Five score years ago, a great American, in whose symbolic shadow we stand today, signed the Emancipation Proclamation.” –Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., 1963).

*Amplification:* The repetition of a word or a phrase in order to emphasize it (suffering, great suffering came upon us ...).

*Gradatio:* Intended, gradual amplification of an idea

*Anaphora:* When one repeats a word or phrase in successive phrases (Was it not us who won? Was it not us who came here first?).

*Antimetabole:* Repetition of words or phrases in reverse order (Do not see a man in a crowd, see a crowd represented in a man.).

*Antithesis:* Making a connection between two opposite ideas to form a contrast – “Speech is silver, but silence is gold.”

*Enumeratio:* Making a point about something by adding many adjectives (these small, intimidating, silly people).

*Metanoia:* The correction of a statement immediately following immediately after the statement itself :”It is a scandal, no, disaster!”

*Rhetorical question:* A question to be asked and answered by the speaker

(examples.yourdictionary.com, literarydevices.net)

What the speakers further do in their speeches is playing with rhythm, but that cannot be demonstrated in written form, thus I have no choice but to hereby note that it indeed is an important trait of effective rhetoric.

## 4.2 THE ANALYSES OF SPEECHES

Let us now proceed to the analysis of the three speeches, finding the common patterns and proving the aforementioned arguments. We shall first look at the rhetorical devices and literary techniques and shortly thereafter at the more directly psychologically effective speech acts, routes of persuasion such as framing, performatives, appeal to the ‘us vs. them’ mentality and using fear-arousing phrases, group identity and symbolism. Added to these I have religious reference, to find if this emotionally loaded concept finds its place among the others.

### 4.2.1 HITLER’S SPEECH

The first speech to be analysed is by Adolf Hitler. As already described, we will analyse speeches of politicians who were soon to become the highest powers in their countries, assuming that those speeches were the ones with the greatest impact, the ones which have been heard and seen by an audience as wide and as diverse as possible – and the ones which have allowed the politician to perform great speech acts.

Hitler’s Proclamation to the Nation [Aufruf an das deutsche Volk] (31/2/1933) was his first speech in a major political role, but not the top role, which he would attain in a short period. By becoming chancellor through the election by president Paul von Hindenburg, Hitler got to the resources needed for him to expand his power to the maximum, becoming *Führer und Reichskanzler* just a year later.

The speech represents what Hitler meant for Germans and in Germany, it is the best speech to view and hear when imagining Hitler as a politician who is at the top of his individual powers, but not yet political status. In the speech, he demonstrates what his plans are with the German nation.

I have originally analysed the speech in German, as to maintain the original, untranslated text which demonstrates the devices used in a better way, as the speaker had originally intended. I will therefore show the “ornaments“ in their original, German form, accompanied by an accurate translation.

The complete speech, both in German and the English translation can be found in the appendix together with a description of meanings of the highlights. I have decided to highlight all relevant parts of speech in both the original and translated text for better transparency.

I will not meticulously point out absolutely all of them, since that would make the whole 8 pages of Hitler's speech colourful – demonstrations will be provided sufficiently to make a strong case.

### **'Aufruf auf das deutsche Volk'**

Hitler strongly draws upon the notion that in the previous 14 years (the 14 years are an ever-recurring pattern in the speech) the Weimar government has brought decay upon the German Volk. This, though, he does not state openly in the beginning. He uses frameworking for people to realise that somebody has brought decay and downfall, and only later does he clarify who is to blame, in waves of animosity against the Communists. But in the beginning, he does not only indirectly identify internal enemies – he goes beyond that, and in a typically innocently-seeming fashion, he blames the destruction of harmony in the world on the fact that there have been winners and losers in the world, thereby pointing at the victorious nations of WWI as the ones to blame (thereby playing on the frame of unjust loss on the side of Germany). Hitler puts his NSDAP in the position of the saviour afterwards, being called on by the president and God, thus creating an imaginary source of credibility and validity to their rule. He proposes the NSDAP as the only viable option as opposed to the Marxists and offers a very persuasive narrative of the aims of the NSDAP about rebuilding the state and maintaining peace in Europe. Nice, peaceful rhetoric seemed to prevail in Hitler's speeches at this time; little did people know what wickedness would come after his claiming power. In this speech, he does not raise the question of the Jews directly, although it is known from his other public performances that he held the Jews partially responsible for the decay since November 1918.

Altogether, the speech proved to be a very effective example of the argument that Hitler based his rhetoric a lot on rhetorical and literary devices and careful psychology which served the purpose of getting people to agree with him through the arousal of fear and subsequent suggestion that his solution is the only one.

It is definitely too soon to make conclusions at this point, but let us recapitulate what we have come to by analysing a famous speech of Adolf Hitler, one of the most infamous, but best speakers in recorded history: in his rhetoric, he depends heavily on arousing fear and on a clear distinction of an enemy that poses a threat to the nation that he presents himself as the saviour of. His speech is full of the formerly named rhetorical devices, as well as speech acts, which I have decided not to highlight since they would mostly intervene with the other studied objects – nevertheless, the whole idea of promises, oaths and vows is quite apparent and one does not need exceptional observational

skills in order to find them.

Thus far, the thesis of the work is confirmed in a one-third measure; let us see if it shall be confirmed after an analysis of our second speech – this one by Margaret Thatcher.

#### **4.2.2 THATCHER'S SPEECH**

After her victory in the Conservative party's internal competition, Margaret Thatcher had another great challenge ahead – being elected Prime Minister. Never before has a woman led the Conservative party; becoming Prime Minister seemed almost impossible at that time. Nevertheless, she seems to have claimed her post at the right time, during the Winter of discontent in Great Britain; at a time when the labour party failed to demonstrate strong leadership over the country. Protests were happening every day called for by the most petty reasons, union leaders were corrupt and not willing to work anymore, the streets of London were drowned in rubbish, because the city cleaners were striking, etc. In this situation, Thatcher was supposed to take the hard role of persuading the nation of putting their trust into a conservative woman's hands, to solve the problems.

Thatcher seemed to be well prepared for taking up this role and her campaign was a great success – she got closer to the people, showing herself as one of them and gave hundreds of speeches to the common folk, to labourers, to both blue and white collar workers, to youths; simply to all who could contribute to her victory with enough votes. As a case study for this analysis I have chosen her Speech to conservative trade unionists, which she gave on the 29<sup>th</sup> of April, 1979.

#### **‘Speech to Conservative Trade Unionists‘**

Very similarly to Hitler's speech, Thatcher uses a great variety and a great number of rhetorical devices in her speech. She uses them not only to make the speech more aesthetically appealing, but also to convey indirect messages, most often in connection to her political opposition. The two speeches actually have a lot common – they both identify their enemies many times throughout the text, they both show themselves as better in comparison with the competitor and, most importantly, propose themselves as the only possible solution (which is demonstrated by the number of how often the word 'we' is used. While Hitler uses the word 'wir' 17 times, Thatcher uses it

approximately 50 times. Nevertheless, both are using it both in order to point at them as a party / political faction and as a collective identity with the audience. A range of speech acts is also apparent in Thatcher's speech – all the promises, all the proposed solutions and the indirect and direct indications that it is the Conservative party which is to transform the society to the better are nice examples of speech acts.

Until now, the thesis stands – both politicians are using a great range of rhetorical devices which do not seem to fill any purpose but aesthetical – on the surface. They are indeed both using these also in order to convey indirect messages in a simpler manner, to which the crowd reacts without even noticing it and by building a frame of the negative enemy and the beautiful, intelligent Hitler or Thatcher.

It is time to create an analysis of the last speech, one by Barack Obama and either confirm or refute the thesis.

#### **4.2.3 OBAMA'S SPEECH**

All who have been following the worldwide political developments of the recent years will surely remember the time when Barack Obama replaced G.W. Bush in the Oval office. Some might even remember his speeches and the impression they managed to leave behind after the inflow of words stopped. In the eyes of many, Obama came, similarly to Thatcher, at the right place, in the right time. After Bush, so to say, "went out of fashion", the people obviously needed a change. The presidential elections runoff in the US is usually a one between experience and change. The greatest problems that the US were facing was a lack of further trust in G.W.B., troops still in Iraq, lack of healthcare and a general lack of trust in politics. Obama was there to promise to change all of that.

#### **‘The American Promise‘**

#### **Acceptance Speech at the Democratic Convention**

It is obvious that even the last speech copies the presuppositions of the thesis and has a lot in common with the first two. Although Obama seems to have completely avoided any attempt at creating fear in people, this just demonstrates that that factor was not as essential as originally

thought and that one can be persuasive without it. Nevertheless, more than any previous, the speech is completely filled with symbols, referring to the past presidents and the history of the United states, there are more rhetorical devices, mainly anaphorae, which serve to emphasize a point by repeating a phrase multiple times. The group identity seems to be an essential concept for Obama, who has mentioned the concept of 'we' over 80 times in his speech. President Obama, similarly to the previous speakers, heavily relied on the concept of 'us vs. them' mentality, which he often demonstrated by pointing out the vices of his political competitor. Immediately following the critique came promises of making the United States a better place, with more freedoms and more certainties at the same time, especially based on his own experience – this factor is an interesting contribution to the altogether concept of speech acts – relating the speech act to one's own experience, thus creating a more credible, more immediate idea.

### 4.3 ANALYSIS CONCLUSION

Through a careful observation of these three exemplary speeches (although upon doing further research and seeing that the validation of my thesis is not coincidental), we definitely see a common pattern in the speeches that provides us with certainty that the most prominent politicians and most respected political speakers and leaders of the 20<sup>th</sup> century seem to share an interest in decorating their rhetoric with a number of rhetorical devices which we would be naive to describe as only ornamental. Naturally, as mentioned sooner, the role of rhetorical devices is, among other things, to better the flow of speech, but definitely not to simplify it. In top politics, very few things happen without a careful pre-analysis and careful calculation and it would be a mistake to assume that the speechwriters would put such an incredible amount of “ornaments“ into a speech by accident or just for the purpose of it sounding better. And even if it were so, we are now aware of the existence of this pattern and of the influence of something aesthetic, ornamental, more artistic on the emotional part of our brain. It is therefore right to assume that a degree of decoration in a speech serves to impress, using the peripheral route to persuasion, making it impossible for the listener not to notice at least that, if he is not concentrating on the power of the argument itself. We have not analysed the strength of arguments, because it goes without saying that these 3 political leaders were absolute experts in argumentation and by analysing the argumentative side, we would be doing something that has been done many times before. In many of the cases, we have observed the working with political frames in people and nudging, when a subtly indicated fact in a statement was to serve as a clue as to what the speaker really intended to say, thus indirectly acting upon the listener’s perception.

The most common and the strongest traits in all the speeches (now omitting rhetorical devices) is the strong concept of an enemy and repetitive persuasion based on attempts at pointing out the common enemy or competitor and displaying and stating their mistakes, thereby triggering the ‘us vs. them principle‘ and obviously showing that the speaker was the better one. This criticism was mostly immediately accompanied by an explanation and promise of how the speaker would make things better, thus using a speech act (as described in Austin’s theory).

## CONCLUSION

This bachelor thesis has been dealing with the description of an alternative approach to analysing political rhetoric in speeches given by prominent political leaders. Throughout the studies of social psychology, political psychology and the impact of these on the form of political speech, many models have been created, which were supposed to stand as an exemplary form of approaching the creation, interpretation, influence and analysis of speeches given in environments of the political sphere. Curiously enough, throughout my preparation and research preceding the writing of my thesis, I have not come across ones that would comment on the importance of theories of speech acts as proposed by the famous oxonian linguist, John Langshaw Austin. Furthermore, the importance and role of "decorative factors", such as rhetorical and literary devices in the performance of said speeches does not seem to be a recognized aspect in the study of rhetorics either. By researching these two aspects individually, a link started showing up; one that would be a recurring pattern in the speeches of influential political leaders, such as Adolf Hitler, Winston Churchill, Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Jr., Margaret Thatcher and Barack Obama. All of these great speakers have been using a great variety of rhetorical and literary devices, speech acts as described by Austin, appeals to people's social identities and fear-arousing motives. While the latter two have been acknowledged and analysed in the political, socio-psychological and linguistic discourse, the preceding have not.

Therefore I have decided to form a thesis that would attribute major importance to them and study how they are constituted and what the important links between them are, using a great spectrum of literature offered by respected social and political psychologists. In order to validate my thesis, I have also decided to conduct a case study of three greatly important political leaders of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, who were divided by many factors which would only emphasize the universality of the truth embedded in my work. By studying 3 speeches (one from each leader), which were presented by them in times preceding their ascent to the highest political positions of their countries; and finding out that they indeed do share common traits described above, I have come to the findings and subsequent conclusion that, not taking into account the argumentation or audience of the speaker, the speech act theory; specifically the part about indirect perlocutionary acts, does accurately describe the process of political influence and an important tool in creating this influence are not only the appeals to group identities and fear-arousing communication, but also the supposedly "decorative" rhetorical devices, which constitute a way of getting around the listener's

central attention, using a peripheral route of persuasion. But centering the whole thesis around this argument would probably still not have sufficed the requirements of a proper analysis, therefore I have included another not-so-frequently recurring theme in social psychology, which is the theory of situationism as proposed by Philip Zimbardo, who ascribes major importance to not internal dispositions of individuals when creating a dynamic of influence, but the situation. Consequently I have described the importance of the situation in the studied cases of politicians influencing and, most importantly, persuading people to obey to them and vote for them in upcoming elections and then proceeded to analyse the speeches in themselves.

I consider this work of importance perhaps not to scientific and academic community on a general level, but it has been an important experience for me in the sense that I have forced myself to perform a meticulous and elaborate research into a topic which I initially only had (a now apparent) superficial interest in, and bring an academic paper to its conclusion. If it got to the attention of the academic community, I would like it to be presented as an original work taking not a necessarily innovative, but unorthodox view on the construction and constitution of effective rhetoric, serving perhaps as a guide for people who are interested in preparing speeches or other tools of political propaganda.

## RESUMÉ

Táto práca sa zaoberá alternatívnym prístupom k analýze rečníckych prejavov. Hlavnou tézou je myšlienka, že doteraz vypracované teórie rétoriky sú príliš diverzné a opomínajú mnoho dôležitých faktorov, medzi hlavnými je teória rečových aktov spísaná J.L. Austinom. Táto práca teda zhrňa poznatky z viacerých iných teórií a dopĺňa ich o teóriu rečových aktov, ako aj o novú teóriu, v ktorej ide o myšlienku, že rétorické a literárne prostriedky v prejavoch nemajú iba ozdobnú funkciu, ale slúžia na sprostredkovanie jedného druhu rečových aktov – nepriameho rečového aktu. Pri tomto rečovom akte ide predovšetkým o myšlienku, že nepriamy vplyv prednesu môže mať na človeka väčší dopad, než priamo stanovené argument, ktoré majú za cieľom presvedčiť. Ďalšou súčasťou tézy je myšlienka, že veľkí politickí rečníci 20. storočia zdieľajú isté prvky rétoriky, ktoré ich rétoriku činili a činia efektívnou. Táto téza sa potvrdzuje vďaka analýze príhovorov Adolfa Hitlera, Margaret Thatcherovej a Baracka Obamu, na ktorých prednesoch je úplne zjavný prvok prehnanej ozdobnosti a zároveň apelovania na nepriamu psychológiu.

## References

Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D., & Akert, R. M. (2010). *Social psychology* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Breckler, S. J., & Wiggins, E. C. (1989). On defining attitude and attitude theory: Once more with feeling. In A. R. Pratkanis, S. J. Breckler, & A. G. Greenwald (Eds.), *Attitude structure and function* (pp. 407 - 427). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Breton, A. (2003). *Rational foundations of democratic politics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Burke, K. (1969). *A rhetoric of motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Connors, R. J., Ede, L. S., & Lunsford, A. A. (Eds.). (1984). *Essays on Classical Rhetoric and Modern Discourse*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.questia.com>

Denham, B. (1998). Political Communication: Rhetoric, Government, and Citizens. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 53(2), 90+. Retrieved from <http://www.questia.com>

Chilton, P. A. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: theory and practice*. London: Routledge.

Cohen, A. R. (1964). *Attitude Change and Social Influence*. New York: Basic Books. Retrieved from <http://www.questia.com>

Examples of Rhetorical Devices. (n.d.). Retrieved April 29th, 2014, from <http://examples.yourdictionary.com/examples/examples-of-rhetorical-devices.html>

King, Jr., M. L. (n.d.). Martin Luther King's Speech: "I Have a Dream". Council on Foreign Relations. Retrieved April 29, 2014, from <http://www.cfr.org/united-states/martin-luther-kings-speech-have-dream/p26070>

Literary Devices and Literary Terms. (n.d.). *Literary Devices*. Retrieved April 29, 2014, from <http://literarydevices.net/>

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *The social psychology of intergroup relations?*, 33, 47.

Redlawsk, D. P. (2002). Hot cognition or cool consideration? Testing the effects of motivated reasoning on political decision making. *Journal of Politics*, 64, 1021 - 1044.

Hovland, C. I., Janis, I. L., & Kelley, H. H. (1953). *Communication and persuasion: Psychological studies of opinion change*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

## KISS: The Good, the Bad and Something In-between

Petty, R. E., Cacioppo, J. T., & Goldman, R. (1981). Personal Involvement As A Determinant Of Argument-based Persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41(5), 847-855.

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). *Communication and persuasion: central and peripheral routes to attitude change*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Billig, M. (1987). *Arguing and thinking: a rhetorical approach to social psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Finlayson, A. (2007). From Beliefs To Arguments: Interpretive Methodology And Rhetorical Political Analysis. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 9(4), 545-563.

Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., & Levy, J. S. (2013). *The Oxford handbook of political psychology* (Second ed.). USA: Oxford University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: an essay in the philosophy of language*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J.R. (1975). Indirect speech acts. In *Syntax and Semantics*, 3: *Speech Acts*, ed. P. Cole & J. L. Morgan, pp. 59–82. New York: Academic Press.

Goffman, E. (1986). *Frame analysis: an essay on the organization of experience*(Northeastern University Press ed.). Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Aristotle (n.d.). *Rhetoric*. Retrieved March 19, 2014, from <http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/a/aristotle/a8rh>

Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). *Nudge: improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't think of an elephant!: know your values and frame the debate : the essential guide for progressives*. White River Junction, Vt.: Chelsea Green Pub. Co..

Lakoff, G. (2008). *The political mind: why you can't understand 21st-century politics with an 18th-century brain*. New York: Viking.

Definition of 'situational attribution'. Retrieved April 24, 2014, from <https://www.boundless.com/psychology/definition/situational-attribution/>

Hegel, G. W. F. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Trans. A.V. Miller. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.

Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to Do Things with Words* (2nd ed.) (J. O. Urmson & M. Sbisà, Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.questia.com>

Bacon, T. R. (2011). *The Elements of Power: Lessons on Leadership and Influence*. New York: AMACOM. Retrieved from <http://www.questia.com>

Berger, C. R., & Burgoon, M. (Eds.). (1995). *Communication and Social Influence Processes*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.questia.com>

KISS: The Good, the Bad and Something In-between

Holtgraves, T. (2002). *Language as Social Action: Social Psychology and Language Use*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Retrieved from <http://www.questia.com>

Joseph, J. E. (2006). *Language and Politics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.questia.com>

Lakoff, R. T. (1990). *Talking Power: The Politics of Language in Our Lives*. New York: Basic Books. Retrieved from <http://www.questia.com>

Rhetorikos, Liddell, H. G., Scott, R., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, at Perseus Digital Library. (n.d.). Retrieved March 26, 2014, from <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/>

Tsohatzidis, S. L. (Ed.). (1994). *Foundations of Speech Act Theory: Philosophical and Linguistic Perspectives*. New York: Routledge. Retrieved from <http://www.questia.com>

Weber, M. (2004). *The Vocation Lectures* (D. Owen & T. Strong, Eds.; R. Livingstone, Trans.). Indianapolis: Hackett. Retrieved from <http://www.questia.com>

Zimbardo, P. G. (2007). *The Lucifer effect: understanding how good people turn evil*. New York: Random House.

## KISS: The Good, the Bad and Something In-between

Appendix:

Speech transcripts:

Adolf Hitler: DE, EN

Margaret Thatcher: EN

Barack Obama: EN

:

- rhetorical device
- working with framing/nudging
- us vs. them
- identification through 'we'
- symbolism
- fear-arousing communication
- religious reference

### *Adolf Hitler: "Aufruf auf das deutsche Volk." (30.1.1933)*

Über 14 Jahre sind vergangen seit dem unseligen Tage, da, von inneren und äußeren Versprechungen verblendet, das deutsche Volk der höchsten Güter unserer Vergangenheit, des Reiches, seiner Ehre und seiner Freiheit vergaß und dabei alles verlor. Seit diesen Tagen des Verrates hat der Allmächtige unserem Volk seinen Segen entzogen. Zwietracht und Haß hielten ihren Einzug. In tiefster Bekümmernis sehen Millionen bester deutscher Männer und Frauen aus

allen Lebensständen die Einheit der Nation dahinsinken und sich auflösen in ein Gewirr politisch-egoistischer Meinungen, wirtschaftlicher Interessen und weltanschaulicher Gegensätze.

Wie so oft in unserer Geschichte, bietet Deutschland seit diesem Tage der Revolution das Bild einer herzerbrechenden Zerrissenheit. Die versprochene Gleichheit und Brüderlichkeit erhielten wir nicht, aber die Freiheit haben wir verloren. Dem Verfall der geistigen und willensmäßigen Einheit unseres Volkes im Innern folgte der Verfall seiner politischen Stellung in der Welt.

Heiß durchdrungen von der Überzeugung, daß das deutsche Volk im Jahre 1914 in den großen Kampf zog ohne jeden Gedanken an eine eigene Schuld und nur erfüllt von der Last der Sorge, das angegriffene Reich, die Freiheit und die Existenz des deutschen Menschen verteidigen zu müssen, sehen wir in dem erschütternden Schicksal, das uns seit dem November 1918 verfolgt,

nur das Ergebnis **unseres** inneren Verfalls. Allein auch die übrige Welt wird seitdem nicht minder von großen Krisen durchrüttelt. Das geschichtlich ausgewogene Gleichgewicht der 2 Kräfte, **das einst nicht wenig beitrug** zum Verständnis für die Notwendigkeit einer inneren Solidarität der Nationen, mit all den daraus resultierenden glücklichen wirtschaftlichen Folgen, ist beseitigt.

Die Wahnidee vom Sieger und Besiegten zerstört das Vertrauen von Nation zu Nation und damit auch die Wirtschaft der Welt. Das Elend **unseres** Volkes aber ist entsetzlich! Dem arbeitslos gewordenen, hungernden Millionen-Proletariat der Industrie folgt die Verelendung des

gesamten Mittel- und Handwerksstandes. **Wenn sich dieser Verfall auch im deutschen Bauern endgültig vollendet, stehen wir in einer Katastrophe von unübersehbarem Ausmaß. Denn nicht nur ein Reich zerfällt dann, sondern eine zweitausendjährige Erbmasse an hohen und höchsten Gütern menschlicher Kultur und Zivilisation.**

Drohend künden die Erscheinungen **um uns** den Vollzug dieses Verfalls. In einem unerhörten Willens- und Gewaltansturm **versucht die kommunistische Methode des Wahnsinns das in seinem Innersten erschütterte und entwurzelte Volk endgültig zu vergiften und zu zersetzen,** um

es einer Zeit entgegenzutreiben, die sich zu den Versprechungen der kommunistischen Wortführer von heute noch schlimmer verhalten würde als die Zeit hinter uns zu den Versprechungen derselben Apostel im November 1918.

Angefangen bei der Familie, über alle Begriffe von Ehre und Treue, Volk und Vaterland, **Kultur**

und Wirtschaft hinweg bis zum ewigen Fundament unserer Moral und unseres Glaubens, **bleibt**

nichts verschont von dieser nur verneinenden, alles zerstörenden Idee. **14 Jahre Marxismus haben Deutschland ruiniert. Ein Jahr Bolschewismus würde Deutschland vernichten. Die heute**

reichsten und schönsten Kulturgebiete der Welt würden in ein Chaos und Trümmerfeld

verwandelt. Selbst das Leid der letzten anderthalb Jahrzehnte könnte nicht verglichen werden

mit dem Jammer eines Europas, in dessen Herzen die rote Fahne der Vernichtung aufgezo-

würde. Die Tausende von Verletzten, die unzähligen Toten, die dieser innere Krieg schon heute

Deutschland kostet, mögen ein Wetterleuchten sein der Warnung vor dem Sturme.

In diesen Stunden der übermächtig hereinbrechenden Sorgen um das Dasein und die Zukunft der deutschen Nation rief uns Männer nationaler Parteien und Verbände der greise Führer des Weltkrieges auf, noch einmal wie einst an den Fronten, nunmehr in der Heimat in Einigkeit und

Treue für des Reiches Rettung unter ihm zu kämpfen. Indem der ehrwürdige Herr

Reichspräsident uns in diesem großherzigen Sinne die Hände zum gemeinsamen Bunde

schloß, wollen wir als nationale Führer Gott, unserem Gewissen und unserem Volke geloben,

die uns damit übertragene Mission als nationale Regierung entschlossen und beharrlich zu erfüllen.

Das Erbe, das wir übernehmen, ist ein furchtbares.

Die Aufgabe, die wir lösen müssen, ist die schwerste, die seit Menschengedenken deutschen

Staatsmännern gestellt wurde. Das Vertrauen in uns allen aber ist unbegrenzt, denn wir

glauben an unser Volk und seine unvergänglichen Werte. Bauern, Arbeiter und Bürger, sie müssen gemeinsam die Bausteine liefern zum neuen Reich.

So wird es die nationale Regierung als ihre oberste und erste Aufgabe ansehen, die geistige

und willensmäßige Einheit unseres Volkes wieder herzustellen. Sie wird die Fundamente

wahren und verteidigen, auf denen die Kraft unserer Nation beruht. Sie wird das Christentum

als Basis unserer gesamten Moral, die Familie als Keimzelle unseres Volks- und Staatskörpers

in ihren festen Schutz nehmen. Sie wird über Stände und Klassen hinweg unser Volk wieder

zum Bewußtsein seiner volklichen und politischen Einheit und der daraus entspringenden

Pflichten bringen. Sie will die Ehrfurcht vor unserer großen Vergangenheit, den Stolz auf

unsere

alten Traditionen zur Grundlage machen für die Erziehung der deutschen Jugend. Sie wird

damit der geistigen, politischen und kulturellen Nihilisierung einen unbarmherzigen Krieg

ansagen. Deutschland darf und wird nicht im anarchistischen Kommunismus versinken.

Sie wird an Stelle turbulenter Instinkte wieder die nationale Disziplin zum Regenten unseres

Lebens erheben. Sie wird dabei all der Einrichtungen in höchster Sorgfalt gedenken, die die

wahren Bürgen der Kraft und Stärke unserer Nation sind.

Die nationale Regierung wird das große Werk der Reorganisation der Wirtschaft unseres

Volkes

mit zwei großen Vierjahresplänen lösen:

Rettung des deutschen Bauern zur Erhaltung der Ernährungs- und damit Lebensgrundlage der

Nation.

Rettung des deutschen Arbeiters durch einen gewaltigen und umfassenden Angriff gegen die

Arbeitslosigkeit.

In 14 Jahren haben die Novemberparteien den deutschen Bauernstand ruiniert.

In 14 Jahren haben sie eine Armee von Millionen Arbeitslosen geschaffen.

Die nationale Regierung wird mit eiserner Entschlossenheit und zähester Ausdauer folgenden

Plan verwirklichen:

Binnen vier Jahren muß der deutsche Bauer der Verelendung entrissen sein.

Binnen vier Jahren muß die Arbeitslosigkeit endgültig überwunden sein.

Gleichlaufend damit ergeben sich die Voraussetzungen für das Aufblühen der übrigen

Wirtschaft.

Mit dieser gigantischen Aufgabe der Sanierung unserer Wirtschaft wird die nationale

Regierung

verbinden die Aufgabe und Durchführung einer Sanierung des Reiches, der Länder und der

Kommunen in verwaltungsmäßiger und steuertechnischer Hinsicht.

Damit erst wird der Gedanke der föderativen Erhaltung des Reiches blut- und lebensvolle

Wirklichkeit.

Zu den Grundpfeilern dieses Programms gehört der Gedanke der Arbeitsdienstpflicht und der Siedlungspolitik.

Die Sorge für das tägliche Brot wird aber ebenso die Sorge sein für die Erfüllung der sozialen Pflichten bei Krankheit und Alter.

In der Sparsamkeit ihrer Verwaltung, der Förderung der Arbeit, der Erhaltung unseres Bauerntums sowie der Nutzbarmachung der Initiative des einzelnen liegt zugleich die beste Gewähr für das Vermeiden jedes Experimentes der Gefährdung unserer Währung.

Außenpolitisch wird die nationale Regierung ihre höchste Mission in der Wahrung der Lebensrechte und damit der Wiedererringung der Freiheit unseres Volkes sehen. Indem sie entschlossen ist, den chaotischen Zuständen in Deutschland ein Ende zu bereiten, wird sie mithelfen, in die Gemeinschaft der übrigen Nationen einen Staat gleichen Wertes und damit allerdings auch gleicher Rechte einzufügen. Sie ist dabei erfüllt von der Größe der Pflicht, mit diesem freien, gleichberechtigten Volke für die Erhaltung und Festigung des Friedens einzutreten, dessen die Welt heute mehr bedarf als je zuvor.

Möge auch das Verständnis all der anderen mithelfen, daß dieser unser aufrichtigster Wunsch zum Wohle Europas, ja, der Welt, sich erfüllt.

So groß unsere Liebe zu unserem Heere als Träger unserer Waffen und Symbol unserer großen Vergangenheit ist, so wären wir doch beglückt, wenn die Welt durch eine Beschränkung

ihrer Rüstungen eine Vermehrung unserer eigenen Waffen niemals mehr erforderlich machen würde.

Soll aber Deutschland diesen politischen und wirtschaftlichen Wiederaufstieg erleben und seine

Verpflichtungen den anderen Nationen gegenüber gewissenhaft erfüllen, dann setzt dies eine entscheidende Tat voraus: die Überwindung der kommunistischen Zersetzung

Deutschlands.

Wir Männer dieser Regierung fühlen uns vor der deutschen Geschichte verantwortlich für die Wiederherstellung eines geordneten Volkskörpers und damit für die endgültige Ueberwindung des Klassenwahnsinns und Klassenkampfes. Nicht einen Stand sehen wir, sondern das deutsche Volk, die Millionen seiner Bauern, Bürger und Arbeiter, die entweder gemeinam die Sorgen dieser Zeit überwinden werden oder ihnen sonst gemeinsam erliegen.

Entschlossen und getreu unserem Eide wollen wir damit angesichts der Unfähigkeit des derzeitigen Reichstages, diese Arbeit zu unterstützen, dem deutschen Volke selbst die Aufgabe stellen, die wir vertreten.

Der Reichspräsident, Generalfeldmarschall von Hindenburg, hat uns berufen mit dem Befehl, durch unsere Einmütigkeit der Nation die Möglichkeit des Wiederaufstiegs zu bringen.

Wir appellieren deshalb nunmehr an das deutsche Volk, diesen Akt der Versöhnung selbst mit zu unterzeichnen.

Die Regierung der nationalen Erhebung will arbeiten, und sie wird arbeiten.

Sie hat nicht 14 Jahre lang die deutsche Nation zugrunde gerichtet, sondern will sie wieder nach oben führen.

Sie ist entschlossen, in vier Jahren die Schuld von 14 Jahren wieder gutzumachen.

Allein sie kann nicht die Arbeit des Wiederaufbaues der Genehmigung derer unterstellen, die den Zusammenbruch verschuldeten.

Die Parteien des Marxismus und seiner Mitläufer haben vierzehn Jahre lang Zeit gehabt, ihr Können zu beweisen.

Das Ergebnis ist ein Trümmerfeld.

Nun, deutsches Volk, gib uns die Zeit von vier Jahren, und dann urteile und richte uns!

Getreu dem Befehl des Generalfeldmarschalls wollen wir beginnen. Möge der allmächtige Gott

unsere Arbeit in seine Gnade nehmen, unseren Willen recht gestalten, unsere Einsicht segnen und uns mit dem Vertrauen unseres Volkes beglücken. Denn wir wollen nicht kämpfen für uns,

sondern für Deutschland!

Quelle: „Aufruf der Reichsregierung vom 31. Januar 1933“, printed in Hans-Adolf Jacobsen und Werner Jochmann, Hg., *Ausgewählte Dokumente zur Geschichte des Nationalsozialismus, 1933-1945*. Bd. 2, Bielefeld, 1961, (Dokument 31. I. 1933).

## *Adolf Hitler: Proclamation To The German Nation -- February 1, 1933*

More than fourteen years have passed since the unhappy day when the German people, blinded by promises from foes at home and abroad, lost touch with honor and freedom, thereby losing all. Since that day of treachery, the Almighty has withheld his blessing from our people. Dissension and hatred descended upon us. With profound distress millions of the best German men and women from all walks of life have seen the unity of the nation vanishing away, dissolving in a confusion of political and personal opinions, economic interests, and ideological differences. Since that day, as so often in the past, Germany has presented a picture of heartbreaking disunity. We never received the equality and fraternity we had been promised, and we lost our liberty to boot. For when our nation lost its political place in the world, it soon lost its unity of spirit and will....

We are firmly convinced that the German nation entered the fight in 1914 without the slightest feeling of guilt on its part and filled only with the desire to defend the Fatherland which had been attacked and to preserve the freedom, nay, the very existence, of the German people. This being so, we can only see in the disastrous fate which has overtaken us since those November days of 1918 the result of our inner downfall. But the rest of the world, too, has suffered no less since then from overwhelming crises. The balance of power which had evolved in the course of history, and which formerly played no small part in bringing about the understanding of the necessity for an internal solidarity of the nations, with all its advantages for trade and commerce, has been set on one side. The insane conception of victors and vanquished destroyed the confidence existing between nations, and, at the same time, the industry of the entire world.

The misery of our people is horrible to behold! Millions of the industrial proletariat are unemployed and starving; the whole of the middle class and the small artisans have been impoverished. When this collapse finally reaches the German peasants, we will be faced with an immeasurable disaster. For then not only shall a nation collapse, but a two-thousand-year-old inheritance, some of the loftiest products of human culture and civilization.

All about us the warning signs of this collapse are apparent. Communism with its method of madness is making a powerful and insidious attack upon our dismayed and shattered nation. It seeks to poison and disrupt in order to hurl us into an epoch of chaos.... This negative, destroying spirit spared nothing of all that is highest and most valuable. Beginning with the

family, it has undermined the very foundations of morality and faith and scoffs at culture and business, nation and Fatherland, justice and honor. Fourteen years of Marxism have ruined Germany; one year of bolshevism would destroy her. The richest and fairest territories of the world would be turned into a smoking heap of ruins. Even the sufferings of the last decade and a half could not be compared to the misery of a Europe in the heart of which the red flag of destruction had been hoisted. The thousands of wounded, the hundreds of dead which this inner strife has already cost Germany should be a warning of the storm which would come....

In those hours when our hearts were troubled about the life and the future of the German nation, the

aged leader of the World War appealed to us. He called to those of us in nationalist parties and leagues to struggle under him once more, in unity and loyalty, for the salvation of the German nation. This time the front lines are at home. The venerable Reichspräsident has allied himself with us in this noble endeavor. And as leaders of the nation and the national Government we vow to God, to our conscience, and to our people that we will faithfully and resolutely fulfill the task conferred upon us.

The inheritance which has fallen to us is a terrible one. The task with which we are faced is the hardest which has fallen to German statesmen within the memory of man. But we are all filled with unbounded confidence for we believe in our people and their imperishable virtues. Every class and every individual must help us to found the new Reich.

The National Government will regard it as its first and foremost duty to revive in the nation the spirit of unity and co-operation. It will preserve and defend those basic principles on which our nation has been built. It regards Christianity as the foundation of our national morality, and the family as the basis of national life....

Turbulent instincts must be replaced by a national discipline as the guiding principle of our national life. All those institutions which are the strongholds of the energy and vitality of our nation will be taken under the special care of the Government.

The National Government intends to solve the problem of the reorganization of trade and commerce

with two four-year plans:

The German farmer must be rescued in order that the nation may be supplied with the necessities of

life.... A concerted and all-embracing attack must be made on unemployment in order that the German working class may be saved from ruin....

The November parties have ruined the German peasantry in fourteen years.

In fourteen years they have created an army of millions of unemployed. The National Government will, with iron determination and unshakable steadfastness of purpose, put through the following plan: Within four years the German peasant must be rescued from the quagmire into which he has fallen. Within four years unemployment must be finally overcome. At the same time the conditions necessary for a revival in trade and commerce are provided. The National Government will couple with this tremendous task of reorganizing business life a reorganization of the administrative and fiscal systems of the Reich, of the Federal States, and the Communes.

Only when this has been done can the idea of a continued federal existence of the entire Reich be fully realized.... Compulsory labor-service and the back-to-the-land policy are two of the basic principles of this program. The securing of the necessities of life will include the performance of social duties to the sick and aged.

In economical administration, the promotion of employment, the preservation of the farmer, as well as in the exploitation of individual initiative, the Government sees the best guarantee for the avoidance of any experiments which would endanger the currency.

As regards its foreign policy the National Government considers its highest mission to be the securing of the right to live and the restoration of freedom to our nation. Its determination to bring to an end the chaotic state of affairs in Germany will assist in restoring to the community of nations a State of equal value and, above all, a State which must have equal rights. It is impressed with the importance of its duty to use this nation of equal rights as an instrument for the securing and maintenance of that peace which the world requires today more than ever before.

May the good will of all others assist in the fulfillment of this our earnest wish for the welfare of Europe and of the whole world.

Great as is our love for our Army as the bearer of our arms and the symbol of our great past, we should be happy if the world, by reducing its armaments, would see to it that we need never increase our own. If, however, Germany is to experience this political and economic revival and conscientiously fulfill her duties toward the other nations, one decisive step is absolutely necessary first: the overcoming of the destroying menace of communism in Germany. We of this Government feel responsible for the restoration of orderly life in the nation and for the final elimination of class madness and class struggle. We recognize no classes, we see only the German people, millions of peasants, bourgeois, and workers who will either overcome together the difficulties of these times or be overcome by them. We are firmly resolved and we have taken our oath. Since the present Reichstag is incapable of

lending support to this work, we ask the German people whom we represent to perform the task themselves.

Reichspräsident von Hindenburg has called upon us to bring about the revival of the German nation. Unity is our tool. Therefore we now appeal to the German people to support this reconciliation. The National Government wishes to work and it will work. It did not ruin the German nation for fourteen years, but now it will lead the nation back to health. It is determined to make well in four years the ills of fourteen years. But the National Government cannot make the work of reconstruction dependent upon the approval of those who wrought destruction. The Marxist parties and their lackeys have had fourteen years to show what they can do. The result is a heap of ruins.

Now, people of Germany, give us four years and then pass judgment upon us. In accordance with Field Marshal von Hindenburg's command we shall begin now. May God Almighty give our work His blessing, strengthen our purpose, and endow us with wisdom and the trust of our people, for we are fighting not for ourselves but for Germany.

The Speeches of Adolf Hitler 1921 - 1941. (n.d.). *Solar General*. Retrieved April 30, 2014, from <http://www.solargeneral.com/library/hitler-speeches-collection.pdf>

- rhetorical device
- working with framing/nudging
- us vs. them
- identification through 'we'
- symbolism
- fear-arousing communication
- religious reference

### *Margaret Thatcher: Speech to Conservative Trade Unionists*

Mr Chairman, friends,

I must first thank you for that original and wonderful welcome which I confess is quite unique in my thirty years of experience in politics but I hope it will happen many times more. And isn't it marvellous to see so many well known people prepared openly to come and declare their support, their support for the principles in which we believe, believing that they are the right principles to govern Britain?

Mr Chairman, this rally of Conservative trade union members is an important and a splendid occasion for the Conservative party and at the outset I'd like to thank you, Fred, for your achievement in bringing together so many trade union members who are proud to speak and work for Conservative values today and who are looking forward in less than a week's time to a Conservative Government. I'm told to "Give 'em the old one-two." I assure you I will, right up to the number ten!

Now the growth and vigour of the Conservative trade unionists has been a great support and encouragement to all Conservatives, and it is a matter of pride for all its members. But all that you've done so far is merely preparation, because there's a greater work ahead for us to do together. We must be sure that the Conservative trade union movement continues to grow as a source of new attitudes and fresh thinking for all trade unionists. Now I find that people often talk of trade union members as if somehow they are all dogmatic Socialists or Marxists. I agree it is rubbish, quite right! And as I look around—you've really taken my next line, but you're going to have it in any case. I didn't think of such a simple explanation, so I've got two sentences and you're going to have to listen to them. Right, as I look round this hall today, and as I remember the many thousands of trade unionists I've met in recent years, the many Conservative trade union members I've met campaigning for us in the last three weeks, I say let us bury this myth. In my experience, only a tiny handful of trade unionists are Marxists or militants. Trade union members, whether they vote for us or not, are not a thing apart. They're

first and foremost, members of families, mothers, fathers, sons and daughters who share our values and who want to see once more a healthy Britain. And when I speak to you, I know that I am talking to people who cherish the best ideals and values of the British trade union movement, people who reject the destructive aims of Labour's steadily growing left wing. Yours and ours is a healthy blend of idealism and realism, the qualities that this country desperately needs over the next five years.

Mr Chairman, we've just experienced the most disastrous five years in our post war history. Five years in which our wealth's been squandered, our currency debased, and even more serious, our traditions of honour and humanity gravely damaged. Production and living standards did not rise at all. Unemployment more than doubled, prices more than doubled, taxes reached record levels, and the understanding with the TUC finally collapsed in the most vicious industrial strife this country's ever seen. Labour politicians, and those trade union leaders who put the pursuit of Socialism before the interests of their members, have between them created an economic wasteland for us all.

And at this fateful moment in our history, what is their message, what is Labour's message? It is a call to surrender, a message telling us that nothing can be done, because all they offer are the same old Socialist platitudes, the endless commitments to spend more of your pay packet on their policies and yet another fresh understanding with the TUC. And the crowning insult, after what has happened last winter, their traditional claim that only Labour care about people. There's not one single measure proposed in Labour's programme to get Britain out of its rut. We're told that Britain's days of vigour, imagination and courage are over, that we must simply accept things as they are and vote for another five years of national decline. Well, I will not and never will do that. Decline is no thing for Britain or for the great British people. They assure us today that their measures will cure inflation, that they'll rebuild British industry, that they'll unite the country. My question is simply this. They've had five years in which to do these things. If they know the answers, why haven't they implemented them before? And if they couldn't do it before, why should anyone believe that they can do it now? And how on earth can a divided Labour party unite this country?

I find it strange after all this that some union leaders are strongly urging their members to vote Labour again. But we're a free people and elections in this country are decided by individuals in the privacy of the secret ballot, not by institutions casting block votes. And when the dust settles, as it will, and when the excitement of electioneering dies away, there is work to be done, and the union leaders will work with the next democratically elected government as they have done in the past, of that I am confident

We Conservatives all know what has to be done to rebuild our economy. We have to increase total production, individual output and investment. We have to cut taxes so that the effort to work and save is worthwhile. We have to stop inflation by stopping government wasting our hard earned money. And we have to support and encourage in every way we can, the great majority of responsible and law abiding people, and we have to stop the militants who today do our economy so much damage.

Of course we can't make life better for everyone overnight. And let us be clear, the aim of cutting tax is not to give us all a May Day bonus we haven't earned. It's to give fresh purpose and energy to the millions of people whose daily work creates the real prosperity on which we all depend. For twelve of the last fifteen years, our economy's been sailing in a different direction from the other economies of the free world and, not surprisingly, we are now arriving at a different destination, a destination which may suit the left wing of the Labour party but which does not suit Britain. And that's why we say, "Change course, change course before it is too late."

Conservative trade unionists have a crucial role in bringing about that change. The trade unions are part of Britain and if Britain is to recover the trade unions must be part of that recovery. British industry can't prosper unless management and unions work together in partnership. We know that many such successful partnerships already exist. They do so because of the honesty, common sense and energy of the individuals concerned. When such attitudes and practices spread throughout Britain, this country's prospects will be transformed. But Mr Chairman, you and I always talk in economic terms. But you know, we have to do more than rebuild an economy. We have to rebuild our self respect as a nation. In this last five years, we've become a sick society. The events of last winter, the unrelenting hostility of Labour's left wing towards our armed services and the police, the rise in crime, vandalism and political violence, they all tell the same story. We're not quite the people we once were.

There's a simple reason why Labour always promises peace, and yet always brings us strife, and it's a fundamental one. Labour doesn't really believe in the individual. It prefers the collective group. And as a result, they start by removing individual initiative and end by removing individual conscience. We know that if democracy is to flourish, it must call for everything that is best in individual men and women, for the loss of democracy would surely bring out all that is worst.

Britain's at a turning point. On Thursday next its people will choose, either to continue our lonely road towards socialism and poverty, or they will choose to turn again towards the free world of the western democracies before it is too late. And I believe that more—yes, do

clap—freedom is the most precious thing of all. You don't always value it while you've got it. Then you find sometimes the government takes it away by stealth until you could wake up one day and find that it's gone. And I believe that more trade union members than ever before will support us this time. Our message to them is this. Labour's Socialism has failed and today it is the Conservative party that speaks for the ideals and hopes of the people of Britain.

We want a Britain where the rule of law, without which freedom would perish, is steadfastly upheld, a Britain where children are taught that there is a real and absolute difference between right and wrong, a Britain where the honest, peaceful and law abiding citizen is valued and defended and supported by all the institutions in the land, a Britain where the sick and the elderly can rely on compassion and kindness, where individually and as a nation, we are daily mindful of our moral duty to care for those in need.

This rally of trade union members for a Tory victory is a massive demonstration of the desire for change, change from disillusionment and decay to hope and prosperity. As trade unionists first, and Conservatives second, you speak for millions of other union members who seek the healthy society we all want. We Conservatives don't seek to divide or level society. We seek to unite and elevate it. We don't pander to class or sectional interests. Our appeal is both wider and deeper; and we appeal today to those instincts and principles which are common to decent men and women, whatever their income, or age, or status, irrespective of their creed, or colour, or race, irrespective indeed of whether they have voted for us or against us in the past. And these are the things we appeal to. We appeal to the sense of personal responsibility, to the knowledge that we all have duties as well as rights, to the sense of fairness which makes us want to see skill and effort and enthusiasm rewarded, to the legitimate ambition which drives us to do the best we can for our family and inspires us to make our own contribution to the welfare of all, to the sense of justice which makes us determined to ensure that the innocent and law abiding are protected, and to that spirit of independence which rebels whenever the state tries to take over our lives and tells us how to lead our own lives.

We appeal also to old fashioned love of country. We are ashamed by the poor figure Britain cuts in the world, and we long to restore the respect and esteem which we once earned for ourselves. We don't dream of lost empires, but we do have a clear and practical vision, of a Britain strong enough at home to care for the weak, strong enough in the world to make our contribution to the Western alliance of free nations.

So, Mr Chairman, while we talk frequently at this election of the things which affect us day by day, of jobs, of inflation, of expanding the economy, we also talk about the things without which you and I could never live or breathe, freedom under the law. But, you know, a lot of

political parties talk about freedom and some do it and they conceal what's really happening underneath. Others, you will find great charters in the history of the world, talk about the freedom of speech, talk about the freedom to worship, talk about freedom from want, talk about freedom from fear. Very important. The astonishing thing is that very few of them give the underlying economic structure of freedom, and that is this, without free enterprise, there can be no freedom. Every free country in the world is a free enterprise country. Extinguish that economic freedom and you will soon extinguish political freedom with it. Every free country in the world is a country that believes in some private property and some private ownership, because it is that which gives the backing to freedom, and it's that which is why we want to give so many of our people the chance to own their own homes and to become a genuine property-owning democracy. This is the economic structure of freedom without which the political structure and the individual values could not endure, and this is why we are Conservative, and this is why we will fight for those things, and fight, and fight until we win.

And so, yes, we do talk about jobs, we do talk about inflation, we do talk about growth, but what we really believe in as well is freedom under the law, individual freedom, the future of parliamentary democracy, the future of everything which made Britain a great nation and is founded on the character of our people. We want a Britain which encourages its people to develop their natural genius for their own sakes, and for the sake of our country, a country to which we are so proud to belong.

Thatcher, M. (1979). Speech to Conservative Trade Unionists. Margaret Thatcher Foundation . Retrieved April 29, 2014, from <http://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/104053>

- rhetorical device
- working with framing/nudging
- us vs. them
- identification through 'we'
- symbolism
- fear-arousing communication
- religious reference

### *Barack Obama: Acceptance Speech at the Democratic Convention*

(The introductory paragraph of thanks has been cut out)

Four years ago, I stood before you and told you my story - of the brief union between a young man from Kenya and a young woman from Kansas who weren't well-off or well-known, but shared a belief that in America, their son could achieve whatever he put his mind to.

It is that promise that has always set this country apart - that through hard work and sacrifice, each of us can pursue our individual dreams but still come together as one American family, to ensure that the next generation can pursue their dreams as well.

That's why I stand here tonight. Because for two hundred and thirty two years, at each moment when that promise was in jeopardy, ordinary men and women - students and soldiers, farmers and teachers, nurses and janitors -- found the courage to keep it alive.

We meet at one of those defining moments - a moment when our nation is at war, our economy is in turmoil, and the American promise has been threatened once more.

Tonight, more Americans are out of work and more are working harder for less. More of you have lost your homes and even more are watching your home values plummet. More of you have cars you can't afford to drive, credit card bills you can't afford to pay, and tuition that's beyond your reach.

These challenges are not all of government's making. But the failure to respond is a direct result of a broken politics in Washington and the failed policies of George W. Bush.

America, we are better than these last eight years. We are a better country than this.

This country is more decent than one where a woman in Ohio, on the brink of retirement, finds herself one illness away from disaster after a lifetime of hard work.

This country is more generous than one where a man in Indiana has to pack up the equipment he's worked on for twenty years and watch it shipped off to China, and then chokes up as he explains how he felt like a failure when he went home to tell his family the news.

We are more compassionate than a government that lets veterans sleep on our streets and families slide into poverty; that sits on its hands while a major American city drowns before our eyes.

Tonight, I say to the American people, to Democrats and Republicans and Independents across this great land - enough! This moment - this election - is our chance to keep, in the 21st century, the American promise alive. Because next week, in Minnesota, the same party that brought you two terms of George Bush and Dick Cheney will ask this country for a third. And we are here because we love this country too much to let the next four years look like the last eight. On November 4th, we must stand up and say: "Eight is enough."

Now let there be no doubt. The Republican nominee, John McCain, has worn the uniform of

our country with bravery and distinction, and for that we owe him our gratitude and respect. And next week, we'll also hear about those occasions when he's broken with his party as evidence that he can deliver the change that we need.

But the record's clear: John McCain has voted with George Bush ninety percent of the time. Senator McCain likes to talk about judgment, but really, **what does it say about your judgment when you think George Bush has been right more than ninety percent of the time?** I don't know about you, but I'm not ready to take a ten percent chance on change.

The truth is, **on issue after issue** that would make a difference in your lives - on health care and education and the economy - Senator McCain has been anything but independent. He said that our economy has made "great progress" under this President. He said that the fundamentals of the economy are strong. And when one of his chief advisors - the man who wrote his economic plan - was talking about the anxiety Americans are feeling, he said that we were just suffering from a "mental recession," and that we've become, and I quote, "a nation of whiners."

**A nation of whiners? Tell that to** the proud auto workers at a Michigan plant who, after they found out it was closing, kept showing up every day and working as hard as ever, because they knew there were people who counted on the brakes that they made. **Tell that to** the military families who shoulder their burdens silently as they watch their loved ones leave for their third or fourth or fifth tour of duty. **These are not** whiners. They work hard and give back and keep going without complaint. **These are** the Americans that I know.

Now, I don't believe that Senator McCain doesn't care what's going on in the lives of Americans. I just think he doesn't know. **Why else would he define middle-class as someone making under five million dollars a year? How else** could he propose hundreds of billions in tax breaks for big corporations and oil companies but not one penny of tax relief to more than one hundred million Americans? **How else** could he offer a health care plan that would actually tax people's benefits, or an education plan that would do nothing to help families pay for college, or a plan that would privatize Social Security and gamble your retirement?

**It's not because** John McCain doesn't care. **It's because** John McCain doesn't get it.

For over two decades, he's subscribed to that old, discredited Republican philosophy - **give more and more** to those with the most and hope that prosperity trickles down to everyone else. In Washington, they call this the Ownership Society, but what it really means is - you're on your own. **Out of work? Tough luck. No health care?** The market will fix it. **Born into poverty? Pull yourself up by your own bootstraps** - even if you don't have boots. You're on your own.

**Well it's time for them to own their failure.** It's time for us to change America.

You see, **we Democrats** have a very different measure of what constitutes progress in this country.

**We measure progress** by how many people can find a job that pays the mortgage; whether you can put a little extra money away at the end of each month so you can someday watch your child receive her college diploma. We measure progress in the 23 million new jobs that were created when Bill Clinton was President - when the average American family saw its income go up \$7,500 instead of down \$2,000 like it has under George Bush.

**We measure the strength** of our economy not by the number of billionaires we have or the profits of the Fortune 500, but by whether someone with a good idea can take a risk and start a new business, or whether the waitress who lives on tips can take a day off to look after a sick kid without losing her job - an economy that honors the dignity of work.

The fundamentals we use to measure economic strength are whether we are living up to that fundamental promise that has made this country great - a promise that is the only reason I am standing here tonight.

Because in the faces of those young veterans who come back from Iraq and Afghanistan, I see my grandfather, who signed up after Pearl Harbor, marched in Patton's Army, and was rewarded by a grateful nation with the chance to go to college on the GI Bill.

In the face of that young student who sleeps just three hours before working the night shift, I think about my mom, who raised my sister and me on her own while she worked and earned her degree; who once turned to food stamps but was still able to send us to the best schools in the country with the help of student loans and scholarships.

When I listen to another worker tell me that his factory has shut down, I remember all those men and women on the South Side of Chicago who I stood by and fought for two decades ago after the local steel plant closed.

And when I hear a woman talk about the difficulties of starting her own business, I think about my grandmother, who worked her way up from the secretarial pool to middle-management, despite years of being passed over for promotions because she was a woman. She's the one who taught me about hard work. She's the one who put off buying a new car or a new dress for herself so that I could have a better life. She poured everything she had into me. And although she can no longer travel, I know that she's watching tonight, and that tonight is her night as well.

I don't know what kind of lives John McCain thinks that celebrities lead, but this has been mine. These are my heroes. Theirs are the stories that shaped me. And it is on their behalf that I intend to win this election and keep our promise alive as President of the United States.

What is that promise?

It's a promise that says each of us has the freedom to make of our own lives what we will, but that we also have the obligation to treat each other with dignity and respect.

It's a promise that says the market should reward drive and innovation and generate growth, but that businesses should live up to their responsibilities to create American jobs, look out for American workers, and play by the rules of the road.

Ours is a promise that says government cannot solve all our problems, but what it should do is that which we cannot do for ourselves - protect us from harm and provide every child a decent education; keep our water clean and our toys safe; invest in new schools and new roads and new science and technology.

Our government should work for us, not against us. It should help us, not hurt us. It should ensure opportunity not just for those with the most money and influence, but for every American who's willing to work.

That's the promise of America - the idea that we are responsible for ourselves, but that we also rise or fall as one nation; the fundamental belief that I am my brother's keeper; I am my sister's keeper.

That's the promise we need to keep. That's the change we need right now. So let me spell out exactly what that change would mean if I am President.

Change means a tax code that doesn't reward the lobbyists who wrote it, but the American workers and small businesses who deserve it.

Unlike John McCain, I will stop giving tax breaks to corporations that ship jobs overseas, and

I will start giving them to companies that create good jobs right here in America.

I will eliminate capital gains taxes for the small businesses and the start-ups that will create the high-wage, high-tech jobs of tomorrow.

I will cut taxes - cut taxes - for 95% of all working families. Because in an economy like this, the last thing we should do is raise taxes on the middle-class.

And for the sake of our economy, our security, and the future of our planet, I will set a clear goal as President: in ten years, we will finally end our dependence on oil from the Middle East.

Washington's been talking about our oil addiction for the last thirty years, and John McCain has been there for twenty-six of them. In that time, he's said no to higher fuel-efficiency standards for cars, no to investments in renewable energy, no to renewable fuels. And today, we import triple the amount of oil as the day that Senator McCain took office.

Now is the time to end this addiction, and to understand that drilling is a stop-gap measure, not a long-term solution. Not even close.

As President, I will tap our natural gas reserves, invest in clean coal technology, and find ways to safely harness nuclear power. I'll help our auto companies re-tool, so that the fuel-efficient cars of the future are built right here in America. I'll make it easier for the American people to afford these new cars. And I'll invest 150 billion dollars over the next decade in affordable, renewable sources of energy - wind power and solar power and the next generation of biofuels; an investment that will lead to new industries and five million new jobs that pay well and can't ever be outsourced.

America, now is not the time for small plans.

Now is the time to finally meet our moral obligation to provide every child a world-class education, because it will take nothing less to compete in the global economy. Michelle and I are only here tonight because we were given a chance at an education. And I will not settle for an America where some kids don't have that chance. I'll invest in early childhood education. I'll recruit an army of new teachers, and pay them higher salaries and give them more support. And in exchange, I'll ask for higher standards and more accountability. And we will keep our promise to every young American - if you commit to serving your community or your country, we will make sure you can afford a college education.

Now is the time to finally keep the promise of affordable, accessible health care for every single American. If you have health care, my plan will lower your premiums. If you don't, you'll be able to get the same kind of coverage that members of Congress give themselves. And as someone who watched my mother argue with insurance companies while she lay in bed dying of cancer, I will make certain those companies stop discriminating against those who are sick and need care the most.

Now is the time to help families with paid sick days and better family leave, because nobody in America should have to choose between keeping their jobs and caring for a sick child or ailing parent.

Now is the time to change our bankruptcy laws, so that your pensions are protected ahead of CEO bonuses; and the time to protect Social Security for future generations.

And now is the time to keep the promise of equal pay for an equal day's work, because I want my daughters to have exactly the same opportunities as your sons.

Now, many of these plans will cost money, which is why I've laid out how I'll pay for every dime - by closing corporate loopholes and tax havens that don't help America grow. But I will

also go through the federal budget, line by line, eliminating programs that no longer work and making the ones we do need work better and cost less - because we cannot meet twenty-first century challenges with a twentieth century bureaucracy.

And Democrats, we must also admit that fulfilling America's promise will require more than just money. It will require a renewed sense of responsibility from each of us to recover what **John F. Kennedy** called our "intellectual and moral strength." Yes, government must lead on energy independence, but each of us must do our part to make our homes and businesses more efficient. Yes, we must provide more ladders to success for young men who fall into lives of crime and despair. But we must also admit that programs alone can't replace parents; that government can't turn off the television and make a child do her homework; that fathers must take more responsibility for providing the love and guidance their children need.

Individual responsibility and mutual responsibility - that's the essence of America's promise.

And just as we keep our keep our promise to the next generation here at home, so must we keep America's promise abroad. If John McCain wants to have a debate about who has the temperament, and judgment, to serve as the next Commander-in-Chief, that's a debate I'm ready to have.

For while Senator McCain was turning his sights to Iraq just days after 9/11, I stood up and opposed this war, knowing that it would distract us from the real threats we face. When John McCain said we could just "muddle through" in Afghanistan, I argued for more resources and more troops to finish the fight against the terrorists who actually attacked us on 9/11, and made clear that we must take out Osama bin Laden and his lieutenants if we have them in our sights. John McCain likes to say that he'll follow bin Laden to the Gates of Hell - but he won't even go to the cave where he lives.

And today, as my call for a time frame to remove our troops from Iraq has been echoed by the Iraqi government and even the Bush Administration, even after we learned that Iraq has a \$79 billion surplus while we're wallowing in deficits, John McCain stands alone in his stubborn refusal to end a misguided war.

That's not the judgment we need. That won't keep America safe. We need a President who can face the threats of the future, not keep grasping at the ideas of the past.

You don't defeat a terrorist network that operates in eighty countries by occupying Iraq. You don't protect Israel and deter Iran just by talking tough in Washington. You can't truly stand up for Georgia when you've strained our oldest alliances. If John McCain wants to follow George Bush with more tough talk and bad strategy, that is his choice - but it is not the change we need.

**We are the party of Roosevelt. We are the party of Kennedy.** So don't tell me that Democrats won't defend this country. Don't tell me that Democrats won't keep us safe. The Bush-McCain foreign policy has squandered the legacy that generations of Americans -- Democrats and Republicans - have built, and we are here to restore that legacy.

As Commander-in-Chief, I will never hesitate to defend this nation, but I will only send our troops into harm's way with a clear mission and a sacred commitment to give them the equipment they need in battle and the care and benefits they deserve when they come home.

I will end this war in Iraq responsibly, and finish the fight against al Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan. I will rebuild our military to meet future conflicts. But I will also renew the tough, direct diplomacy that can prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons and curb Russian aggression. I will build new partnerships to defeat the threats of the 21st century: terrorism and nuclear proliferation; poverty and genocide; climate change and disease. And I

will restore our moral standing, so that America is once again that last, best hope for all who are called to the cause of freedom, who long for lives of peace, and who yearn for a better future.

These are the policies I will pursue. And in the weeks ahead, I look forward to debating them with John McCain.

But what I will not do is suggest that the Senator takes his positions for political purposes. Because one of the things that we have to change in our politics is the idea that people cannot disagree without challenging each other's character and patriotism.

The times are too serious, the stakes are too high for this same partisan playbook. So let us agree that patriotism has no party. I love this country, and so do you, and so does John McCain. The men and women who serve in our battlefields may be Democrats and Republicans and Independents, but they have fought together and bled together and some died together under the same proud flag. They have not served a Red America or a Blue America - they have served the United States of America.

So I've got news for you, John McCain. We all put our country first.

America, our work will not be easy. The challenges we face require tough choices, and Democrats as well as Republicans will need to cast off the worn-out ideas and politics of the past. For part of what has been lost these past eight years can't just be measured by lost wages or bigger trade deficits. What has also been lost is our sense of common purpose - our sense of higher purpose. And that's what we have to restore.

We may not agree on abortion, but surely we can agree on reducing the number of unwanted pregnancies in this country. The reality of gun ownership may be different for hunters in rural Ohio than for those plagued by gang-violence in Cleveland, but don't tell me we can't uphold the Second Amendment while keeping AK-47s out of the hands of criminals. I know there are differences on same-sex marriage, but surely we can agree that our gay and lesbian brothers and sisters deserve to visit the person they love in the hospital and to live lives free of discrimination. Passions fly on immigration, but I don't know anyone who benefits when a mother is separated from her infant child or an employer undercuts American wages by hiring illegal workers. This too is part of America's promise - the promise of a democracy where we can find the strength and grace to bridge divides and unite in common effort.

I know there are those who dismiss such beliefs as happy talk. They claim that our insistence on something larger, something firmer and more honest in our public life is just a Trojan Horse for higher taxes and the abandonment of traditional values. And that's to be expected. Because if you don't have any fresh ideas, then you use stale tactics to scare the voters. If you don't have a record to run on, then you paint your opponent as someone people should run from.

You make a big election about small things.

And you know what - it's worked before. Because it feeds into the cynicism we all have about government. When Washington doesn't work, all its promises seem empty. If your hopes have been dashed again and again, then it's best to stop hoping, and settle for what you already know.

I get it. I realize that I am not the likeliest candidate for this office. I don't fit the typical pedigree, and I haven't spent my career in the halls of Washington.

But I stand before you tonight because all across America something is stirring. What the nay-sayers don't understand is that this election has never been about me. It's been about you.

For eighteen long months, you have stood up, one by one, and said enough to the politics of the past. You understand that in this election, the greatest risk we can take is to try the same old politics with the same old players and expect a different result. You have shown what history teaches us - that at defining moments like this one, the change we need doesn't come from Washington. Change comes to Washington. Change happens because the American people demand it - because they rise up and insist on new ideas and new leadership, a new politics for a new time.

America, this is one of those moments.

I believe that as hard as it will be, the change we need is coming. Because I've seen it. Because I've lived it. I've seen it in Illinois, when we provided health care to more children and moved more families from welfare to work. I've seen it in Washington, when we worked across party lines to open up government and hold lobbyists more accountable, to give better care for our veterans and keep nuclear weapons out of terrorist hands.

And I've seen it in this campaign. In the young people who voted for the first time, and in those who got involved again after a very long time. In the Republicans who never thought they'd pick up a Democratic ballot, but did. I've seen it in the workers who would rather cut their hours back a day than see their friends lose their jobs, in the soldiers who re-enlist after losing a limb, in the good neighbors who take a stranger in when a hurricane strikes and the floodwaters rise.

This country of ours has more wealth than any nation, but that's not what makes us rich. We have the most powerful military on Earth, but that's not what makes us strong. Our universities and our culture are the envy of the world, but that's not what keeps the world coming to our shores.

Instead, it is that **American spirit** - that American promise - that pushes us forward even when the path is uncertain; that binds us together in spite of our differences; that makes us fix our eye not on what is seen, but what is unseen, that better place around the bend.

That promise is our greatest inheritance. It's a promise I make to my daughters when I tuck them in at night, and a promise that you make to yours - a promise that has led immigrants to cross oceans and pioneers to travel west; a promise that led workers to picket lines, and women to reach for the ballot.

And it is that promise that forty five years ago today, brought Americans from every corner of this land to stand together on a Mall in Washington, before Lincoln's Memorial, and hear a young preacher from Georgia speak of his dream.

The men and women who gathered there could've heard many things. They could've heard words of anger and discord. They could've been told to succumb to the fear and frustration of so many dreams deferred.

But what the people heard instead - people of every creed and color, from every walk of life - is that in America, our destiny is inextricably linked. That together, our dreams can be one.

"We cannot walk alone," the preacher cried. "And as we walk, we must make the pledge that we shall always march ahead. We cannot turn back."

America, we cannot turn back. Not with so much work to be done. Not with so many children to educate, and so many veterans to care for. Not with an economy to fix and cities to rebuild and farms to save. Not with so many families to protect and so many lives to mend. America, we cannot turn back. We cannot walk alone. At this moment, in this election, we must pledge once more to march into the future. Let us keep that promise - that American promise - and in

the words of Scripture hold firmly, without wavering, to the hope that we confess.

Thank you, and God Bless the United States of America.