

ТМ	Г. XXXVIII	Бр. 3	Стр. 1313-1328	Ниш	јул - септембар	2014.
----	------------	-------	----------------	-----	-----------------	-------

UDK 808.51(497.5):808.51(73)

Оригиналан научни рад

Примљено: 3. 3. 2013.

Ревидирана верзија: 11. 2. 2014.

Одобрено за штампу: 12. 9. 2014.

Daniela Matic

University of Split

Faculty of Electrical Engineering,

Mechanical Engineering and Naval

Architecture

Split

Croatia

IDEOLOGY HIDDEN IN THE FORM OF CROATIAN AND AMERICAN POLITICAL SPEECHES

Abstract

This paper focuses on four political speeches delivered by two Croatian and two American politicians during political campaigns in their respective countries. Since these politicians represent and are endorsed by the political parties, their speeches are necessarily ideological. Applying the tools offered by critical discourse analysis, which to an extent draws on pragmatic theories, the speeches will be compared in such a way as to point out which formal linguistic devices the candidates choose in order to act upon hearers/voters. The aim of the paper is to establish whether some linguistic devices and choices reflect the politicians' ideological stance and whether certain choices are more typical in the representatives of some ideology or not. We conclude that the speakers use certain structures to negatively present the members of the out-group, as well as to divide or to unite the electorate around some goal, but to a different extent, depending on their ideological viewpoint.

Key words: political speeches, critical discourse analysis, formal linguistic devices, pragmatics, ideology

ИДЕОЛОШКА ОБЕЛЕЖЈА У ФОРМАЛНИМ СТРУКТУРАМА ХРВАТСКИХ И АМЕРИЧКИХ ПОЛИТИЧКИХ ГОВОРА

Апстракт

У овоме се раду бавимо четирима политичким говорима које су одржали два хрватска и два америчка политичара за време изборних кампања у Хрватској и Сједињеним Америчким Државама. Будући да ови политичари представљају своје политичке странке које су их кандидовале и које их подржавају, и говори су идеолошки. Примјењујући средства критичке дискурзивне анализе, која се донекле ослања и на прагматичке теорије, упоредићемо говоре како бисмо открили којим се формалним језичним средствима говорници служе како би деловали на слушаоце/гласаче. Циљ овога рада је установити је ли нека језичка средства и одабири говорника одражавају њихове идеолошке ставове и јесу ли ти одабири типични за представнике одређене идеологије или не. Закључили смо да су говорници користили неке структуре како би негативно представили идеолошке противнике, као и поделили или ујединили бирачко тело око некога циља, али у различитим размерама овисно о њиховим идеолошким стајалиштима.

Кључне речи: политички говори, критичка дискурзивна анализа, формална језичка средства, прагматика, идеологија

INTRODUCTION

Ideology may be defined in several ways, e.g. “ideologies are general mental representations shared by the members of social groups” (van Dijk, 2009, p. 81) or, according to Fairclough, as “any social policy which is in part or whole derived from social theory *in a conscious way*”, whereas in the Marxist tradition it represents “ideas which arise from a given set of material interests” (2001a, p. 77). Politics, on the other hand, is a social activity of both struggle and cooperation, depending on the political stance of the person concerned.

Ideology as a system of beliefs can enter language at several levels, therefore both form and content can be ideologically marked, but ideological meaning can also be reproduced through interpretation of text. Evidence of ideology can be found in institutional politics and its everyday text and talk, as stated by Chilton and Schäffner (2002, p. 3):

“[P]olitical activity does not exist without the use of language. It is true that other behaviours are involved: for instance, physical coercion. But the doing of politics is predominantly constituted in language”.

Political communication basically consists of public debates on socially relevant issues. Social problems can be played up or down by language, given undeserving attention or covered up, which suggests that various linguistic devices can politicize public opinion and influence the intensity of social conflict (Edelman, 2003, p. 9). Language proves to be a powerful means of persuasion especially when physical coercion is to be avoided, and people still have to be convinced that certain political actions are just, inescapable, necessary or wrong, suspicious, dubious, and unnecessary, which is often justified by some moral, social, and political reasons, and sometimes by false or incomplete information. Consequently, political speeches are meant to be persuasive. They are delivered before the audiences that usually side with the speaker and support them. Speeches are usually polarized between “us” and “them” and binarily conceptualized through various linguistic devices as a struggle between “good and evil”. Speakers, therefore, are well aware that their multimodal performance, which a political speech is, is subject to various interpretations and that nothing in form or content can be left to improvisation, except for occasional adaptations to contextual situation.

The critical discourse analysis approach (Fairclough, 1992, 1995a, 1995b, 2001a, 2003; Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; van Dijk, 1997, 1998, 2001, 2008, 2009; Chilton & Schäffner, 1997; Chilton, 2004) sees language as a social phenomenon, therefore, it does not only study linguistic devices in isolation but within the cultural, historical, social and political background or situation that produced some discourse. Even though these theoreticians may differ in their theoretical postulates and methodology used in analyses, they are all focused on some social problem expressed by and through language. In this type of analysis, discourse may refer to a whole process of social practice that text is part of; therefore, text is no longer seen only as a suprasentential unit. Furthermore, language users are not one- but multidimensional real people, who participate in discourse, occupy some position in a society, and have various identities, as they belong to various organizations, regions, nations, and professions. All the identities and roles they perform merge into one person that delivers some text, and they also influence the creation and interpretation of discourse (van Dijk, 1997, p. 3). In van Dijk’s interpretation “discourse” can refer to a description of all genres in politics or to politicians’ discourses, so in politics “discourse” is “a socially constituted set of such genres, associated with a social domain or field” (1998, p. 196). A speech delivered by a political figure belongs to institutional politics, it is a genre of political discourse and a part of public discourse. It is necessarily ideological (van Dijk 1997, p. 32-33), as politicians speak on behalf of some group that they represent, which is the most conspicuous in the use of pronominal forms and other devices by which adherence to some group is expressed. The ideological component is, however, more visible in the content of the speech

as speakers state the values they represent and ideas that the political group advocates, often compared to their opponents' political stance. Such linguistic moves contribute to positive representation of the in-group and negative representation of the out-group and the polarization of the speech around "us" and "them", within van Dijk's ideological square (1998).

CORPUS

The material studied in this paper was extracted from the two speeches held by the two representatives of two ideologically opposed political parties in Croatia, Zoran Milanović of the Socialist Democratic Party (hereinafter SDP) and Ivo Sanader of the then ruling Croatian Democratic Union (hereinafter HDZ), delivered during the parliamentary election campaign in 2007, which brought victory to HDZ. In the paper the speeches are marked as G1 and G2 respectively (in Croatian: Govor 1, Govor 2, that is, speech 1 and speech 2). The speeches were compared with those delivered by the Republican Party candidate John McCain (Speech 1 or S1 hereinafter) and the Democratic Party candidate Barack Obama (Speech 2 or S2 hereinafter) during the US election campaign in 2008 in which John McCain lost to Barack Obama. All the speeches were downloaded from these four parties' official website YouTube video channels active at the time and transcribed verbally, phonetically, and nonverbally by the author of this paper. G1, S1, and S2 were analyzed multimodally since these speeches were extracted and transcribed from video footage, unlike G2, which was not accompanied by a video, so a complete contrastive, cross-referential, and both verbal and nonverbal analysis of all four speeches was not, unfortunately, possible. As to their ideological stance, the G2 and S1 speakers would be perceived as representatives of rightist and more conservative parties, whereas the G1 and S2 speakers would be of leftist and more socially sensitive parties (as they are sometimes perceived or expected to be so), but only up to a point, as there is no clear-cut division in any of the cases.

Social and discursive practice

In the social practice of elections there are two concepts nowadays, one based on the ideological program of a political party and the other based on the needs of the electorate and the problems they perceive as critical. The Croatian parliamentary election follows the former concept and the presidential campaign organization in the USA exemplifies the latter (Šiber, 2003, 2007).

As for the discursive practice, all four speakers produced their speeches in real time in front of their audience.

Global and local situational contexts

These four speeches were delivered within one year. The financial and economic crisis broke out a year after the Croatian parliamentary election, so in 2007 the Croatian society had still been entrenched in ideological conflicts. The 2007 Croatian parliamentary election campaign was the battlefield mainly of two parliamentary parties, SDP and HDZ. The latter party had already been in power and constituted the ruling administration in the preceding 2003-2007 mandate and was running for one more, while SDP, along with some other parties, fought for more political power after their defeat in 2003. This campaign was rather personalized, unlike the former ones, which was rather unusual in a parliamentary campaign considering the fact that the parties prioritize their programs and not individuals. However, in this campaign the presidents of these two parties occupied most of political space.

The US presidential campaign was still running at the time of the crisis outbreak in 2008, therefore the US presidential campaign and the topics in S1 and S2 were largely determined by the economic circumstances. Both candidates had considerable political experience, especially the Republican Party candidate John McCain, but he also had a rather unfavorable position since he was faced with one “natural” opponent, Barack Obama, who was a new political contender, while the other opponent was the current Bush administration, the administration which was at that time rather unpopular and blamed for causing the crisis. McCain therefore had to show in what respects he would be different from the ruling Republican administration, still advocate the values, principles, methods and measures which the current administration stood for, and at the same time be different from his opponent.

G1 was held at a pre-election rally in Karlovac, November 19, and G2 in Varaždin, November 20, while the election day was November 24, 2007.

S1 was delivered at a rally held in a plant in Bensalem, Pennsylvania, and S2 at an open-air pre-election rally in Miami, Florida. Both speeches were delivered on the same day, October 21, 2008, and fourteen days before the Election Day.

Participants

The audience at pre-election rallies is diverse in the sense that among them one can find political party members and voters, but also those still undecided, as well as political opponents and those that incidentally attend such events. They may be listeners with diverse political or social backgrounds and hence have identities formed by their education, profession, class, age, or race. The speakers may also have several identities in their professional and private lives, which may all surface at some point in their speeches.

METHODOLOGY AND AIM

In this paper we deal with ideology in political texts that is expressed through formal language devices where the presence (as well as absence) of some forms can be fraught with ideological meanings. These linguistic devices may be ideologically marked and structured in such a fashion that those political agents responsible for some often unfavorable political actions remain hidden. These structures, delivered by a politician before the audience, may also contribute either to dividing and antagonizing the electorate or to unifying it around some common good or goal. Since these politicians represent the political parties that support them, their speeches are necessarily ideological to some extent both in form and content.

According to the aforementioned critical discourse analysis theoreticians, ideology is reflected in, and may be conveyed by, formal linguistic devices, such as adverbial clauses expressing semantic relations, parataxis and hypotaxis expressing grammatical relations between clauses within sentences, passive structures, impersonal structures, nominal phrases, and deictic elements/pronominal forms, which politicians choose in order to act upon hearers/voters to achieve consensus and feeling that the audience and voters are on the right side. In adverbial clauses, some semantic relation may be predominantly used and therefore contribute to the specific tone of the speech. In paratactic structures, where words and clauses are just listed, loosely connected, or coordinated with some conjunction, as stated by Fairclough (2001a, p. 211), “the relationship between the connected entities [is] rather vague”, and causality may be blurred. By the use of nominal phrases in text, one avoids naming the agent, deemphasizes their responsibility, and leaves the impression that actions happen by themselves and that they are static and unchangeable. Nominalization turns a verbal process into a noun, i.e. an object or an entity, so that causality is avoided or it remains unknown. In addition, the verbal tense features and modality are lost as well. The use of agentless passive structures, just like the use of impersonal structures, can also intentionally hide agency and causality, even though it is generally used to avoid the repetition of agent, or when the agent is not known or less important than the result of the process. Pronouns and their derived forms can also be ideologically colored. According to Chilton and Schäffner (1997, p. 227):

“[I]t is the pronouns *I*, *you*, *we*, and *they* (and their variants) that have a special function in producing a social and political 'space' in which the speaker, the audience, and others are 'positioned'”.

Power can also be achieved by using patronizing or ironic intonation. Applying the tools of critical discourse analysis, the speeches will be compared in such a way as to point out which formal linguistic devices the candidates chose in order to act upon hearers/voters with a view to establishing whether some linguistic devices and choices are more typical in the representatives of some ideology or not.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Upon analyzing these four speeches we discuss and focus on the following formal devices: impersonal structures, nominalized structures, and pronominal forms, since we could not find any prevailing ideological pattern in other linguistic devices. We provided the translations of utterances for the examples in Croatian speeches, approximate to some extent, since the speakers sometimes failed to word them grammatically or they did not express themselves coherently. In some examples these structures were used for stylistic reasons or they were used transparently and did not trigger any interpretation other than non-ideological, or we did not notice any, in Fairclough's words, "ideologically motivated obfuscation of agency, causality and responsibility" (2001a, p. 103).

Impersonal structures.

In **G1** impersonal structures testify to the speaker's caution:

1) *Ali ne možemo i nećemo dopustiti da se po tko zna koji put manipulira i manipulira se.* (English: We cannot and we will not allow manipulation for who knows how many times)

2) *Jer ako će se tako vodit' Hrvatska, (...) da se dodjeljuje po političkim kriterijima...*

(English: If Croatia is to be led like that, (...) to be allocated according to some political criteria) – in example 1 the speaker does not name anyone as the culprit for political manipulations, perhaps out of fear of being sued, and in example 2 he again avoids naming the person or the party, but the situational context can steer the interpretation in the direction of the opponent's party.

In **G2** we did not find any interesting examples, but in **S1** we found the following:

1) *Senator Obama wants to raise taxes and restrict trade, and... You know my friends, the last time America did that in a bad economy it led to the Great Depression.* – according to the speaker one could think that tax rise and trade restrictions led to the Great Depression that happened during the Republican Party rule without any human intervention. Being the Republican Party member, the speaker understandably does not name the culprits. However, this example can suggest that the Democratic Party opponent, according to the **S1** speaker, has the same ideas as the Republican Party had in the 1920s.

S2 also has an example which is inexplicit as to who the prime movers are:

1) *I know this. It will take a new direction. It will take new leadership in Washington. It will take a real change in the policies and politics of the last eight years – that's what this election is all about.* – the speaker just states his opinion that new policies and new leadership are necessary; however, he did not give a definite statement as to who is an ideal future leader, hiding his ambition in his impersonal structure.

Nominalization.

The examples of nominalization are not frequent in G1, G2 and S2, and again, those that we found are sometimes also used for stylistic reasons.

In **G1** we found the following:

1) *Biramo između istine, biramo između laži. Biramo između borbe protiv korupcije, poštene politike, čistih računa, i mulja i močvare sa druge strane.* (English: We choose between truth, we choose between lies. We choose between a struggle against corruption, fair politics, and short reckonings, and sludge and swamp on the other side) – the nouns used metaphorically hide the doers, who are the members of the two parties, here ideologically opposed as the choice between good and evil.

2) *Nema više muljanja.* (English: No more conning) – it would seem that this noun expresses some action developing without any external influence, but the context tells us that the agents could be found in the opponent's party.

In **G2** the examples were more numerous but also more transparent and straightforward, so the only interesting example is the following:

1) *Demokratski uzus traži da se ponašamo kao tehnička vlada do formiranja nove vlade.* (English: Democratic practice requires that we act as a technical administration until the consolidation of a new administration) – the speaker is not explicit about who will form the new government, that is, who will win the election. We can only speculate whether the speaker tries to cover his insecurity about winning.

In **S1** nominal phrases are rather frequent, compared with the other 3 speeches, and they are used for negative other-presentation but also for implicit criticism of the current administration:

1) *He certainly (Joe Wurzelbacher¹) didn't ask for the political attacks on him from the Obama campaign.* – by not naming who led the alleged attacks (the attacks had already been denied by Joe Wurzelbacher himself), the speaker distributes the guilt to all the members of his opponent's team.

2) *And the attacks on him (Joe Wurzelbacher) are an attack on small businesses.* – by these nouns the speaker states that the alleged attacks are a static fact and draws an inductive conclusion, often used in

¹„Samuel Joseph Wurzelbacher, famously dubbed Joe the Plumber, is a resident of Ohio, United States who gained significant attention during the 2008 U.S. presidential election. As an employee of a plumbing contractor, he was given the moniker "Joe the Plumber" after he was videotaped questioning then-Democratic candidate Barack Obama about his small business tax policy during a campaign stop in Ohio. The Republican McCain-Palin campaign later applied "Joe the Plumber" as a metaphor for middle-class Americans. He subsequently published a book about his experiences, and has appeared as a motivational speaker and commentator” <http://www.nydailynews.com/topics/Samuel+Wurzelbacher> (accessed in 2010).

political manipulation. If paraphrased, the statement could be interpreted as follows: “whoever attacks Joe, attacks small businesses”, which may be a serious allegation.

3) *You know, after months and months of campaign trail eloquence...* – the speaker sums up the opponent's campaign and reduces it to senselesslogorrhea. The opponent's campaign is presented as empty talk and not an activity with clear goals. However, he does not say who the eloquent person is, as such a statement could be interpreted, at least by some people, as praise.

4) *He believes (Barack Obama) in redistributing wealth, not in policies that grow our economy.* – the speaker metaphorically speaks of policies that act on their own, but does not say who would be the political leader that would implement such policies. The fact is that the then Republican president advocated the low tax policy which the S1 speaker favors; nevertheless, the crisis broke out, so the speaker's statement does not correspond to the present moment and the present tense form he used.

5) *Senator Biden guaranteed that if Senator Obama is elected, we will have an international crisis to test America's new president.* – according to the speaker, the voting for the opponent entails a crisis, the crisis is looming and the breakout is imminent, but he does not state which country could be the one that would provoke the international incident. By not naming any country (and naming could be a matter of legal lawsuit) the speaker acts mystifyingly and intimidatingly because the citizens could now fear all powerful countries and individuals.

6) *He opposed the surge strategy that is bringing us victory in Iraq...* – the strategy can really bring victory, but the speaker does not mention those who implemented the strategy. By avoiding any mention of human participation, by euphemizing the war in Iraq and calling it the “strategy that is bringing us victory”, the speaker avoids provoking emotions in the audience who may not instantly think that it was in fact the current administration that had started the war.

7) *I'm gonna make sure we take care of the working people who were devastated by the excess, greed and corruption of Wall Street and Washington.*

8) *Fight to clean up the mess of corruption, infighting and selfishness in Washington.* – in these two examples the speaker hides the doers in nouns used metonymically. According to the speaker's interpretation, it is the greed of the political and financial centers that devastated the working people, not the people who work there. In fact, the speaker cannot name the agents as he would speak against those that nominated him.

9) *What caused this crisis: Fannie and Freddie Mae, and the subprime lending crisis.* – the speaker turns to the other cause of crisis, and those are the financial sector institutions that deal with real estate. Again, he does not name any people, maybe due to lack of information or

to ongoing financial investigation, but his inexplicitness leaves the impression that the causes of crisis work on their own.

10) *The explosion of government spending over the last eight years has put us deeper in debt to foreign countries that don't have our interests at heart. It weakened the dollar and made everything that you buy much more expensive.* – the opponent finds the current administration guilty of the rise in spending and debts, but again fails to mention the Republican officials that brought about this situation. Being loyal to his party, the speaker cannot be too explicit in his statements regardless of his attitude.

In S2 we found only one example that hides the agent:

1) *It's time to turn the page on eight years of economic policies that put Wall Street before Main Street.* – the first structure hides the agent for stylistic rather than for some other reasons, since the speaker had already accused the current administration of causing the crisis, though the utterance sounds as if economic policies work on their own; the two metonymies oppose two different worlds, the center of financial power and the small-town world of the middle class for whose well-being the speaker fights and whose existence has been endangered by financial speculations of Wall Street. The two worlds epitomized in two noun phrases clearly define the speaker's policy, but also his concern and empathy for the less powerful and influential.

Pronouns and adjectives.

Pronominal forms may also express ideological stance. We counted occurrences of personal, reflexive, and possessive pronouns and adjectives to establish whether they have any ideological content.

In both speeches the occurrence of the first person singular pronoun and the adjective is similar, but in G1 the speaker uses this pronoun or the derived forms to express his private identity and not his party affiliation whereas the G2 speaker uses these forms to express the adherence to his party and also to emphasize his partisan identity.

The second person pronoun and adjective occurrence in singular is not significant in either of the speeches; however, its occurrence as the plural pronoun is slightly higher in G2, where the speaker addresses the audience using directives and asking cooperation from the voters. The “we” as the umbrella term for all first person pronouns and adjectives is the most interesting in these speeches as it encompasses a variety of referents that may be indicative of ideological differences between the speakers. The G1 speaker uses these forms to express the meaning “we, the citizens”, whereas the G2 speaker uses them very rarely in that sense, which may mean that the G1 speaker tries to rise above ideological differences and act as a candidate of all citizens, no matter what their ideological inclination or ethnicity is. However, when using “we”, the G2 speaker refers to two more groups of people, “we, the party and the party voters” and “we, the Croats” (in terms of ethnicity, not citizenship). Thus

the speaker divides the electorate into “us” and “them” and may antagonize some ethnic groups – this is the crucial difference in the approach of these two speakers to the audience and the voters. In G2 we found that the referents “we, the ruling party” and “we, the Government” were implicitly equalized, though some other political parties participated in the ruling administration; in this way the speaker minimizes their political contribution, though they were his partners, and maximizes the contribution of the party he represents.

Table 1. Occurrence of personal, reflexive, and possessive pronouns and adjectives and their distribution in G1 and G2 (the data discussed at length in Matić, 2012)

Personal, reflexive, and possessive pronouns and adjectives	Croatian speech 1 - Govor 1 (G1) 1,109 words		Croatian speech 2 - Govor 2 (G2) 3,662 words	
	Occurrence (N)	Distribution (%)	Occurrence (N)	Distribution (%)
	1) „Ja“ (mene, meni, moj/a/e/i) - “I” (I, me, my, myself)	12	1.08%	46
2) „Ti“ – (tebe, tebi, tvoj/a/e/i) - “You”, singular (you, your, yours, yourself)	6	0.54%	1	0.02%
3) „Vi“ – (vas, vama, vaš/a/e/i) – “You”, plural (you, your, yours, yourselves)	4	0.36%	43	1.17%
- “You, your” referring to people in general	0	0	0	0
- “you and I”	0	0	0	0
4) „Mi“ – (nas, nama, naš/a/e/i) - exclusive use, referring to the speaker and his political party	34	3.06%	104	2.83%
our, ours, ourselves)	18	1.62%	4	0.10%
- inclusive use, referring to the speaker and all citizens	0	0	26	0.70%
- refers to his political party and party adherents/voters	0	0	9	0.24%
5) „Oni“ - (njih, njima, njihov/a/o) opponents	2	0.18%	58	1.58%
- “They” (they, them, their, theirs, themselves)	11	0.99%	11	0.30%
- refers to someone else (people, citizens, voters, organizations)				

“They” as the umbrella term for all the derived forms in both speeches has two referents: “opponents” and “others”. In both speeches “they” most

often occurs as opposed to “we, the party” or “we, the party and the party voters” in utterances in which the speakers positively present their party, avoiding any mention of their wrong political moves, and negatively present their opponents, again avoiding any mention of their right moves. This use reflects two sides of van Dijk’s “ideological square” (1998).

These two speeches not only differ in the use of “we” and in ideological manipulation of referents in G2 but also in the use of unifying utterances in G1 and antagonizing and polarizing utterances in G2, which is brought about by pronouns and adjectives.

Table 2. Occurrence of personal, reflexive, and possessive pronouns and adjectives and their distribution in S1 and S2 (the data discussed at length in Matic, 2013)

Personal, reflexive, and possessive pronouns and adjectives	Speech 1 (S1) 2,597 words		Speech 2 (S2) 4,063 words	
	Occurrence (N)	Distribution (%)	Occurrence (N)	Distribution (%)
1) “I” (I, me, my, myself)	86	3.31%	93	2.28%
2) “You”, singular and plural – (you, your, yours, yourself/selves)	46	1.77%	66	1.62%
- “You, your” referring to people in general	4	0.15%	10	0.24%
- “you and I”	0	0	3	0.07%
- exclusive use, referring to the speaker	29	1.11%	23	0.56%
3) “We” (we, us, our, ours, ourselves)	67	2.57 %	93	2.28%
- inclusive use, referring to the speaker and all citizens				
4) “They” (they, them, their, theirs, themselves)	2	0.077%	8	0.19%
- refers to opponents				
- refers to someone else (people, citizens, voters, organizations)	16	0.61%	23	0.56%

In S1 and S2 we noticed that both speakers often used “I” forms, speaking as both politicians and private persons. As to the “you” and the derived forms, the speakers did not explicitly ask the voters to vote for their political options but to fight against enemies in S1 or to help the S2 speaker to win the election in order to bring some change in the country. To express this unity of him and the electorate, the S2 speaker used the expression “you and I”, which suggests his focus on their common goal,

unlike the S1 speaker who is focused on the fight against the dispersed opponents, but also the current administration and consequences of their wrong moves. This use reflects the main political and ideological difference of these two speakers, which is then materialized in their approach to the electorate: the S1 speaker sees “enemies” and “friends”, while the S2 speaker asks for cooperation and unity of all voters. The “we” and its derived forms are used in their inclusive and exclusive meaning, the former being more often in both speeches, which may mean that both speakers, by speaking inclusively, try to present their political viewpoints as compliant with those of the audience. The occasional shifts of referents of the “we” were not significant and we are of opinion that they were not used to manipulate voters intentionally. The use of “they” was low since both speakers referred to their opponents by their last name and their official titles, so the opposition “us” and “them” was not formally expressed by pronouns. Different ideological stances were most noticeable in the speakers’ use of “you” accompanied by different utterances that divide or unite the electorate.

CONCLUSION

Having analyzed the four speeches, we can say that the formal linguistic devices we found were used for ideological purposes, but to a varying extent. The comparison of the impersonal structures examples from three speeches has shown that the G1 and S1 speakers were more ready to implicitly but cautiously accuse the opponent of carrying out the actions which are ideologically different, and therefore unacceptable to them. The S2 speaker, on the other hand, used the impersonal structure to state his opinion in an epistemic utterance, but expressed as a contrast to the current state of affairs, ideologically opposed to what he envisages.

As for nominal phrases, what we noticed was that in his two examples the G1 speaker used the nouns to contrast the difference between the two parties which is not even ideological: in his interpretation, the difference is presented as the choice between honest and corrupt policy, and the ideologies of the two parties are stripped of all unnecessary programmatic layers and reduced to the very basic choice between good and evil. In his only example the G2 speaker avoids mentioning the agent, which would be his party, perhaps out of insecurity and caution, since the victory in the election was rather uncertain. A higher number of nominal phrases were found in S1, ten examples altogether: namely, in addition to his direct opponent with whom he could openly fight, the S1 speaker had an enemy he could not directly name and address. He thus implicitly criticized the Republican administration which was in power, and resorted to nominal phrases as he could not directly blame the Republican Party, which had nominated him, for the crisis. That is why the actual agents were often hidden in the metonymies “Wall Street” and “Washington”, which symbolize the centers of financial and political world, without the names of

persons responsible for the financial and economic problems during the Republican Party rule. The S1 speaker's examples can be categorized either as those which concern his opponent, both directly and indirectly, or those which concern the current administration. As to the former group of nouns, they are used as stylistic devices in negative other-presentation. The latter group literally hides the agents disguised in metaphors and metonymies since naming could provoke ideological battles in the Republican team. Finally, the S2 speaker, in a way similar to the G1 speaker, opposes two nouns used figuratively but, unlike the G1 speaker, presents his ideological stance and, implicitly, his future moves – he will change the wrong economic policies and stand for those who were neglected.

As far as pronouns, adjectives, and their derived forms are concerned, the analysis established that the difference in the first person singular pronoun and adjective use is due to extralinguistic factors: the American speakers use them much more frequently than the Croatian speakers, which is due to the very concept of and difference in parliamentary and presidential elections in these two countries, the US presidential elections being personalized. A similar finding may be reported for the use of the third person plural use: while the Croatian speakers used the pronouns and adjectives, often opposed to “us”, the American speakers referred to their opponents by their official titles and surnames and did not express any ideological opposition along the lines of van Dijk's ideological square, “us” vs. “them”. Their ideological opposition was expressed in terms of the first person singular and the name or the third person singular. The second person singular and plural forms were used in all speeches, but for a different purpose and to a different extent: in G2 the speaker explicitly asked of the voters, by directive speech acts, to vote for him and his party and thus show their faithfulness, whereas the S2 speaker used these forms to appeal to voters for help and cooperation in changing the country. He also used a sub-category “you and I”, which was not found in any of the speeches. The G1 speaker rarely used the second person forms and the S1 speaker used them to pander to the audience and to ask the audience to fight. As to the first person plural pronoun, as well as its derived forms and adjectives, they are more interesting in the Croatian speakers than in the American ones, since the former show some ideological inclinations – the G1 speaker, who rises above the ideological differences, often referring to all citizens, and the G2 speaker, who divides the electorate and antagonizes at least some ethnic groups, not referring to all citizens, but more often exclusively to his party members and party voters. In both American speakers, these forms are used inclusively far more frequently than exclusively, probably to show that they reached a consensual unity with their audience.

To sum up, we can say that, for the purposes of negative other-presentation, the G1 speaker (Z. Milanović) used the impersonal structure, the G2 (I. Sanader) used pronouns, the S1 speaker (J. McCain) used nouns and pronouns, and the S2 speaker (B. Obama) used none of these structures.

The speakers also used some of the structures to divide the electorate: the G1 speaker used nouns, the G2 speaker pronouns, and the S1 nouns and pronouns. The S2 speaker did not divide the electorate, but he was determined to unite it using nouns and pronouns, and the G1 speaker also acted in a unifying manner using pronouns only. Finally, we established that the two speakers, G2 and S1, who are ideologically somewhat closer to one another than to the other two speakers, were more prone to use the structures that served the negative other-presentation, at least in these speeches.

The final outcome of both campaigns indicates the interplay of discourse and society. The negative other-presentation and the division of the electorate by the abovementioned formal structures proved to be more successful in the Croatia of 2007, at the time divided along ideological lines, since HDZ finally won the election. In the USA of 2008, in grim economic circumstances, such discourse strategies realized by the analyzed formal devices did not bear fruit, since the winner was the speaker who avoided ideological clashes and strived for the unity of the whole nation.

REFERENCES

- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: theory and practice*. Abingdon-New York: Routledge.
- Chilton, P. & Schäffner, C. (1997). Discourse and Politics. In: Teun van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction, volume 2* (pp. 206-230). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Chilton, P. & Schäffner, C. (2002). Introduction: Themes and principles in the analysis of political discourse. In: Paul Chilton and Christina Schäffner (eds.), *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse*. (pp. 1-41). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Edelman, M. (2003). *Konstrukcija političkog spektakla*. Zagreb: Politička kultura.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995a). *Critical discourse analysis*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Fairclough, N. (1995b). *Media Discourse*. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Fairclough, N. (2001a). *Language and Power*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Fairclough, N. (2001b). Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research. In: Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp.121-138). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis. In: Teun van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction, volume 2* (pp. 258-284). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Matić, D. (2012). Zamjenice u hrvatskim političkim govorima. *Filolog: časopis za jezik, književnost i kulturu*. V, 187-198.
- Matić, D. (2013). Pronouns in American Political Speeches. *LINGUA MONTENEGRINA časopis za jezikoslovna, književna i kulturna pitanja*, god. VI/1 br. 11. 157-178.
- Šiber, I. (2003). *Politički marketing*. Zagreb: Politička kultura.
- Šiber, I. (2007). *Političko ponašanje*. Zagreb: Politička kultura.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). Discourse as Interaction in Society. In: Teun van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction, volume 2* (pp. 1-37). London: Sage Publications Ltd.

- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: a plea for diversity. In: Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 95-120). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and Power*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2009). *Society and Discourse. How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk*. Cambridge, New York: CUP.

Даниела Матић, Универзитет у Сплиту, Факултет електротехнике, машинства и бродоградње, Сплит, Хрватска

ИДЕОЛОШКА ОБЕЛЕЖЈА У ФОРМАЛНИМ СТРУКТУРАМА ХРВАТСКИХ И АМЕРИЧКИХ ПОЛИТИЧКИХ ГОВОРА

Резиме

У овоме се раду бавимо четирима политичким говорима које су одржали два хрватска и два америчка политичара за време изборних кампања у Хрватској и Сједињеним Америчким Државама. Проматрамо како је идеологија у политичким текстовима изражена формалним језичким средствима која могу имати и идеолошка значења. Наиме, нека формална језичка средства могу бити идеолошки обележена и тако уобличена и употребљена да вршитељи радње одговорни за неке непопуларне политичке потезе остају скривени. Ове конструкције, које изричу говорници пред слушатељством, могу придонети или поделити и антагонизирају бирачкога тела или уједињавају око некога заједничког циља. Политички говори, који се држе пред публиком која обично подржава говорника и слаже се с њим, обично су персуазивни и поларизирани између „нас“ и „њих“, те бинарно концептуализирани разним језичким средствима као борба између „добра и зла“. Критичка дискурзивна анализа види језик као друштвену појаву, стога не проучава језичка средства у изолацији него уклопљена у културни, историјски, друштвени и политички контекст из којег је и произашао дискурс. Примјењујући средства критичке дискурзивне анализе, која се донекле ослања и на прагматичке теорије, говорне смо упоредили како бисмо открили којим се формалним језичким средствима говорници служе како би утицали на слушаоце/гласаче те како би установили је ли нека језичка средства и одабири говорника одражавају њихове идеолошке ставове и јесу ли одабири типични за представнике одређене идеологије или не. Усмерили смо се на безличне конструкције, номинализоване конструкције и заменичке облике те закључили да су говорници користили одређене структуре како би негативно представили оне који не припадају њиховој политичкој групи те како би поделити или ујединили бирачко тело око некога циља, у различитој мери и овисно о идеолошким стајалиштима. У међусобном деловању дискурса и друштва, негативна презентација противника и подела бирачкога тела споменути формалним структурама биле су успешније у идеолошки подељеној Хрватској 2007. године, будући да је ХДЗ однео победу. У Сједињеним Америчким Државама 2008. године и лошим економским приликама, такве дискурсне стратегије остварене наведеним формалним језичким средствима нису биле успешне, будући да је победио онај говорник који је избегавао идеолошке сукобе и тежио уједињењу целе нације.