

## PRE-ELECTION PROPAGANDA SPEECH AS MEANS OF SPEECH MANIPULATION REALIZATION (BY THE EXAMPLE OF BRITISH POLITICAL DISCOURSE)

*Anna Antonova*  
Orenburg, Russia

*Summary:* The article deals with the study of contact and distant perlocutionary effects being achieved by the pre-election propaganda speech producers while actualizing such manipulation targets as emotions and instincts of a collective recipient.

The main peculiarity of political discourse is that it contains mostly those text types which have manipulative intention as a prevailing one. Among the political text types of a manipulative kind, we can see political interviews, slogans, announcements, articles in special party papers and certain messages in electronic mass media. Nevertheless, the most remarkable type of manipulative messages which function within political discourse is the text type of pre-election propaganda speeches.

As a rule, the texts of such speeches have some structural and intentional characteristic features which make it possible to consider the whole bulk of these speeches as a definite text type. All speeches contain special etiquette phrases (greetings and words of appreciation), they have prognostic character and the main communicative intention of such speeches is that of promise. In addition to that, pre-election propaganda speeches have one more interesting peculiarity: the collective recipient of the speech is fully or partly aware of the manipulative character of the message. In other words, recipients guess or understand which perlocutionary effect is planned to be achieved by the producers of pre-election propaganda speeches before the election.

Voting for the speech producer and his party – this is the pre-planned perlocutionary effect of pre-election propaganda speeches – is the kind of some *distant* perlocutionary effect of a manipulative message. It is achieved (or not achieved) in some period of time after the speech is being delivered and in the speech producer's absence. In order to make the collective recipient of the message vote for his party, the producer of the speech should achieve the series of some *contact* perlocutionary effects via actualizing the most productive speech manipulation targets. In our consideration, such targets are the collective recipients' instincts, peculiarities of human sensation and basic emotions. Exactly these speech manipulation targets can be regarded as most effective as they have such essential properties as *universality* (which makes the speech recipients' reaction similar) and *collectivity* (the targets are significant for all the representatives of the collective recipient).

The main task of the speech producer is the formation of correct associative links which are made as the following opposition: we and our party – comfort

(positive emotions, instincts' satisfaction guarantee) versus opponents and their party – discomfort (negative emotions, inability to satisfy the recipients' needs).

The analysis of pre-election propaganda speeches on the British Conservative Party's website shows that the intentionally integral texts of the speeches consist of certain pragmatic subunits which we call *microtexts*. We define *microtext* as an intentional subunit of a manipulative message which is used to achieve certain *contact* perlocutionary effect that is to form one definite manipulative association.

The most, so to speak, *productive* targets of speech manipulation are ethological and physiological ones. They are connected with human instincts and the peculiarities of human physiological sensation. This large group of manipulation targets can be divided into several subgroups which can be named as follows:

1) *Ethoreceptive* targets of linguistic manipulation (which comprise only human instinctive behavioral reactions, such as vital instincts, zoosocial ones etc.).

Information about the possibility of satisfaction or dissatisfaction of human instincts, together with some positive or negative association connected with it, is the main manipulative mechanism. If the producer of pre-election propaganda speech forms the image of his (her) party as of being able to satisfy the main instincts of the speech recipient, he (she) achieves the necessary perlocutionary effect. If the opponents' party is represented as unwilling or unable to satisfy these instincts (that means that this party threatens the species existence), this effect is achieved as well. For example:

a) The pre-Budget report has set a tax timebomb ticking in the pockets of every family in Wales.

Teachers, journalists, social workers, police officers, paramedics, office managers and professionals will all be worse off as a result. Gordon Brown and Alistair Darling are gambling with the nation's finances and it is the people of Britain who will end up footing the bill. However Labour wraps this up *this is still a Christmas tax bombshell*.

Families across Wales will be hit with rising tax and National Insurance bills. That is the reality of this give-away statement. To anybody in work this is going to mean higher taxes.

(Cheryl Gillan: Families pay the price for Labours tax timebomb, <http://www.conservatives.com>)

The pre-election propaganda speech producer uses metaphors (*a tax timebomb ticking in the pockets of every family in Wales*) which bring to the recipients' mind some negative emotions and associations connected with the image of a timebomb. The so-called military metaphors are aimed at stirring up recipients' fear and alarm. These emotions usually show up as a result of self-preservation instinct activation. So, the opponents' actions are shown as being dangerous for recipients.

2) *Exteroreceptive* targets of linguistic manipulation. The exteroreceptive level of speech perception is connected with exteroreceptive sensations which help people to perceive the information from the outer world via eyes, ears, skin and other exteroreceptive sense organs. On modeling speech acts which nomi-

nate or are associated with some of exteroceptive sensations, the producer of a manipulative message achieves his (her) pre-planned perlocutionary effect. In this case of linguistic manipulation, we can talk about some kind of *synesthetic* mechanism as verbal message being perceived by auditory receptors which result in some *sensational image* of another modality (we imagine and *see* green, *feel* sour *taste* and *feel* something *round* and *smooth* on hearing the words *an unripe apple*). Thus, applying to this peculiarity of speech perception, the producer of pre-election propaganda speech associates his (her) party with some pleasant sensations and the opponents' party – with the unpleasant ones. For example:

a) The story of the Special Relationship can be *depicted in light and attractive colours* (pleasant visual sensation associated with the producer's party). The triumph of noble ideals; Sacrifices rewarded; Friendships forged and not forgotten. Together America and Britain have helped re-make much of the world in the image of liberty and democracy. The rule of law, rights of property, respect for individual rights – these formative ideas have transformed the prospects of nations that lived *in the darkness* (unpleasant visual sensation associated with the opponents' party) *of fear and despair*.

But the history of that Relationship deserves for the sake of realism *to be painted in darker shades as well* (unpleasant visual sensation associated with the opponents' party). It was not just ideals, it was the force which lay behind them that eventually prevailed. The Cold War was cold indeed in Europe but it was hot and bloody in other continents.

(Liam Fox: Security and Defence – Making sense of the special relationship, <http://www.conservatives.com>)

3) *Proprioreceptive* targets of linguistic manipulation. It is known that with the help of proprioreceptors human beings obtain information about the position and balance of their body. The manipulative perlocutionary effect is achieved in cases when recipients somehow *project* on their bodies the position of the image being suggested by the producer of the pre-election propaganda speech. At that the images which raise the sense of balance are necessarily associated with the producer's party. On the contrary the images which bring the association with something unstable and rickety are associated with that of political rivals. For example:

a) So if we cut big government *back*. If we move society *forward*. And if we rebuild responsibility, then we can put Britain *back on her feet* (the pleasant sensation of balance and stability associated with the producer's party). I know that today there aren't many reasons to be cheerful.

(David Cameron: Putting Britain back on her feet, <http://www.conservatives.com>)

b) Young people, full of potential, have their futures blighted by drugs. Soft attitudes towards drug taking and easy access to drugs create *a slippery downward slope* (the unpleasant sensation of unbalance associated with the opponents' party).

(Lord Taylor of Warwick: Labour are sending mixed messages on drug use, <http://www.conservatives.com>)

4) *Interoreceptive* targets of linguistic manipulation. Human interoreceptive system is connected with the signals about inner physiological state of the organism. The sensational images of some painful conditions and pain in the internal organs are created by the speech producer in order to be associated with the opponents' party. The producers' party is associated with the sensational images of healthy conditions and internal organs. For example:

a) Today I want to speak to you about what our approach to unemployment will be during this recession. Because before people hear your policies, they want to know what values and attitudes you bring to the table, and that's what I'm going to set out.

You don't need a long memory in this country to remember *the trauma* (painful condition associated with the opponents' party) of mass unemployment. As a recession sets in, hundreds of thousands of people are at risk of losing their jobs, and as recessions go on, long-term unemployment soars.

(David Cameron: We will not walk on by while people lose their jobs,  
<http://www.conservatives.com>)

5) *Spatial* targets of linguistic manipulation. The recipients' spatial perception has an anthropocentric character. It is oriented relative to the coordinate system which has a natural vertical position of a human being as a baseline point. Thus, spatial coordinate system is conceived as something *high* or *low* in the very human being (everything which is kind and generous is comprehended as being *high* – e.g. *high aims*; everything which is mean – as being *low* – e.g. *low tricks*); events which are going to happen in the future are perceived as those being *in front*; direction to the *right* is considered to be honest and true (*right roads*); top is perceived as culmination of some state (*to be/sit on top of the world*), and bottom – as the symbolic place of fall and sins (*to be at the bottom of the class*). For example:

a) Nearly a quarter of the electorate took part, almost 17,000 people – that's more than some council elections, and about a hundred times the number that turn up to the typical selection meeting. Changing the Conservative Party has been *central* to my leadership...

...and *central* to that has been changing who we are, what we look like, where we come from.

(David Cameron: Labour are trying to rewrite economic history,  
<http://www.conservatives.com>)

b) At our party conference we said we would support the Government in all the necessary action they had to take to save the financial system from *meltdown*.

(David Cameron: Labour are trying to rewrite economic history,  
<http://www.conservatives.com>)

6) *Temporal* targets of linguistic manipulation. The process of temporal perception is very complex, so is the very notion of time. There are several kinds of time: biological time, physical time, social time and some others. As the analysis of the British politicians' pre-election propaganda speeches shows, the associative perception of biological time becomes the most frequently used target of linguistic manipulation (here we can mention the cyclic recurrence of

some natural processes – such as seasons of the year, day and night cycles which are stably connected in our mind with our own life rhythms). Sometimes the speech producers apply to the recipients' perception of social time as of the process of social development. For example:

a) Dynamic change in commerce and in our *broader* culture is helping to make *the top-down* model history. The internet is transforming people's lives, making their ambitions *greater* and their horizons *broader*. Before, politicians and the mainstream media believed that when we talked people listened. Today, there are 57 million blogs – that means 57 million new newspaper editors. Every minute 15 new user-generated videos are uploaded on to YouTube – that means 450 new news items during the time of an evening news bulletin. We're living *at the dawn* of what I have called *the post-bureaucratic age* where true freedom of information makes possible a new world of people power, responsibility, citizenship, choice and local control.

(David Cameron: The power of social innovation,  
<http://www.conservatives.com>)

7) *Kinesthetic* targets of linguistic manipulation. On the kinesthetic level of speech perception the recipients evaluate the situation from the point of view of its motion, direction and speed relative to themselves as some central point. Traditionally, feeling of moving *forward* is conceived as the sign of some positive changes. Vice versa, feeling of moving backward is associated with negative changes. The high speed of favorable and positive social changes is perceived with approval; the low speed of these changes – with disapproval and alarm. For example:

a) I want to give everyone – no matter what their background or their circumstances are – the chance to lift themselves up and make the most of their lives.

And an important part of that means tackling homelessness – giving everyone the security that a roof over their head brings.

The problem today is that *we're going backwards, not forwards*.

(David Cameron: Launch of the Homelessness Foundation,  
<http://www.conservatives.com>)

Regarding negative basic emotions [Plutchik 1980: 119-127] (*anger, disgust, fear*) as targets of speech manipulation is a good manipulative tactic as well. The study of pre-election propaganda speeches shows that the speech producers appeal to the basic emotions of the collective recipient rather frequently. For this verbal means such as nominating lexemes (lexemes which directly nominate the pre-planned recipient's reaction or state), stimulus lexemes (lexemes which arouse some necessary negative or positive associations), metaphors and some other means are used. For example:

1) *Fear* as contact perlocutionary effect.

The emotion of fear evolved to protect the human organism from various dangers of primeval life. Psychological experiments show that people remember the situations in which they feel pain or suffer better than those in which they feel positive emotions. The emotion of fear being connected with these painful moments makes people avoid similar situations. Fear is also connected with the probability that some need or instinct is not likely to be satisfied. So, the main

task of the manipulative message producer is to form recipients' associations such as «the producer and his or her party – stability, rescue from fear» versus «the opponent and his or her party – fear and dissatisfaction of the recipients' needs».

a) This report puts clear blue water between us and Gordon Brown.

It is *hope versus fear* (explicit opposition in which «hope» stands for the producer's party and nominating lexeme «fear» for the opponent's party).

The current Prime Minister wants you *to fear* (the repetition of the nominating lexeme «fear» emphasizes the idea) the future, reign in your aspirations, share his cautious, suspicious view of the world and cling to Nurse Brown *for fear* (the repetition of the nominating lexeme «fear» emphasizes the idea) of finding something worse!

But that has never been the British Way.

The *threats* (the stimulus lexeme «threats» is used to achieve the contact perlocutionary effect of fear and discomfort) to our planet from Climate Change are unprecedented.

Within our lifetime, the consequences of global warming are potentially *catastrophic* (one more stimulus lexeme is used by the manipulative message producer).

But we do have a choice.

We can be players on the field, looking for solutions.....

(Greg Barker: We can meet the challenge of climate change and improve our quality of life, <http://www.conservatives.com>)

2) *Anger* as contact perlocutionary effect.

Anger appears when people realize the presence of some obstruction which makes it impossible to achieve their aim or to satisfy some need of theirs [Леонтьев 2002]. Besides, anger is a natural reaction to some insult, reason of grief or injustice. So, there can be various associations which can cause the state of the collective recipient's anger (the opponent – insult, the opponent – injustice, the opponent – outrage). For example:

a) For years and decades, *politicians have been treating the public like mugs* (the association «the opponent – insult» is formed by the producer), pretending that we have all the answers. Just give us some power we say, let us pass a few more laws, issue a few more regulations, spend a bit more of your money – and it will all get miraculously better. But change doesn't work like that. If it did, we wouldn't need an election because we'd be living in utopia by now. If this whole leave-it-all-to-government approach had all the answers, *Wales wouldn't have been left so far behind, with the highest rates of unemployment and child poverty of any country in the UK* (anger is planned to be aroused when national pride is touched). No. The idea that change comes from government alone is a lie. A big lie.

(David Cameron: Welsh Manifesto launch, <http://www.conservatives.com>)

3) *Disgust* as contact perlocutionary effect.

The emotion of disgust evolved from primary gustatory sensation and the sense of hunger. It is connected with the basic reaction of pushing away everything which cannot be accepted by our organism. The emotion of disgust is often used by the manipulative message producers to create the opponent's nega-

tive image. To achieve this contact perlocutionary effect nominating lexemes (*disgust, detest, repugnant, repulsive* and all the like) and some stimulus lexemes are used.

a) Last week we had the latest revelations from Parliament. The details might be new but the feelings they provoke are all too familiar. Disappointment. Despair. *Even disgust (nominating lexeme is used by the producer of the speech)*.

(David Cameron: Rebuilding trust in politics)

b) The Chief Constable of Cheshire said earlier this week that anti-social behaviour in Britain is «out of control». And most people agree. A recent poll showed that half of British people feel more frightened on the streets than they did a decade ago. And it's not just the fear that matters – it's the damage to our quality of life. *Vomit (stimulus lexeme)* and broken glass in the town centres. Graffiti and *litter and urine (stimulus lexemes)* in the stairways of blocks of flats. Fly-tipping in country lanes.

Aggression and foul language on the train and the bus... general disrespect... all the little acts of aggression and ugliness that people have to put up with in the course of a day. Is all this an inevitable feature of life? I don't believe so.

(David Cameron: Youth crime and measures to reduce it,  
<http://www.conservatives.com>)

As the analysis of pre-election propaganda speech shows, negative basic emotions, human instincts and other genetic behavioral reactions are most frequently used by the speech producers as manipulation targets.

## REFERENCES

- Леонтьев 2002 – *Леонтьев В.О.* Классификация эмоций. Одесса: Издательство Инновационно-ипотечного центра, 2002. [Электронный ресурс: <http://emoatlas.narod.ru/book1.html>] (Leontyev V.O. The Classification of emotions [Electronic Resource])
- Plutchick 1980 – *Plutchik R.* Emotion: A psychoevolutionary synthesis. New York: Harper & Row, 1980.