ARGUMENTATIVE STRATEGIES AND IMPLICATURES IN BLAIR'S RESIGNATION SPEECH:
A RELEVANCE-THEORETIC STUDY

ABSTRACT

This paper is a relevance-theoretic investigation of the argumentative strategies and the implicatures they generate in Blair's resignation address. Relevance theory (RT) hinges on the notion that human communication is highly inferential and relevance-driven. The addressor provides the ostensive (linguistic/non-linguistic) stimulus which is processed by the addressee to work out its explicit as well as implicit messages. Relevance is reached when the cognitive effects created by the communicative stimulus are computed with the least processing effort. It is determined by the audience's processing route (central/peripheral). Among the ostensive stimuli Blair's speech houses to function persuasively are the argumentative strategies. A good argumentative strategy must exhibit: (a) reasoning aspects represented in introducing logically well-constructed arguments, and (b) social persuasive aspects, which enable the speaker to manipulate his physical appearance, style, tone, posture, voice modulation, etc. to introduce his argument attractively (Jovicic, 2006). Though sometimes given implicitly and not well-constructed, Blair's arguments evoke an array of implicatures on Blair's personality (being firm, honest, compassionate, loyal to group, etc.), political philosophy (fresh blood, Third Way, eliminating old dichotomies of thinking, etc…), and his achievements, all enhancing Blair's positive image. Among the ostensive argumentation types favorable to Blair are: ***ad populum appeals, appeals to pity, argument from rule, argument from comparison/contrast***, ***Plain folks pleading, red herring, argument from example, argument form consequence, argument from commitment, self-sufficient arguments/assertions, etc.,*** all of which prove relevant as they attract the audience who process them effortlessly. The implicatures evoked vary according to the type of audience (friendly, neutral and opposing), each processing the speech in the light of prior knowledge, bias, etc. The study also uncovers that implicatures are also used in constructing arguments by sometimes supplying the unsaid components such as claim, data and warrant, a finding indicating the inextricably interdependent relationship between argumentative strategies and implicature. Two kinds of implicatures are distinguished: *argument-construction implicatures* and *argument-outcome implicatures*, each type performs special functions. Analysis also shows that Blair's exceptional audience awareness helps direct audience to process the speech more peripherally than centrally in most of the time. Finally, some of the typical characteristics of resignation speeches are pinpointed and some pedagogic implications are accounted for.

INTRODUCTION

The process of meaning interpretation has long intrigued pragmatic theories. Recent development in cognitive pragmatics has paid considerable attention to the study of the cognitive processes underlying meaning interpretation and the influence of contextual (cognitive environment) properties during these processes. Leading this trend is RT (Relevance Theory). The main thrust of RT (Sperber & Wilson 1986 onwards) is that communication is largely an inferential process. Recognizing the speaker's informative and communicative intentions, symbolizes a key aspect of successful communication. According to RP, meaning interpretation is conditional on two basic cognitive processes: cognitive effects (meaning interpretation) and cognitive processing effort. Since processing information needs effort, there should be a reward which is manifested in understanding the message (cognitive effects). Relevance manifests itself in the balance striked between these two ends: cognitive effort for cognitive effects. The message to be processed must be ostensive, explicitly or implicitly, verbally or non-verbally so as to secure an interpretation on the part of the addressee.

Political discourse is ostensively persuasive in which it is assumed that recipients are hounded by relevant ostensive argumentative strategies. An argumentative strategy, according to Jovicic (2006), inherently comprises two components: the reasoning aspects which have to do with logically-constructed arguments where claims are supported by data, and the social persuasive aspects which are concerned with making the arguments attractive to the audience by displaying an awareness of the audience beliefs and appeals, the strength of these beliefs, prior knowledge, processing route, interests, concerns, etc.

One inherent property of political speech is that it is highly inferential. Politicians prefer to convey their argumentation implicitly, leaving the audience to deduce the politician's desirable messages by making argumentational links, drawing conclusions, and deriving implicatures. RT is of special significance in this regard, as one of its basic communication principles is that one should leave implicit everything one can trust audience to supply with least effort. Accordingly, the unsaid (latent) information is also ostensive and therefore easily inferred. In RT, information inferred basically on pragmatic grounds is technically termed "implicatures". In political discourse, implicatures (sometimes labeled political implicatures, e.g. Van Dijk 2005) are derived by audience based on their political knowledge, the setting, the politician's political objectives, their attitude towards the politician (negative/positive), the politician's attitude towards them and the topic he/she is talking about (tone), the politician's competence in displaying his/her argumentative strategies (reasoning and persuasion), the genre of political discourse (e.g. press release, debate, speech, etc.), and their processing routes, among other things.

Political discourse is typically viewed as a site of power exercise where ideological, discursive and ethnographical messages are strongly conveyed. RP is primarily cognitive. For investigating such issues the relevance-theoretic approach is to be supplemented by some general principles of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) [Fairclough 1995, Van Dijk 2005, Wodak, 2007].

The present paper examines, from an RT perspective supplemented by major principles of argumentative theory and CDA, argumentation strategies as ostensive communicative stimuli and the implicatures they arise in the former British Prime Minister Tony Blair's resignation address. More specifically, the paper explores the following:

a.   The argument types and structures.
b.   The role of implicature in constructing arguments.
c.   The processing routes of argumentation.
d.   The functions of implicatures.
e.   Major characteristics of resignation speeches.

Political speeches, as a genre of political discourse, have gained much interest since Aristotle, especially at the rhetorical and logical levels. However, cross-disciplinary work, using different perspectives of language-oriented research is not much. Political discourse analysis, rhetoric, critical theories, pragmatics, communication theory, argumentative theory and social psychology each provides separable endeavors. The corollary of that is that there are diverse, fragmentary paradigms accounting for political speeches [Schaffner 1996, Van Dijk 2003, 2004, Gies 1989, Billing, 2006 , Chilton, 2004, Harris 2001, Augoustinous *et al.* 2002, among others]. Moreover, political speeches do not constitute a homogenous genre. Rather, they vary according to the occasion, the setting, the audience, etc. Resignation speeches are believed to host special properties distinguishing them from the rest of speeches. Such properties are relatively less-studied than those of other speech genres.

It is hoped that the approach adopted will lead to a better investigation of the argumentative strategies and implicatures in political speeches, in general, and in resignation speeches, in particular. It is argued that examining the argumentative strategies and implicatures gives an insight into the unique structures of arguments in speeches (which are not typically normative), the different processing routes recipients employ (central/peripheral), what exactly is processed centrally/peripherally, and how implicatures are derived and further employed in supplying some unsaid, latent constituents in the argumentative structure. In other words, the dynamics and flexibility of the argumentation in speeches are hoped to be explored.

The present paper falls into three sections. Section one discusses the theoretical premises of RT, CDA, political language and argumentative theory.

Section two is devoted to the analysis of Blair's speech. Finally, section three discusses the findings obtained and provides suggestions for further research.

1.   Theoretical considerations
1.1. Relevance theory (RT)
Sperber & Wilson (1986, 1995, 1997) and Wilson & Sperber (2004, 2005) introduce RT as a theory of cognitive pragmatics. Based on the notion of relevance as one of Grice's (1975) conversational maxims, RT hinges on the assumption that communication is largely inferential where the addressor offers certain evidence or clues by which the addressee can successfully infer meaning (Vianna, 2005). Communication is viewed as a problem-solving task for both communicators. For the addressor, what is problematic is to provide enough evidence (ostensive stimuli) to make it possible for the addressee to work out the "relevant" interpretation. The addressee, on the other hand, gets his/her problem solved when she/he assumes that the message is relevant (having effects) and worthy of the processing effort exerted. Explaining the cognitive processes involved in communication, RT holds that the addressee's interpretation of meaning is constrained by: (1) expectations of relevance raised by utterance, (2) addressee's world knowledge (schema) and (3) his mental model of that world.

In the above introduction, such terms as *relevance, ostensive inferential, effects, efforts, cognitive processing, context and implicature* represent the core elements of RT, though some of them are deeply rooted in previous paradigms, while others are newly coined and accounted for. RT breathes new life into such "old" terms. In following section, a brief account of these terms is given, as it is instrumental in shedding more light on RT.

1.1.1. Relevance:
Inspired by Gice, Sperper and Wilson (1995) argue that Grice's (1975) conversational maxims could be collapsed to one only maxim: "be relevant". This was forced by their aim to explain implicature in communication in the first place (Foster-Cohen 2004a) and by their convection that "be relevant" entails that the addressor undoubtedly observes the rest of the maxims, quantity quality and manner. Carston (2005) contends that RT diverges in multiple ways from the Grician paradigm. On top of these discrepancies is that Grice was not interested in the cognitive aspects of communication which represents the crux of RT (Carston, 2005). Sperber & Wilson (1986 onwards) contend that communication is relevance-driven. The principle of relevance is a cooperative concept conditioned simultaneously by the values of gain and cost in communication.

Relevance is seen as a balance between cognitive effects (the message worked out) and the processing effort: the less the processing effort needed and

the greater the cognitive effect an utterance has, the greater is the relevance of the utterance. In other words, the cognitive effects arising from the message should be greater than the processing costs in order for the communication to be relevant. The notion of cognitive effects underlying the relevance principle seems to guide communicators towards the optimal information processing, to make "maximum use of contextual information and select an interpretation which best confirms the relevance of the utterance" (Taguchi, 2002, 154).

Sperber and Wilson discuss relevance in relation to the communicator's life. They argue that it is this relation that makes communication rewarding. The addressor manages to encode his massages that have the optimal cognitive effects on the addressee who, in turn, strikes a balance between the effects relative to the processing load to determine its relevance. Relevance, in this sense, manifests itself in the salience of meaning, the individual's personal experience, the cultural convention, etc. Thus, it is a discourse property that is cognitively and communicatively based. Moeschler (2004) notes that being relevant implies not only giving information about what is said in a conversation but also giving an appropriate quantity of information as well as satisfying the Grecian maxim of quality.

Relevance principle, to Wilson and Sperber (2004), is divisible into two principles: cognitive and communicative. Cognitive principle of relevance states that "human cognition tends to be geared to the maximization of relevance" (610), whereas communicative principle of relevance holds that "every ostensive stimulus conveys a presumption of its own optimal relevance" (612). On the presumption of optimal relevance, Sperber and Wilson contend that an ostensive stimulus (linguistic/non-linguistic) is optimally relevant to the audience if:

a. It is relevant enough to be worth the audience processing.
b. Its effort is the most relevant one compatible with communicators' abilities and preferences.

Misunderstanding arises, intentionally or unintentionally, when the audience's interpretation contradicts the speaker's informative intention due to the latter's preferences in enacting the ostensive stimulus that may lead to faulty interpretation by the addressee. A closely related notion to relevance is that of "effort". In communication, effort is usually estimated in relation to effect. The message/utterance is optimally relevant if the effects gained are worth the effort exerted. If the opposite holds, the addressee gives up. So, humans abandon "exhaustive" communication in most of the cases. Nevertheless, this is not the case in interpreting poetic texts. Readers are willing to put more effort as they expect to gain a worthwhile reward. Cameron (2005) concludes that the amount and quality of effort vary from one text to another.

1.1.2. Ostensive inferential model of communication:

Sperber and Wilson (1996) contend that relevance is a universal concept and it functions in terms of *the ostensive-inferential model of communication*, where a text, an utterance, etc. is made ostensive if "it makes manifest an intention to make something manifest" (49). Kearns (2001) holds that the hearer, stimulated by this ostention, makes further inference in interpreting further possible intentions conveyed by the text, the utterance, etc. Thus, human communication is twofold: ostensive (operated by the addressor) and inferential (operated by the addressee). Ostensive communication is not necessarily linguistic. The speaker can make clear his intention via non-linguistic means as well. Paralinguistic features or body language may equally communicate ostention which fosters the addressee's recognition of the addressor's informative intention. Nevertheless, since people can convey more than what they say, ostensive verbal communication is supplemented by an additional inferential work employing both textual and contextual aids to help the addressee have access to the addressor's communicative intention. Two types of intention are identified by Wilson and Sperber (2004: 611): (1) informative intention: "the intention to inform the audience of something", and (2) communicative intention: "the intention to inform an audience of one's informative intention", e.g.: A: It's very hot here.
B: Goes and opens the windows.

Here, A's informative intention is "it is hot", yet his communicative intention is "please open the window". B's recognition of both intentions is derived from the ostensive linguistic stimulus "it's very hot" as well as drawing an inference based on world knowledge and experience (schema) that make opening the windows an indication that B succeeds in interpreting A's utterance.

Furthermore, Sacristan (2005) notes that in overt communication both informative intention and communicative intention are made explicit. By contrast, in covert communication (irony, indirect requests, etc.) the informative intention is made implicit through "ostensivizing" contextual pragmatic assumptions. The addressee instinctively (like all humans) finds pleasure in interpreting covert communication. Optimal relevance is not guaranteed in covert communication. However, the addressee is motivated by the cognitive reward that compensates for his/her processing effort in meaning interpretation. Moeschler (2004) maintains that ostensive-inferential communication is a mixed process that involves the coded model where the linguistic code is decoded "literally", and the inferential model through which the global meaning of the utterance/discourse is derived. It is hypothesized that the linguistic properties of an utterance may hinder its interpretation, especially when it features ambiguous, vague expressions, severe elliptical parts, referential

structures with undetermined referents, etc. (Kearns, 2001). As a corollary, the addressor should make his/her message as ostensive as possible to understand.

1.1.3. Cognitive processing: Effort and effects:

Unlike other pragmatic theories which focus on how and why people use language, RT pays considerable attention to how communication is processed. The cognitive facet of language use is the major concern of RT. It is materialized in the attempt to answer the following question:
Which elements of conceptual information are activated at which points in discourse processing?

Carston (2005: 304) contends that the general view RT holds, in this regard, is that the cognitive system tends to be selective, processing only the significant parts of the input "that are potentially beneficial to the ongoing functioning of the cognitive system and whose processing costs to the system are relatively low". The linguistic stimulus "ostention" which provides "relevant" information (that is of satisfactory cognitive benefit) is attended to by the addressee's cognitive system. Kecskes (2004) goes a step further and introduces what he terms "the Dynamic Model of Meaning" (DMM). According to DMM:

> The actual contextual meaning is constructed in the dynamic interplay of the conceptual system relying on prior coded knowledge, blending schemes, napping and other cognitive operations and the actual contextual operations triggered by the merging of lexical units and extralinguistic situational elements (13).

Voicing a similar view is Moeschler (2004). He maintains that the linguistic module (based on Foder's modularity theory) responsible for parsing the linguistic stimulus does not necessarily provide a complete interpretation except by mixing the linguistic input with other linguistic, non-linguistic, physical and mental knowledge stored in the addressee's cognitive system. Since processing effort should be compatible with the cognitive reward gained when the message is understood, RT recommends the following processing steps (Wilson & Sperber, 2004: 613):
(1) Follow the path of least effort in computing cognitive effects.
(2) Stop when the expected level of relevance is reached.

More practically, Wilson and Sperber (615) describe the sub-tasks in the overall comprehension process as follows:
a) Constructing an appropriate hypothesis about implicit content (explicatures) through mechanical decoding, disambiguation, reference resolution and other pragmatic enrichment process.

b)   Constructing an appropriate hypothesis about the intended contextual assumptions (implicated premises)

c)   Constructing an appropriate hypothesis about the intended contextual implications (implicated conclusion).

1.1.4. Implicature:

The key term "implicature" has triggered much debate on how to define an implicature, its kinds, its relation to other related terms such as explicature (impliciture), strong and weak implicature, among others. First introduced by Grice (1975),implicature is defined as "extra-messages" that are indirectly enacted in discourse. In Gricean pragmatics, an implicature is something between linguistic meaning and the speaker's meaning. It arises when conversational maxims are violated (maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, politeness, etc.). Grice distinguishes between "generalized conversational implicature" whose prime characteristic is that mere uttering of the utterance carries the implicature e.g.: He is meeting a woman < not his wife, mother, sister, etc.; and "particularized conversational implicature" which requires special contextual aids and experience for its meaning recovery. Kallia (2004) states that implicatures serve many functions. They may supplement the linguistic (semantic) meaning of the speaker's utterance, convey additional meaning, or convey completely different meaning from what is said. The following examples illustrate these functions respectively:

1)   a) I missed the mid-day prayer
       b) There is a mosque over there.
       > You can pray there.

2)   Mother to a sleeping child.
       It is seven a.m.
       > It is time to get up.

3)   Mother to a naughty child.
       You are so quiet!
       > You are not quiet.
       >=implicate

Kallia further draws a distinction between implicature and other inferences. Implicatures "are intended by the speakers, that is the speaker wants the hearer to arrive at the implicature" (15), whereas other inferences (deductions) are not necessarily the case.

The relevance-theoretic notion of implicature is over-pragmatic. An implicature content consists of wholly pragmatically inferred matter (Sperber and Wilson, 1995: 182). Communicator's inferencing is always guided by the expectation and search for relevance, where there must be an interaction between linguistic and pragmatic information. Sperber and Wilson (1995) also maintain that implicatures vary in their degree of strength; some implicatures

are strongly encoded and therefore recognizable, while some others are weak probably because their meaning is opaque and unconventional, and therefore hardly recognized or recovered. Further explaining such a distinction, Willson and Sperber (2004: 620) state that a strong implicature is that one whose recovery is essential in order to arrive at the interpretation that satisfies the addressee's expectations of relevance, whereas a weak implicature is defined as that one "whose recovery helps with the construction of such an interpretation, but is not itself essential because the utterance suggests a range of similar possible implicatures, anyone of which would do".

A twin term to implicature is "explicature". Carston (2005) argues that an explicature is a proposition whose interpretation is defined through a combination of linguistically decoded material and pragmatically inferred material. Wilson and Sperber (2004) argue that the inferential work is not restricted to implicature recovery, rather it extends to explaining explicature. Explicature is the first stage of utterance processing and, as its name suggests, it has to do with the explicit part of the message. To Wilson and Sperber an explicature is a product of an "enrichment process" conducted by the addressee and operates on the propositional form of the meaning. It demystifies the logical form by checking the referents of the referential expressions, disambiguating semantically and structurally opaque parts in the utterance, etc.

Viewing explicature from a wider cognitive perspective, Foster-Cohen (2004b) notes that explicature is divisible into two kinds, each corresponding to a processing pattern. One is lower-level explicature which involves understanding the propositional (local) meaning of the utterance that is associated with the bottom-up processing, where the addressee is concerned with what is actually said. The second type is the upper-level explicature by which the speaker's attitude towards the message is uncovered, involving top-down processing where the addressee employs some paralinguistic features to interpret meaning.

Garrett & Harnish (2007) coin a new term to replace explicature, i.e. "implicature". Missed by Grice's taxonomy of utterance signification, they claimed, implicature (among other labels are: implicature, unarticulated constituents, default heuristics, and generalized implicature) refers to "the information not explicitly contained in the words uttered, but not worked out by typical Gricean mechanisms of particularized conversational implicature" (P. 66) A. frequently-cited example is: "it is raining" where the unarticulated constituents are "now" and "here", such unarticulated words are termed "impliciture" or, in RT terminology, "explicature". Interpreting explicature, according to RT, involves "enrichment mechanisms [other terms are: mechanisms of completion and expansion, (Bach 2000), and mechanisms of saturation and strengthening (Racanati 2000)]. Thus, enrichment mechanisms

are cognitive tasks done by the addressee to enrich the utterance by identifying the unarticulated constituents that expand meaning, disambiguating unclear parts, linking the referential expressions to their referents, etc. In an experiment testing explicatures interpretation, Garrett & Harnish (2007) report that context-free explicatures were better interpreted than context-supported explicatures. Their findings support the common theorization that working out the meaning of an explicature is recovered from the utterance per se provided some semantic and pragmatic inferential work is done.

1.1.5. Context:

Processing should not stop after obtaining the explicature because working out the implicature is the next task, where context plays a crucial role. The notion of context has been a key construct in all pragmatic and discourse analysis theories. There has been a consensus among theorists on the fact that context is indispensable for meaning interpretation. Of particular significance in this regard is RT treatment of the notion of context. Context refers the communicator's set of presuppositions, values and background. A basic RT processing principle is that one should leave implicit everything one can trust the audience to supply with the least effort. This justifies the significance of contextual assumptions necessary for successful communication. Sperber & Wilson (1995: 15) state that context is not limited to textual, co-textual, or external (physical environment) factors but also "a set of all the assumptions the addressee knows about the world such as expectations about the future, scientific hypo or religious beliefs, anecdotal memories, general cultural assumptions, beliefs about the mental state of the speaker's". Going a step further, RT theorists coin the term "cognitive environment" to forcefully emphasize how so important the individual's world representation (how s/he views the world, his mental model of things events and other individuals, culture, etc.) is in interpreting meaning that is part and parcel of "the context". Tagushi (2002), elaborating on RT notion of cognitive environment, postulates that it involves all facts the addressee knows about an utterance environment. He argues that among the many assumptions that pop in one's mind when processing an utterance, one selects the most relevant interpretation which creates the maximum cognitive effect through the least resources. To Sperber and Wilson (1995: 39) "a fact is manifest to an individual at a given time if and only if he is capable of representing it mentally and accepting its representation as true or probably true".

Germane to the notion of mental representation of facts underlying the context is the notion of "mental context" proposed by Sequeiros (2004) and Breheny (2006). Mental context embraces our stored knowledge that we learn overtime of how to recognize such features as sociopolitical background, ethnic identity, power, politeness, solidarity, injustice, etc. from the way an individual

talks, behaves, wears, etc. Such data help us interpret language. Tapping on the same issue is Van Dijk (2005). Thanks to his decade-long collaboration with the cognitive psychologist Walter Kintsch on the psychology of text processing, Van Dijk views context as a mental model represented in memory including many cultural, semantic, rhetorical, pragmatic, lexical and stylistic assets necessary for the production and comprehension of discourse. Finally, Pilkington (2000) states that the addressee should not know everything known to the addressor; s/he just has to construct some immediate assumptions from context and memory.

1.2. RT & CDA:

All pragmatic theories, including RT, share a common philosophy: communication is inferential. Their main goal is the recognition of the speaker's intentions, and that a mere decoding of the linguistic structure of utterances does not suffice. The concept of context is crucial in their argumentation. However, RT seems to be advantageous over other pragmatic theories in many respects. One is its economy: all maxims proposed by Grice (1975), Levinson (2000), Horn (1996 onwards), Bach (2000), etc. are collapsed according to RT into one principle: relevance. Secondly, the notion of implicature (shared by all paradigms) is successfully formulated, giving further room for pure pragmatic factors to get their significance manifested (Oswald, 2007). Thirdly, naturally-occurring data have been favorable to the theory, not constructed "artificial" examples. Fourthly and most importantly, as Foster-Cohen (2004a) states, RT celebrates the mental procedures conducted in communication which manifest themselves in the speaker's desire to get the hearer understand, and the hearer's assumption that a relevant interpretation is derivable and worth the effort. RT has the advantage of decomposing and analyzing the two mental processes of communication: production and interpretation. The speaker's mental processes before and during speech production gain scant (and possibly no) attention in most pragmatic theories. Their main interest revolves around the post-production stage, that of the hearer. RP is believed to be speaker-oriented. Fifthly, the concept of context is freshly and comprehensively introduced in RT. The mental context, the mental model, the cognitive environment, world representation, etc. display a profound reliance on the cognitive, social, cultural, linguistic components constituting the processing frame of reference i.e. "the context". Context, according to RT, is not limited to the text, the co-text or the external physical world. Rather, it encompasses the ideology, the culture, the discursive knowledge, the coded language, etc. stored in the communicators' minds which shape the way they represent and view the world: its people, events, actions, etc. "By doing so, RT provides a way forward for joining the cognitive to the social in ways not attempted by previous research" (Foster-Cohen, 2004b: 190).

However, RT has been criticized for being asocial, where discursive facets of communication which encode social and ideological implications are not adequately attended to. Sperber and Wilson (2005) refute that claim arguing that RT does accommodate social aspects of communication. As a theory of communication, the social, ideological, cultural and political facets are inherently addressed. Nevertheless, it is argued that RT could be supplemented by some discourse assumptions from a critical theory, most notably is CDA. The outcome constitutes a more useful basis for depicting such socio-discursive aspects, since political discourse is a site where power, ideology and other social issues are perfectly elucidated.

CDA as a discourse analysis framework is grounded on the argument that language is a social practice whose structure is socially conditioned. Language also structures and reinforces these social practices. CDA is "critical" of the social injustice, the abuse of power, racism, dominance, brain washing, etc. through shedding light on the dominant forces, "the elites", that impose their agenda and version of reality on the dominated, not necessarily through violent means but through persuasion and manipulation (Fairclough, 1989, 1995 Fairclough & Wodak, 1997) Wodak (2007: 209) elaborates.

> *Critical theories, thus also CDA, are afforded special standing as guides for human action. They are aimed at producing enlightenment and support emancipation. Such theories seek not only to describe and explain, but also root out a particular kind of delusion. Even with differing concepts of ideology, critical theory seeks to create awareness in agents of how they are deceived about their own needs and interests ... one of the aims of CDA is to "demystify" discourses by deciphering ideologies.*

Recent CDA work tends to minimize the risk of critical bias (subjectivity) by adopting the principle of "triangulation" i.e. to work under an interdisciplinary umbrella, where a variety of theories are employed in studying a given discourse phenomenon (Van Dijk 2005, Wodak, 2007). The rationale is that CDA on its own is not able to explain fully some pragmatic devices such as presupposition, allusions and implicature. Accordingly, their interpretation is possibly subject to the researcher 's bias. Moreover, the solid role of cognitive processes is mushroomingly recognized among CDA theorists. A cautionary view is expressed, by Chilton 2005 (in Wodak 2007: 204). He states that the growing interest in the cognitive approach, under various cover terms, "would prove that a CDA approach becomes obsolete". Thus, the theoretical and analytical framework of a study depicting the implicatures in political discourse, which is typically conditioned by ideology, history, critique, and power (four concepts indispensable in all CDA models), should be multidisciplinary grounded. The present study is no exception.

1.3. Political Discourse:

Recent research on political discourse has produced a large body of literature (eg. Chilton; 2004, Geis;1987; Billing; 2006, Saussure & Schulz, 2005, Van Dijk 2002, 2003, 2005). Nevertheless, the notion of politics proves elusive, defined in diverse senses. An extremely general trend regards every single social practice, verbal and non-verbal, political. A more common trend sees political discourse as that one produced by politicians in political addresses, press releases, parliamentary debates, etc. George Orwell's writings on language and politics represent the dawn of work on political discourse. The main thrust of his argument is that language when manipulated by a government, has a crucial, unconscious influence on people's political thought, i.e. the way they see the political issues. Among his strongest statements are (qtd, in Geis 1989: 2-3):

> *In our time, political speech and writing are largely the defense of the indefensible.*
> *Political language ... is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable.*

Politics is by its very nature a linguistic practice. Language functions not only as a vehicle by which political issues are expressed, outlined, marketed, etc. but also as an integral part of politics itself (Edelman, 1974 in Geis, 1989: 5). Consequently, language to a great extent helps shape people's political vision. They do not know "political" events language does not describe or attend to. Further, the languages used in the description of a given event creates a bundle of implicatures, assumptions, attitudes, schemata etc. that shape our experience when we use, read, or hear something related to that event. We represent events through the way language describes them. Accordingly, a given political event may have as many representation versions as the descriptions it receives conditioned by who describes, his/her ideological and political agenda, the target audience, etc.

One major characteristic of political discourse is that it is persuasive whether by making the case or not making the case. Persuasion takes different forms. One common form is mythic thinking. Proposed by Edelman and reviewed by Geis (1989), mythic thinking is causally simple in the sense that it advocates one and only one apparent cause of an event, hence it is unscientific as any event can be caused by a number of variables. Furthermore, mythic thinking enjoys wide support among audience, especially the politically naïve, as its premises and conclusions are not verified, simply because they are taken for granted. Augoustinos *et al.* (2002) broach a similar concept; it is self-sufficient arguments which are mere unsupported assertions. Geis argues that politicians enhance mythic thinking for a number of reasons:

a. It is hard not to think in simple causal terms.

b. Simple causal theories are easier to grasp and are more elegant than complex causal theories.
c. Simple causal theories warrant simple causal solutions.
d. Simple causal solutions are more appealing to people than are complex causal solutions.

Finally mythic thinking works until people stop supporting it (37).

However, the strategy of promoting mythic thinking adopted by politicians has lost some, if not much, of its force recently before and after the war on Iraq, for instance. People become less vulnerable to mythic thinking campaigns. This is partly ascribed to the multiplicity of institutes that provide diverse and sometimes opposing opinions to those marketed by the governments. The political scene is no longer constructed solely by the elite in power. Opposing voices, ideologies, etc., also take part. Consequently, it is no wonder that demonstrations overwhelmed the whole world against the war on Iraq, for instance, regardless of the myth of weapons of mass destruction. Linguistically, Geis argues that there are three techniques for conveying mythic thinking: (1) through the use of socially-favored claims/law-like claims, (2), through the use of favored language and (3) through the use of ordinary language.

1.4. Argumentation: Reasoning & persuasion:

Jovicic (2006: 29) argues that argumentation results from communicative interaction between interactants against a background of varying commitments with the aim of resolving a conflict of opinions through persuasive means. Argumentative strategies involve two important dimensions: (1) *the reasoning aspects* which are the claims proposed, and the evidence/proof that supports them on logical basis, and (2) *the social aspects* which have to do with addressing audience's characteristics by providing the argument in such an attractive way so that audience would accept it (persuasion). It is hypothesized that many factors determining the dynamics of argumentation are to be explored, and that many disciplines, including linguistics, can help understand how argumentation works. Social and psychological aspects of argumentation are regarded as indispensable factors of argumentation.

A similar view of argumentation is voiced by Emmel *et al.* (1996). Argumentation involves two overlapping processes: inquiry and persuasion. Persuasion is believed to involve using all possible rhetorical strategies to win an argument. Inquiry, on the other hand, involves an exploration of the possible rational means to believe in something. Inquiry is a collaborative act whereas persuasion is a competitive one. Haring-Smith (1994) holds a similar position. She states that inquiry enables arguers to look at the different sides of the issue, whereas in persuasion the arguers have a predetermined view and they do their

best to convince others that it is worthy of belief. Accordingly, the first part of the following section is an account of the nature of the reasoning aspects i.e. the notion of argument, different models of argument, schemes of arguments, etc. The second part, in turn, is devoted to uncovering the social aspects of argumentation such as the audience, the processing of message, persuasive strategies, etc.

1.4.1. Reasoning aspects:
1.4.1.1. Argument:
   An argument commonly involves premises which are a set of statements or propositions put forward and support a conclusion which is derived from the premises. Two major models of argument have swayed the argument theorization since the classic Greeks: (1) the classical model based on induction and deduction and the modern paradigms based on it and (2) Toulmin's model. Drawing on the classical model, Juthe (2005: 2) proposes a taxonomy of four kinds of argument. One is the *deductive argument* where if the premises are true the conclusion is true, and the reasoning moves from the general to the particular i.e. "the meaning of the statement entails the conclusion". The second type is the *inductive argument* in which the reasoning moves from the particular to the general and a probable conclusion is entailed. The third type is similar to inductive argument in that the reasoning flows from the particular to the general and then to the particular. Further, "the premises do not convey truth-value to the conclusion but plausibility-value". It helps explain the correlations between events and facts. for instance:

1. The window is open.
2. If John had been home the window would be open.
3. The window is not broken by a thief.

  ∴ John is home.

   This sort of argument is termed *abductive*. The fourth kind is *argument by analogy*; where reaching a conclusion is achieved via an analogical relation in contrast to inductive or deductive argument.

   In reaction to the classical model of argument which is too formal and mathematically defined, Toulmin (1958) has noted that logicians have gone too far in assuming that an argument should be orderly and of a definitive structure. Alternatively, he proposes a model that fits real-life arguments. According to this model, a well constructed argument should comprise three components: *the claim, the data and the warrant*. The claim is an arguable statement. The data support the claim in various ways: giving examples, facts, statistics, expert testimony and sometimes by hypothetical examples. Data are also used to refute a given claim. The warrant functions as the underlying assumptions linking

between the claim and the data[1]. Below is an application of Toulmin's model on the following argument.

claim

The bus is the best means of transportation to Cairo

Data

- It is air-conditioned.
- It is more comfortable.
- You can enjoy your time during the trip.

warrant

Taking the bus is the right choice if you want to travel enjoyably and comfortably.

Inspired by both the classic paradigms and Toulmin's (1958) model, Schellens & Jony (2004) propose a taxonomy of argument or argumentation schemes that include the following types of argument:

a. **Argument from consequences** in which an action or behaviour is supported/opposed on the basis of desirable consequences (pros.) or undesirable consequences (cons.), e.g.

Action A leads to B.

B is (un) desirable.

Therefore action A is (un) desirable.

b. **Argumentation from cause to effect** holds that a phenomenon is the effect of the cause A and any other related phenomena:

A (generally) leads to B.

A: is the case.

Therefore, B; is (probably the case).

c. **Argumentation from example** is a sort of argument used in supporting a claim:

In example A_1, B is the case/appropriate.

(In example A_2 etc. B is the case/appropriate)

Therefore, in cases of A, B is the case/appropriate.

d. **Argumentation from rule** justifies taking a given course of action/conduct.

If A is the case, then an evaluation E is justified and conduct

C is required.

e. **Argumentation from authority**

A says P.

Therefore, (I) P.

Where P stands for proposition and (I) for interpretation.

Emotional arguments

Emotional argumentation, which is based on the assumption that it is an easier task to touch people's emotions that could lead to persuasion, has been regarded as a type of faulty reasoning. Daniels & Daniels, (1993: 131) postulate that "although getting an audience to care deeply about an issue is one of the legitimate tasks of a speaker or writer, playing on people's emotions to confuse their thinking is unfair". Damer (1980) broaches a similar view. To Damer, strong emotions distort rational thought and turn arguments fallacious. Pragma-dialectical argumentation models (van Emeren & Houtlosses, 2003) have been concerned with the use of emotional argumentations as persuasive strategies that could be used without being fallacious. Walton (2005) maintains that emotional argumentation could be logically used, as emotions are instrumental in argument processing. Finally, emotional argumentation is easier to construct by arguers, on the one hand, and easier to process by audience, on the other. It is no wonder, therefore, to find people appeal to emotions so frequently (Walton, 1992). Emotional argumentation manifests itself in the following argument types (Daniels & Daniels, 1993; Walton, 1992 onwards):

a.   Ad populum argument:

Appeals to patriotism and loyalty to the country, nation, group, friends, colleagues, etc. are always strongly made, swaying peoples' senses. Ad populum in Latin means "to the people" and it emphasises the need to support claims without questioning, as they are reflecting the in-group bonds. Ad populum argument could turn fallacious if appeal is made not to group interests but to the position by some influential members of the group in the name of the group (Walton, 2005).

b.   Argumentum and Metum (argument from fear):

Fear is a strong emotion, which once appealed to turns into a strong warrant to believe in the argument and further to take an action (enargeia). It is a scary argument. Fear might be rationally appealed if it is justified by data that support its arguments. Yet if baseless/groundless, it turns fallacious,

c.   Argumentum ad Misericordiam (argument from pity):

Pity is also a strong feeling, appeal to which takes the form of tapping on people's compassion. Damer (1980) argues that a distinction should be made between a fallacious appeal to pity which replaces logic and a legitimate appeal to pity which supports logic.

d.   The plain folks appeal is a sort of emotional argumentation in which people in power are strategically portrayed as acting like common people (plain folks) to look modest (Walton, 1992).

e.   Argument by transfer refers to the transference of people's positive feelings towards an idea, an individual, an object, etc. to another individual, idea, etc. not necessarily evoking the same positive feelings.

f.   In a special pleading argument, the arguer is mainly focusing on the favorable aspects and ignoring equally important but less favorable aspects of an argument (Daniels & Daniels, 1993).

Other types of arguments:
a.   **In a red herring argument**, the arguer sidetracks the argument by talking off the subject to distract the audience (Damer, 1980).

b.   Self sufficient arguments are mere assertions that need no support (Augoustinos *et al.*, 2002). They bear resemblance to Edelman's notion of mythic thinking slogans (discussed earlier)

1.4.2. Social aspects (persuasion):
In classical rhetoric, audience is framed as present and directly addressed in discourse. In persuasive speech, a strong focus is put on the audience. Developing a strong argument involves a consideration of the kinds of evidence that are meaningful to audience. This entails that the arguer knows the audience and their biases (Haring-Smith 1994), and understands their experiences, expectations and beliefs (Wollman-Bonilla 2001). Persuasive speech intends to make audience believe and do something they otherwise might not have. Emmel *et al.* (1996) argue that asymmetrical (unilateral) theories of rhetoric assume a passive role to audience whose minds may change in case the rhetoric is successful. The speaker's mind does not change. Symmetrical theories, on the other hand, advocate an active role to both the speaker and the audience, each participates in constructing a well-reasoned argument that explains the point at hand. Jarvis & Connaughton (2005) maintain that studying speeches may shed light on the audience's ideology, assumptions and schemata. They refer to the audience as a construct that affects the content and language of speeches, claiming that the audience is involved in making a given speech a success or failure.

Wallman-Bonilla, further, proposes four kinds of rhetorical moves usually signaling audience awareness on the part of the addressor: (1) *naming moves* which guide audience to take a stance, (2) *context moves* that furnish the background information the addressor feels the addressees need to work out meaning, (3) *strategy moves* that keep the audience's interest and appeal to their emotions, and (4) *response moves* that may explain the audience's possible inquiries or concerns. Argumentation and communication theorists have emphasized that audience are of three groups: friendly, neutral and hostile. Argumentation scheme and pragmatics are largely determined by the group to

which the audience given belong. Daniels and Daniels (1993) maintain that persuading a hostile audience is the most difficult task. However, it is recommendable, they argue, that the arguer anticipates the audience opposing views. They state that "no matter how reasonable and well supported your argument is, hostile readers or listeners may well refuse to accept your line of reasoning and cling stubbornly to their own opinions" (7).

1.4.3. Processing of argumentative strategies

How the audience process argumentative strategies and the cognitive factors involved has been of little interest to rhetoricians. Nevertheless, it has intrigued social and cognitive psychologists since the sixties of the 20th century [e.g. Sherif & Hovland, 1981, Fishbein 1967, Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975, Petty & Cacioppo, 1979 and Shavitt & Nelson, 2000]. Petty and Cacioppo (1984) maintain that argumentation in persuasive discourse is processed either peripherally or centrally. Audience, while processing peripherally, have little processing load. In central processing, by contrast, much processing resources are used to work out the argumentation. Argument claim or premises are examined carefully and further related to the conclusion. Activating the appropriate route depends on the audience motivations, the topic of argumentation, etc. Shellens and Jong (2004) note that attitude change, due to peripheral processing is less stable and durable than attitude change due to central processing. On attitude change, they argue that in peripheral route, attitude change may occur not as a result of weighing the pros and cons in the argument, nor checking its validity.

Persuasion theories (reviewed thoroughly in Jovicic 2006)[(2)] explain further how audience process the ostensive argumentation message, and how (un)persuasion occurs. According to Sherif & Hovland's (1961) *Social Judgment Theory*, persuasion is conditional on many factors. One is *scope of the respondent's acceptance* (possible accepted opinions), *scope of rejection* (possible rejected opinions) and *scope of non-commitment* (the set of opinions towards which the respondent is indifferent). Persuasion is successful when the opinions proposed are close to the respondent's scope of acceptance or non-commitment. This explains why friendly and neutral audiences are more easily persuaded than hostile audience, since the persuader's opinions are close to the hostile audience scope of rejection. The second factor is the ego-involvement of the respondent with an issue. It is argued that the more involved the respondent is, the higher the possibility his attempt is to critically receive an opinion and even place it within the rejection scope. The third one is *the assimilation and contrast affects*, whereby the persuader, anticipating a possible rejection of an opinion, introduces it in a way that seems closer to the respondent's scope of acceptance than it really is.

Petty & Cacioppo's (1979) *Elaboration Likelihood Model* suggests that the likelihood of audience elaboration (thinking about) the relevant information determines the selections and success of persuasion appeals. High elaboration and low elaboration correspond to the central route and the peripheral route respectively. Central route of elaboration has to do with the issue-relevant thinking which includes analyzing the arguments proposed, checking their components, their counter arguments, relevant information, etc. On the other hand, in the peripheral route of elaboration, the respondent is concerned with the persuader's style, way of talking or looking and reaction of the audience. Elaboration (thinking) is motivated by the personal relevance of the issue, need for cognition (curiosity) and the number of argument sources. The elaboration ability is influenced by distraction (the existence of various stimuli) and prior knowledge (the wider the respondent's prior knowledge, the higher the elaboration ability needed for central route processing). Inoculation is a further factor of successful persuasion, related to elaboration. It is explained in the weak attacks on audience members' existing attitudes and beliefs. Inoculation is manipulated by some persuaders to get audience prepared for resisting unfavorable claims deliberately introduced by the persuaders to secure audience's rejection of these claims.

Persuasion is also influenced by such factors as: the communicator's credibility, liking of the communicator, his similarity with the receivers, physical attractiveness of the persuader, language style, order of arguments, implicatures, the types of evidence and claim proposed, speed of speech, audience's expectation, etc. Similarly, Jørgensen *et al.* (1998) suggest four basic (interrelated and overlapping) persuasive properties: precision, firmness, energy, and commitment. All of which are manifested in: (1) nonverbal features such as modulated voice, (highlighting important content), energetic articulation, intense gaze, energetic posture, etc., and (2) argumentation strategies such as using evidence, examples, statistics, etc. to support warranted conclusions.

1.5. Political context:

Descending from a conservative family background, an MP for Sedgefield, then a minister in the Shadow Cabinet and eventually Labour party leader in 1994, Tony Blair, the former British Prime Minister, is seen as a historical figure in modern British history. Winning elections for three times, a record seldom made by a British PM, Blair boasted Labour and raised expectations. His looks, appearance, self-confidence, lucidity, clarity of mind appealed to the people, finding in him the new blood that would refresh the British political thinking. Thanks to his bold measures and eclectic beliefs, Labour is transformed into New Labour. His new doctrine/philosophy is

materialized in the "Third Way" which is seen as an alternative to Thatcherism (cutting taxes, reducing social services, stimulating competitiveness and efficiency in the private sector) and the collectivism of traditional Labour (the state shoulders responsibility for economic and social welfare in the broadest terms, such as narrowing the gap between the rich and the poor through public education and national health care) (Krieger 2006). After September 11th 2001, Blair was America's key ally in the war on terrorism, morally, diplomatically and militarily. Then came the war on Iraq. Based on inaccurate intelligence and false claims of mass destruction weapons, Blair participated in the war, sending British troops to Iraq. The war was not popular among the majority of the British people, and by time, the causalities among the British soldiers and the massive destruction and killing in Iraq on daily basis had negative impact on Blair's credibility and achievements. Though winning the 2005 election, Blair's leadership of Labour was questioned. Striving for further two years (up to 2007), Blair's decision to resign was forced largely by Labour's losing the majority in Municipal Elections. Fearing from further failures, Blair decided to resign two years ahead of his term end. The resignation address was given in his constituency "Sedgefield" attended by Blair's supporters.

2.   Analysis

Blair's resignation address on Thursday May 10th 2007 (videotape & transcript)[(3)] represents the main data analyzed. The analysis focuses on elucidating and examining the argumentative structure by highlighting the ostensive sections in each argument, the possible various ways an argument is processed in accordance with the relevance principle interacting with the processing routes adopted by the different sections of the audience, and finally drawing the implicatures evoked. The RT-based analysis rests, though broadly, on the normative criteria observed in constructing an argument (that it must be fully and well-constructed comprising, according to Toulmin's model of argument: claim, data and a warrant) and the persuasion theories which explain the diverse cognitive ways by which messages could be processed and evaluated (all outlined briefly in the previous section). As for implicatures (the way Blair wants audience understand his speech), they are routinely understood based on common political knowledge and current situation, and only presupposed in later talk and texts. They "explain that and why political participants say the things they do" (Van Dijk 2005: 70).

Immediately after briefing the Cabinet of his decision to step down, Blair headed to his constituency, Sedgefield, where he addressed a small audience of

his supporters. Blair prefers to make his resignation address in such a friendly, intimate setting which makes it possible for him to adopt a personal tone through breaking the conventional barriers between the addressor and the audience (he smiles, jokes and names some of the audience members before making his speech). So the setting is a family one (not that of party or parliament). Old, middle aged and young people from both sexes, some accompany their kids and toddlers, make up his audience, all cheering, and some carrying "Too young to resign" and "Good Luck" signs. Given this atmosphere, Blair's address is catered to strike a balance between the typical characteristics of a speech (argumentation, moving rhetoric, self-image enhancement etc.) and creating a family atmosphere and reinforcing the prevailing personal tone that makes his arguments attractive to the audience.

Blair is grateful and loyal

Blair's speech opens with a number of emotional, fairly-constructed arguments which make manifest a range of ostensive stimuli that help derive a range of implicatures. The first extract is:

"I have come back here, to Sedgefield, to my constituency, where my political journey began and where it is fitting it should end.

The argument is an *ad populum appeal* where emotional appeals are made to consolidate feelings of patriotism, in-group loyalty, in-group bonds, etc. The prime target is to address people's emotions of belonging and loyalty. In relation to the argumentation structure, it would be as follows:

Claim (Implicated): Blair is loyal, and grateful to his constituency.
Data: He started his career there and is ending it there too.
          It is the place whose people supported Blair and remained faithful to him to the end.
Warrant (Implicated): Choosing Sedgefield as the right place to make his resignation speech is evidence that Blair is faithful to his constituency.

Not all of the argument components are explicitly provided. One possible explanation is that their absence is recoverable from the context or the audience mental model. The second one is that their very absence is regarded as ostensive (even more) as the explicitly-presented data. The latent material better expresses Blair's objectives at the beginning: to mobilize the feeling of the audience by tapping on in-group bonds in a bid to enhance his image as a modest, grateful, loyal leader. Among the ostensive clues deployed by Blair to help audience make such inferences he wants them to draw are: the hyperbolic appositive: "to Sedgefield to my constituency" without which the argument reads: I have come back here, where my political journey began and where it is fitting it should end. This appositive also enhances intimate, friendly tone and connotations.

Items such as "should" and "back" function similarly. The striking contrast in "began" and "end" and the poetic effects it creates in the audience who surrender themselves to such catchy oratory make the above section memorable.

Blair loves Britain most:

> *"I have been prime Minster of this country for just over 10 years. In this job in the world to day, that is long enough for me but more especially for the country. Sometimes the only way to conquer the pull of power is to set it down.*

A further *ad populum argument* is furnished stirring further feelings of patriotism and slogan-making: "Britain comes first". It reads:

Claim (implicated): Blair loves his country most.
Insufficient data: He steps down after 10 years because he thinks this is in Britain's interest.
Warrant: Blair's resignation is evidence of his love to the country

In argumentation theory, Blair's data that support the claim telling us why he resigns are missing (not latent), the cover justification that "it is in the country's interest" is not true, given the fact that Blair ran for a third term that supposedly ends in 2009. The reason why he is resigning is not given, opening the gate for many speculations. Most plausible of which is that he was forced to resign when Labour loses many seats in the Municipal Elections, and when the people gradually find in the worsening current situation in Iraq new evidence that this war was unjustifiable. The absence of a sound justification for his resignation is very ostensive. Equally ostensive is the so-called justification: "10 years are long enough for me but more especially for the country". The product of both ostensive structures accompanied by the memorable, mythic, self-sufficient argument "*sometimes the only way you conquer the pull of power is to set it down*" raise the following implicatures:

I believe in change
I resign willingly because I felt that that would be in Britain's interest.
I have not been pressured to resign.

Such implicatures (intended by Blair) are securely arrived at by Blair's supporters because they process the speech peripherally, taken by Blair's attractive and charismatic character. Being friendly, audience would find Blair's justification of resignation plausible. They even would popularize it in their discussion after the address. Neutral audience would find Blair's warrant attractive too and would generate similar implicatures to those of the previous group. Opposing audience who process Blair's speech centrally focusing on its reasoning, arguments, etc. would detect the defective part of his argument and circulate it in their discussion too. However, Blair wants things to be taken emotionally in order to evade mentioning the reason of his resignation and

disguise in this emotionally-stirring one. Blair manages to evoke image-repair implicatures, even his opponents find in his justification a sort of celebrating cherished values not easily attacked.

Blair is democratic

> *"It is difficult to know how to make this speech today. There is a judgment to be made on my premiership and in the end that is for you, the people, to make.*

This is the third emotional ***ad populum argument*** in a row wrapping hot issues into an emotional context. Argumentatively, it reads:

Claim (implicated): Blair is democratic and fair.
Data: He leaves people to judge him.
Warrant (implicated): To leave people judge is a property of a good, fair politician.

The claim absence is very ostensive as it helps derive the implicatures wanted without stating them explicitly. The warrant which links between the claim and the data is partly latent, deriving further implicatures. Blair's argument implicates that although judging Blair's era is made by the people, the deployment of recurrent emotional appeals, which stir people's feelings towards supporting him, indirectly direct them to judge him the way he desires: ***judge me in light of my many achievements, their historical conditions and the philosophy behind them. Your judgment must be the following:***

I was an exceptional, reflective, consistent Prime Minister.
Also implicated is:
> ***Don't be harsh judges***

It is noteworthy that furnishing three successive emotional arguments accommodating a range of implicatures sets the stage for Blair to: (1) escape from right judgment , (2) defend himself against critical and opposing voices, and (3) pave the way to introduce his core arguments depicting his achievements, his philosophy, his leadership and his personality.

> *"I have never quite put it like this before.*

> *"I was born almost a decade after the Second World War. I was a young man in the social revolution of the '60s and ' 70s. I reached political maturity as the cold war was ending, and the world was going through a political , economic, and technological revolution.*

Emphasizing the intimate, personal tone, Blair argues that this speech is a special occasion. It evokes transparency, love, and intimacy. The implicatures drawn could be:

> *Our discourse was always formal. Today, it is different. I want you to know that what I have done has been conditioned by personal, national and international factors.*

The above extract lays out the political situation that makes Blair's policy and vision understandable and reasonable. It paves the way for Blair's major argument on his political thinking and vision. Its argumentation structure is that of **argument from comparison**, where Blair draws a comparison between the political thought prevailing in the Pre-Blair era and his new political vision. It is a comparison/contrast between "yesterday" and "today": the past and the present.

Yesterday's Britain Vs. Today's Britain:

1. *"I looked at our own country-a great country, wonderful history, magnificent tradition, proud of its past, but strangely uncertain of its future, uncertain about the future, almost old-fashioned"*
2. *"All of that was curiously symbolized in its politics.*
3. *"You stood for individual aspiration and getting on in life, or social compassion and helping others.*
4. *"You were liberal in your values, or conservative.*
5. *"You believed in the power of the state, or the efforts of the individual. Spending more money on the pubic realm was the answer, or it was the problem.*
6. *"None of it made sense to me. It was 20th century ideology in a world approaching a new millennium.*
7. *"Of course people want the best for themselves and their families, but in an age where human capital is a nation's greatest asset, they also know it is just and sensible to extend opportunities to develop the potential to succeed-for all, not an elite at the top.*
8. *"People are today open-minded about race and sexuality, averse to prejudice and yet deeply and rightly conservative with a small "c" when it comes to good manners, respect for others, treating people courteously.*
9. *"They acknowledge the need for the state and the responsibility of the individual.*
10. *"They know spending money on our public services matters and that it is not enough. How they are run and organized matters too.*
11. *"So 1997 was a moment for a new beginning, for sweeping away all the detritus of the past.*

The above extract is overtly argumentative. The argument is given explicitly and the construction of its argumentative structure is not left to the audience. The claim is placed at the very end, it is the last sentence in the extract: "so 1997 was a moment for a new beginning, for sweeping away all the detritus of the past".

Ostensively stated in the claim are: "new beginning" "sweeping away" "all" and "past". Though put finally, the claim and its ostensive items guide and warrant a careful examination of the data provided previously. Proposition (P)1 is a continuation of the emotional ad-populum appeals through the use of such ostensive hyperbolic expressions as: the appositive "own", the glittering words like "great", "wonderful", "magnificent", "proud", "strangely" and the striking opposites "future", "past" and "old fashioned", not to mention the continuing use of the discursive personal pronoun "I" which establishes a solid personal, intimate tone. Among the implicatures drawn are:

- *Our past is the single glorious thing of which were are proud. This past inspires me (Blair).*
- *On the other hand, at the time, future was not clear and that was embodied in the policies of the time.*
- *Politicians of the time were not good! They create a state of dichotomous thinking that reflects two extremes.*

Ps. (3), (4) and (5) serve as examples supporting that dichotomous, extremist, and vague social and political thinking characterizing the pre-Blair era. People were divided and torn between two competing (rather conflicting) social, economic and political philosophies: the collective (state responsibility) Labour and the private (individual's responsibility) Conservative. Ps (6), (7) represent the transitional stage that leads to the tremendous changes Blair has made in the political thinking.

Blair wants to implicate:
- *I represent the new ideology.*
- *It is I who brings these changes that wipe all the detritus of the past.*
- *The new ideology that I enhance changes the people's political and social vision and endorses values of social justice and the extension of opportunities for all.*

Ps, (8), (9) and (10) constitute the second half of the comparison that represents the outcome of Blair's new ideology, vision, etc. People become more flexible, tolerant and less dogmatic about controversial socio-economic issues, yet some values are kept unchanged, that have to do with morals: "good manner, respect for others and treating people courteously".
The implicatures Blair wants to evoke out of this comparison argument are:
> *I am a historic Prime Minister who makes an unprecedented change, "the third way" that turns the British political thinking towards flexibility, tolerance, justice and open-mindedness. Simultaneously, my new ideology keeps and strengthens the authentic British values. They are still a "c". I manage to widen people's scope and enable them to think flexibly. I transformed Britain. Today's Britain is much better.*

Nevertheless, that Blair attributes these changes to him solely is not totally fair. It is true that Blair symbolizes new blood and fresh, creative political vision that really transform Britain, yet Blair was fortunate, as he benefitted from the achievements of previous governments and the global changes that strike different parts of the world, Britain is no exception.

Blair's achievements:

Next, Blair turns immediately to talking about his government achievements implying that his is the best since 1945. The type of argument employed is ***argument from example***, where Blair provides informally a list of sampled examples of his government achievements:

1. *"Expectations were so high, too high, too high in a way for either of us.*
2. *"Now in 2007, you can easily point to the challenges, the things that are wrong, the grievances that fester.*
3. *"But go back to 1997. Think back. No, really. Think about your own living standards then in May 1997 and now.*
4. *"Visit your local school, any of them round here, or any where in modern Britain[4].*
5. *"Ask when you last had to wait a year or more on a hospital waiting list, or heard of pensioners freezing to death, unable to heat.[5]*
6. *"There is only one government since 1945 that can say all of the following: more jobs, fewer unemployed, better health, education results, lower crime and economic growth in every quarter. This one.*
7. *"But I don't need a statistic. There is something bigger than what can be measured in waiting lists or GCSE results or the latest crime, or job figures.*
8. *"Look at our economy-at ease with globalization, London the world financial center. Visit our great cities and compare them with 10 years ago. No country attracts overseas investment like we do.[6]*
9. *"Think about the culture of Britain in 2007. I don't just mean our arts that are thriving. I mean our values. The minimum wage, paid holydays as a right, amongst the best maternity pay and leave in Europe, equality for gay people.[7]*
10. *"Or look at the debates that reverberate round the world today, the global movement to support Africa in its struggle against poverty, climate change, the fight against terrorism. Britain is not a follower, it is a leader. It gets the essential characteristic of today's world, its interdependence.*
11. *"This is a country today that, for all its faults, for all the myriad of unresolved problems and fresh challenges, is comfortable in the 21st century, at home in its own skin, able not just to be proud of its past but confident of its future.*
12. *"I don't think Northern Ireland would have been changed unless Britain had changed[8], or the Olympics won if we were sill in the Britain of 1997.*

P (6) is the claim of the current argument. The remaining propositions are **data**, supporting **the claim** via a number of examples. The **claim** is placed medially preceded and followed by the supporting examples. The argument starts with the first achievement which is that people today are more able to figure out problems and challenges than before: the implicature is that:

> *My clear vision and new ideology have created further transparency that enables you to better see the reality and locate problems. I have given you the vision to tackle them too.*

The intimate, personal tone is ostensively reflected in the way the examples are introduced. Instead of providing figures to sound credible and reliable, Blair feels that statistics would ruin the intimate context within which he is conveying his messages. The implicature is: *my achievements are facts that need no verification*. Equally ostensive are the use of a series of requests. "ask", "visit", "think", "compare", "look" and "go back", the hedge, "I don't' think", and the repetitive use of the personal pronouns "I" and "you" (Giora *et al.*, 2005). Instead of listing his achievements in formal declarative structures which sound like unquestionable assertions, Blair puts them in an interpersonal, tentative and compact fashion that leaves room for the audience to think, elaborate, fill gaps and derive implicatures.

"But go back to 1947. Think back. NO, really, think back" Directly addressing the audience by asking them to "think back" , Blair's extremely ostensive clues here are the repetition of "think" and the discursives "no" and "really", revealing confidence, intimacy and reassurance. "No, really" implicates that Blair is confident that the audience is supporting him and is persuaded even without proof. They process his address peripherally, attracted by his authoritative, charismatic, articulate character. But Blair is asking them to "think" to "elaborate" to verify these views. Simultaneously, he knows that his audience is not restricted to those sitting or standing in front of him. He is indirectly addressing his supporters and opponents nationwide and worldwide. The implicature is:

> *If you think carefully of my achievements, you will do justice to me.*

Nevertheless, to help audience, or to put it differently, to drive audience to think, he provides a sketchy, reduced reference to key examples presenting only favorable information and ignoring equally valid material. This indicates that Blair's argument is reasonably defective. It is likely that a lot of people look at the government unhappily due to different reasons. Blair ignores the problems and weaknesses and casts light only on the favorable work.

Visit your local, school, any of them round here, or anywhere in Modern Britain.

This mini argument contains many latent components which serve as implicatures on their own:

Claim (implicated): I paid special attention to education which modernizes Britain.

Data: Visit any school and see for yourself. I'm not going to provide evidence. You find it there.

Warrant (implicated): My interest in education improvement symbolizes my determination to modernize Britain.

Then Blair strategically furnishes another vital example: health care. Constructing, though implicitly, a similar sub-argument:

Claim: Blair improved the health services

Data: Waiting a year or more on a hospital waiting list no longer exists which implicates that the number of hospitals and medical staff increases. Also, improving are the service quality, the equipment, etc. Blair also grants special care to the aged, by improving health care and supplying them with heat. This is evident in the fact that people no longer "hear of pensioners freezing to death in winter unable to heat their homes".

Warrant: Improving health care and caring for the aged proves that Blair is a compassionate, caring Prime Minister.

The next example has to do with economic achievements:

"Look at our economy-at ease with globalization, London the world's financial centre. Visit our great cities and compare them with 10 years ago. No country attracts overseas investment like we do.

The claim of the argument is intimately and interactively put. Instead of saying "our economy is at ease with globalization", Blair says "look at" which gets people involved and informed. The last two sentences provide the evidence/data needed to support this claim.

The following sub-argument is a mere (unsupported) claim which provokes mythic thinking. It has to do with Britain's culture (arts and values: they are thriving). Two possible interpretations are arising here. One is that this is a taken-for granted assumption that does not need support (self-sufficient argument), the second is that Blair is reducing the argument, drawing on the informal situation that does not necessitate supplying everything.

Then comes the significant part in the current argument which hosts the most controversial issue: "*Britain is not a follower, it is a leader*". The argument structure is schematically illustrated as follows:

Claim: One of Blair's achievements is that, in today's world, Britain is not a follower; it is a leader

Data (Examples):
- The global movement to support Africa in its struggle against poverty.
- Climate change
- The fight against terrorism.

Warrant : Britain's' leading role in these issues makes it a leader not a follower.

This argument from example is defective, as it belongs to a sort of faulty argumentation called *argument from transfer* which is "the association of a claim/idea with another one about which people feel strongly" (Daniels & Daniels 1993: 135). It is true that Blair's humanitarian work in Africa and his active role in ratifying Kuyoto's Climate Change Treaty made Britain a world leader in these respects, and earned Blair worldwide respect. Benefitting from these positive and favorable works which are internationally acknowledged, Blair makes a tricky insertion of "war on terrorism" in which Blair is widely believed to be a provocatively follower to Bush, not a leader. In so doing, Blair aims to get people's positive feelings about Blair's humanitarian and environmental work **transferred** to his anti-terrorism work. He does not say "I am not a follower, I am a leader. Alternatively "I" is replaced by "Britain" implicating that:

If Britain is a leader, Blair is a leader.
If Britain is a follower, Blair is a follower.
But Britain is not a follower, Britain is a leader.
Therefore, Blair is not a follower. Blair is a leader.

By associating himself with Britain, Blair is trying to refute the change that marred his image, that he is a follower to Bush. The argument also breeds "transfer" where people's love for their country transfers to Blair, which is a faulty reasoning.

The charge of being Bush's follower hounds Blair aggressively and has, in part, caused him to resign. Further refuting the claim that "he is a follower", Blair argues that "Britain gets the essential characteristic of today's world: its interdependence". Interdependence means that global vision, ideas and policies are increasingly governing the international relations. The implicature is that.

1. **Don't confuse believing in interdependence with following others. I'm not a follower; I'm a leader in a world governed by a new ideology: "interdependence".**
2. **Those attacking me are attacking Britain. They are not country lovers; they are disloyal.**

Reacting with stormy applause, the audience are taken by this intelligent argument, as they want to erase this charge to keep Blair's record bright. The hostile audience would also be struck by this argument, though after-speech processing would reveal Blair's faulty reasoning: "You are not Britain. If you are a follower, Britain is not a follower. Don't deceive us". Before moving on to the following achievements, Blair provides another dose of ad populum appeals where he argues that even in the presence of challenges, faults and problems, Britain is in harmony with the 21st century ideology, proud of its past and confident about the future. Blair's ostensive use of "faults, "past", "future", "proud" etc. implicates the following:

Regardless of my faults, I transformed Britain to a new age in which it is able to be proud of its past and confident of its future. My achievements outweigh any "faults".

The changes that Blair makes are positive and yield positive consequences:

"I don't think Northern Ireland would have been changed unless Britain had changed or the Olympics won if we were still the Britain of 1997."

This is an ***argument from consequence*** which links the cause to the consequence. Striking a balance between pros. and cons. determines whether the consequence is desirable or not (Shellens and Jong, 2004).

Claim (cause): The changes Blair made had positive consequences.
Data:
- Northern Ireland problem resolved.
- The Olympics won.
Warrant: These favorable, desirable consequences are attributed to Blair's policy of changing and transforming Britain.

A close examination of the reasoning underlying the above argument proves that it is faulty. Such positive consequences cannot be solely ascribed to Blair's policy. Other possible reasons ignored by or not known to Blair or the audience might have caused these consequences such as a change in the political vision of the IRA or that London deserves to host the Olympics. It is wonder, since many cities less internationally influential than London have hosted the Olympics before. This sort of argument is also an amalgam of **argument from ignorance and special pleading**. The instant processing would make it difficult for audience (even those who process centrally) to detect such a defect. They continue to be taken by Blair's stunningly verbal and non-verbal persuasive strategies. The human mind is commonly obsessed by the speaker's oratory, modulation of voice, posture, etc., all of which are as ostensive as the linguistic stimuli.

To end this core ***argument from example***, the following implicatures "intended" by Blair are derived:

> *I have been a phenomenal Prime Minister*
> *My achievements are numerous, bigger than statistics*
> *I transformed Britain from uncertainty to confidence*
> *I made Britain a leader not a follower*
> *If there are faults, my achievements wipe them all. My opponents should stop attacking me because they indirectly attack Britain.*

His Leadership and the Party:

Blair returns to the emotional "***ad populum arguments***"

1. *"As for my own leadership, throughout these 10 years, where the predictable has competed with the utterly unpredicted, right at the outset one thing was clear to me-without the Labour party allowing me to lead it, nothing could ever have been done.*
2. *"But I know my duty was to put the country first. That much was obvious to me when just under 13 years ago I became Labour leader.*
3. *"What I had to learn, however, as Prime Minister was what putting the country first really meant.*

The claim of the above argument is:
Although he leads the Labour party, Blair puts the country first.

Like many ***ad populum arguments***, the claim is not supported given the fact that it is always emotional and that suffices to stir people to believe strongly about it. Nevertheless, the claim alludes to: (1) the internal problem inside the party between Blair and other leading members, (2) the claim that Blair used to act individually, following his "inner voice" and ignoring opposing views, and (3) the fact that Blair is trying to refute the claim that he is responsible for the party failure to win the majority in the Municipal Elections. What Blair can be seen to be implicating here are:

You chose me a leader and backed me because I was the right candidate. Labour's achievements are basically mine because I lead and I know how to lead. Simultaneously and more importantly, I am the Prime Minister of the UK and I should put the UK first. So if the party loses, the country wins and this matters. The party is the servant of the country.

Decision-making is hard:
Some of Blair's decisions were controversial, and on many occasions he seems not listening to anyone. His fatal decision to join the war on Iraq by sending British troops to Iraq backing America, despite the severe opposition form the majority of Britons, supports this claim. The following argument is

argument from contrast, through which Blair makes a contrast between "when you are in Opposition and in government".

"Decision-making is hard. Everyone always says "Listen to the people". The trouble is they don't always agree "Laughter"

"When you are in Opposition, you meet this group and say "why can't you do this? And you say "It's really a good question. Thank you.. And they go away and say "It is great, he really listened."

"You meet that other group and they say "why can't you do that? And you say "It is a really good question. Thank you. And they go away happy you listened.

"In government you have to give the answer, not an answer, the answer."

Schematically**:**

Claim You act differently when you are in opposition from when in government.

Data: In opposition, you just listen to the various, disagreeing groups who go away happy that you listened; you just do them the favor of listening to their questions and requests. You don't have to give any answer.

By contrast, in government you are committed to answer, to give the exact answer by explaining "why you can't do that' and "why you can't do this."

Two implications are derived:
1.   In government, you can't satisfy all groups because each has views and attitudes that are sometimes conflicting with those of another group. There must be a disagreement. Your critics are so many.
2.   In Opposition, you listen and that makes people happy, but you don't take actions that can be criticised. Those who work are criticized. Blair is implicitly accusing the opposition of passivity; its sole action is to criticize governments. Blair feels that it is time to criticize the opposition telling people that making a decision, the right decision, is a painstaking task that requires firmness, energy, far-sightedness, courage, and a balanced character. All these traits are symbolized in Blair's decisions.

Blair's message is simultaneously self-praising and opposition-attacking, a classic technique in political speeches. Needless to say that in government you have to give the answer, not an answer, the answer" is also a memorable statement that appeals to audience, a self-sufficient/mythic thinking-provoking

argument that usually makes people strongly feel about it. The repetition of the "answer" makes it rhythmically symmetrical, and accordingly memorable. Thus, Blair is ostensively employing linguistic and non linguistic clues to help audience deduce what he has not explicitly stated.

Your duty is to act according to your conviction:
"And, in time, you realize putting country first doesn't mean doing the right thing according to conventional wisdom or the prevailing consensus or the latest snapshot of opinion it means doing what you genuinely believe to be right. Your duty is to act according to your conviction.

Blair's argument that leaders should act according to their conviction rather than to conventional wisdom or the prevailing consensus of the latest snapshot of opinion could be labeled and explained in two different ways, according to the type of audience processing the message: friendly and hostile. Friendly audience who process most of the speech peripherally would call it *argument from commitment*, schematically:

Claim (implicated): Blair is committed to his conviction which proves that he is a reflective, talented statesman.

Data (Implicated)**:** He does not listen to the people because of his unique vision.

Warrant (Implicated): People who are committed to their beliefs are persuasive and admired.

Blair's fans would interpret it this way, generating what Blair wants to say:
Electing me does not mean I should blindly act according to your views and consensus. I was almost forty when I became Labour leader and three years later I became the Prime Minister. You elected me because I'm a thinker. Don't deter me from listening to my inner voice.

Processed by the opposing audience, Blair's argument could be termed *"argument from inconsistent commitment"*, as it casts doubt over Blair's commitment to democratic preliminaries. Schematically:

Claim: Blair is committed to democracy (by virtue of the country's political system).
Data: Blair does not listen to the people, which is an inherent principle of democracy data
Counter claim: Therefore Blair is inconsistent or at most not democratic.

Thus, the implicatures intended by Blair would not find a space in the mental processing of the opposing audience. However, many of them admire Blair's tricky, skilful rationalization of a charge that has hounded him: "that he does not listen to the people". He wins their respect at least.

To act according to one's conviction means that one painstakingly decides accompanied by "doubt, hesitation, reflection, consideration and reconsideration". Some decisions are controversial, others are accepted, some are predicted and others are unpredicted. In the following **argument from example**, Blair provides a sample of his prominent and popular decisions about the most controversial one: "the war on terrorism", where the word "war" never occurs. In all the following example decisions, Blair, as he states, is guided by the above "good" companions of proper decision-making or is alone with his own instinct.

1)   *"Sometimes, the decisions are accepted quite quickly. Bank of England independence was one, which gives us our economic stability.*

2)   *"Sometimes, like tuition fees or trying to break up old monolithic public services, they are deeply controversial, hellish hard to do, but you can see you are moving with the grain of change round the word.*

3)   *"Sometimes, like with Europe, where I believed Britain should keep its position strong, you know you are fighting opinion but you are content with doing so.*

In the above examples, Blair, as he does throughout the whole speech, exhibits argumentative strategies where he simultaneously addresses the two kinds of argumentation aspects: the reasoning aspects by providing logically well-constructed arguments and the social aspects by addressing the audience's needs to make argumentation worthy of processing effort. The personal tone prevailing and the skilful, striking reasoning (sometimes tricky) provide the sufficient ostensive clues which the audience find relevant enough and worthy of processing. Briefly, the above examples implicate the following:

Though some decisions were met with people's resistance, all were in the country's interest, economically, regionally, and socially. Some of my decisions might not be popular, but proved the opposite by time. Had I listened to the people at the time, none of these good decisions could have been made and the nation would have been deprived of their positive consequences. I did the best. Believe me!

Blair proceeds his argument by providing further examples:

1.   *"Sometimes, as with the completely unexpected, you are alone with your own instinct.*

2. *"In Sierra Leone and to stop ethnic cleaning in Kosovo, I took the decision to make our country one that intervened, that did not pass by, or keep out of the thick of it.*
3. *"Then came the utterly unanticipated and dramatic September 11th 2001 and the death of 3, 000 or more on the streets of New York, I decided we should stand shoulder to shoulder with our oldest ally. I did so out of belief.*

In the Sierra Leone and Kosovo examples, Blair is deceiving the audience by appealing to the view that Britain must have a leading international role as an extension to its history as a former empire. Britons are proud of their mighty, glorious past. Blair tries to revive this past though not in its old, typical picture. The ostensive, relevant forms such as: "intervened", "did not pass by", and "keep out of the thick of it" create such cognitive effects, worthy of the audience's processing effort. This example on its own makes up a separate argument called ***"argument from tradition"*** where reference to traditional past actions justifies the action at hand.

The September 11th 2001 example displays a composite of convergent arguments. The first one is ***"appeal to fear argument"*** illustrated in the hyperbolic expression "the death of 3, 000 or more on the streets of New York". Cynically, the death toll in Iraq, which is increasing daily, is not mentioned. The second one is **"argument from norm, rule or tradition"** where Blair hypothesizes that his support to "our oldest ally" is no new position. Traditionally and normally, America and Britain have stood shoulder to shoulder in many historical events, e.g. World War 2 and the American Marshall Project which helped Europe, including Britain, recover after the war. Blair is implicating the following:

I have made Britain a world leader as it was before. I'm faithful to the norm, tradition or rule that governs the special Anglo-American relation. What I have done is to follow these traditions because I think they are in the country's interests.

The following example symbolizes the peak of Blair's argumentative and persuasive skill:
"So Afghanistan and then Iraq, the latter, bitterly controversial".

Blair deliberately avoids saying "the war on terrorism", "war on Afghanistan" or "war on Iraq". Some of the audience members have sons killed, kidnapped or currently fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the ostensive avoidance of the word "war" may not arouse them. In fact, Blair has been the most articulate and effective leader in the legitimatization of war on Iraq under the pretext that Saddam was harboring terrorists and developing weapons of

mass destruction. The ostensive expression "bitterly controversial" indicates that Blair knows that this decision is a fatal mistake for which his resignation is largely believed to be the price he has to pay or the punishment he has to undergo. Yet, he does not publicly admit that.

"Removing Saddam and his sons from power, as with removing the Taliban, was over with relative ease.

Blair's war rhetoric has magnified the thesis that "by removing Saddam and the Taliban, the world will be better off". Unfortunately, the opposite holds: global terrorism becomes fiercer and more "unrelenting and costly". This casts doubt over this claim, leading to ***a cause and effect argument***

1. *"But the blowblack since, from global terrorism and those elements that support it, has been fierce and unrelenting and costly. For many, it simply isn't and can't be worth it.*
2. *"For me, I think we must see it through. They, the terrorists, who threaten us here and round the world, will never give up if we give up.*
3. *"It is a test of will and of belief, and we can't fail it.*

After removing Saddam and Taliban, who is the enemy? Who supports terrorists? Blair answers: "elements". Based on the conspiratorial enemy theory (Gies 1989), there must be an enemy. The enemy is the international terrorism. Blair is sticking to the enemy theory for two reasons. One, it is symbolizing his ideology, second the existence of terrorists and terrorism makes it justifiable to launch war on them and therefore implicates that Blair is right. In this argument, Blair strategically avoids talking about the massive destruction and killing in what was once Iraq as just one consequence of his decision to invade Iraq. The rest of the argument reverberates repeatedly in Blair's war speeches, where "appeals to fear" which scare people from "the enemy", "the terrorists who threaten us here and round the world" are consistently and exaggeratedly made. Blair is still faithful to his decisions, especially the last example. He even calls for the continuity of fighting terrorism. Blair's ostensively compact treatment of this "bitterly controversial issue" by shedding light on the terrorists and the need to fight them as "they will never give up if we give up" and masking the catastrophic consequences of the war on Iraq in particular, including the death of "dear Britons", illustrates the fact that he is arrogantly committed to his former opinions, implicating the following: ***I was right in fighting terrorism.***

The claim: It is a test of will and of belief and we can't fail it.

Data: Terrorists threaten us here and round the world they will never give up if we give up.

This claim implicates the following:

I succeeded in the test because I have the will and the belief, while my opponents fail because they lack the will and the belief.

The latter is a classic discursive technique: positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation.

A final attempt of image-repair

Blair's entire address is viewed as an image-repair attempt. Yet the concluding part is always the most persuasive and the most moving. In this part, Blair returns to the emotional appeals, talking more personally, refuting further claims, and beautifying his image. About his high expectation and the possibility of having lowered them he says:

1.   *"But, to be frank, I would not have wanted it any other way. I was and remain, as a person and as a Prime Minister, an optimist. Politics may be the art of the possible, but at least in life, give the impossible a go (applause).*

2.   *"So, of course, the vision is painted in the colours of the rainbow, and the reality is sketeched in the duller tones of black, white and grey.*

In this part, the reasoning aspects of argumentation recede giving way to the social, emotional "persuasive" aspects. Through the words of this part, Blair paints a positive self-image where he deems himself an optimist, dreamy person. Quoting Rad Butler's book entitled **Politics: The Art of the Possible**, which implicates that the politician's plans must be feasible and achievable, Blair replaces the linking verb "is" by the modal "may be:" denoting that he partly believes in this statement. Equally catchy and memorable is "at least in life, give the impossible a go". The argument was incredibly received, striking the audience by its freshness in form and meaning.

Taken from a relevance-theoretic perspective, most people stop processing the utterance when they find it difficult to process. It is argued that the audience process it peripherally, deceived by Blair's unconventional oratory and persuasive skills. However, Blair anticipates that the reasoning is not OK, so he corrects it by a move illustrating the gap between reality and dreams: "so, of course, the vision is painted in the colours of the rainbow and the reality is sketched in the duller tones of black, white and grey", another memorable utterance housing so many poetic properties making the audience surrender to its captivating aethestic and mythic effect. The utterance also introduces a self-sufficient argument that is widely accepted without evidence. Intensifying the personal, intimate, persuasive dose, Blair proceeds:

1.   *"But I ask you to accept one thing-hand on heart, I did what I thought was right"*

2.   *I may have been wrong. That is your call. But believe one thing if nothing else. I did what I thought was right for our country (applause).*

The social aspects of argumentation are clearly ostensive. Blair employs all possible clues. His voice falls to a lower pitch, the rhythm becomes slower, his eyes are widely open and shining, almost weeping, his head is shaking gently, granting looks to audience setting in every corner of the place and his posture is upright. All there have persuasive effects received instantly by the audience and by his listeners and viewers worldwide. Linguistically, Blair attends to these social aspects of argumentation by anticipating that his fans want him to emphasize and clarify this point: *that Blair did what he thought was right.* To this effect, a speech act of begging is performed via such ostensive requests "I ask you to accept one thing-hand on heart", "I may be wrong, this is your call", and "but believe one thing if nothing else", repetition of "one thing", the intensifier "of nothing else", not to mention "hand on heart". Blair's ostensive emotional messages continue:

1-   *"I came into office with high hopes for Britain's future, I leave it with even higher hopes for Britain's future.*
2-   *"This is a country that can, today, be excited by the opportunities, not constantly fretful of the dangers.*

The above statements are assertions that have been supported earlier in his speech where he lists some of his achievements and refers to the changes he makes that lead to the transformation of Britain. Blair intends to repeat only the conclusions of his arguments to strongly re-evoke and consolidate implicatures the audience have drawn earlier in the speech.

1.   *"People often say to me "It's a tough job", Not really.*
2.   *"A tough life is the life of the young severely disabled children have and their parents, who visited me in the parliament the other week.*
3.   *"Tough is the life" my dad had, his whole career cut short at the age of 40 by a stroke.*

In this extract, Blair is furnishing an *over-loaded-argument*. It is a composite of arguments. The first one is:
Claim: It is not a tough job.

No supporting evidence is given; it is typically an assertion, a self sufficient argument. Intentionally putting it his way, Blair wants to imply:
1.   *I was happy with the task. It was not a burden.*
2.   *I leave it not escaping from responsibility; I leave because it is in the country's interests.*

Thus, instead of pursuing his main argument by providing supporting data, Blair skilfully picks the word "tough" to construct a new argument with the purpose of casting light on some humane aspects of his character. The argument constructed is an amalgam of **red herring** and **the plain folks**

appeal. P (2) and P (3) are not related to the first claim in P (1). By these two examples, according to argumentative theory, Blair is not sticking to the real argument, rather he sidetracks it, because he talks "off the subject" which is "it is not a tough job". Simultaneously, the "side" argument is very emotional, termed, **the plain folks appeal**. They portray Blair as a compassionate, kind-hearted leader, an attempt to refute the accusation that Blair is ruthless and warmonger circulated due to the war on Iraq. His argument implicates the following

Blair is empathetic.
Blair cares about the disabled and their families.
Blair constantly interacts with the people.
His office is open far all.
He listens to the people.
He cares also about public health.

Blair's two examples also serve as **"argument from pity"** where he manages to arouse people's pity for him, for his dad's premature death, and for the disabled children. More importantly, he succeeds in sketching a picture of a kind man for himself implicating:

Blair is pro-life.
He went to war to save people's lifes.
He is a peaceful, compassionate man, who has empathy for those who suffer.

Of course Blair's linguistic stimulus, by itself, does not enable listeners to draw these implicatures. Blair is drawing on their background knowledge which interacts with the stimulus generating the intended implicatures.

1. *"I have been very lucky and very blessed. This country is a blessed nation. The British are special, the world knows it, in our inner most thoughts, we know it:*
2. *This is the greatest nation on Earth. It has been an honor to serve it".*

Closing his speech, Blair returns strongly to his favourable argument **"ad populum appeals"**, though without supporting his claim. Examining the first assertions:

I have been very lucky and very blessed
This country is a blessed nation.

One can feel the significance of repeating the word "blessed" and deduce that the first part could be the data of the second part which functions as a claim implicating: **Britain is blessed because Blair is the P.M.** This is followed by such unsupported, yet captivating, assertions as: "this is the greatest nation on Earth" and "the British are special", both empowering the assertion: "Britain is not a follower, it is a leader". Among the implicatures arising are:

It is Blair's conviction that Britain is the greatest nation on Earth. He acts accordingly. He makes Britain a leader. He loves his country most and everything he does is in the country's interest.

"I give my thanks to you the British people, for the times I have succeeded and my apologies to you for the times I have fallen short."

In the final utterance of a speech, the speaker traditionally thanks the audience and wishes them "good luck", but Blair surprises the audience and listeners/viewers worldwide when he makes "a general apology" to them for "the times I have fallen short." Blair does not specify these times. But there has been a call from many Britons, especially the families of the British soldiers killed in Iraq to Blair to make amends to these families who lost their sons. Blair's statement could be an implied apology for those people. The final implicature Blair intends could be: ***Blair is a respectful, courteous man.*** Throughout the entire speech, Blair consistently displays his commitment to his convictions and beliefs. He does not think that he has made mistakes. But out of fear of sounding stubborn and arrogant he makes a general "insincere" apology for "nothing". Thus, Blair's "apology" simultaneously helps strengthen his position as a man committed to his inner voice and convictions, a highly cherished trait only historical and outstanding politicians enjoy; and refute potential present and future charges of arrogance and stubbornness.

3.   Findings & Discussion:

Blair's speech enjoys the highest relevance. It is thought that the audience are able to compute the cognitive effects the speech creates with relatively low processing cost. This is reflected in the audience's instant, positive reaction to the speech. More specifically, its relevance is also derived from the fact that it interests the audience and is linked to their life. Consequently, working out the implicatures based on the examination of the ostensive reasoning and persuasive stimuli (argumentative strategies) sounds rewarding. Blair's argumentative strategies and the implicatures they generate are compatible with the political objectives of the speech. In other words, Blair uses ostensive argumentative stimuli in order to evoke implicautres serving and materializing the political functions of his resignation speech. Political speeches are typically characterized by such discursive and rhetorical features as: positive self-presentation, negative other-presentation, hyperbole, metaphors, argumentation, etc. Blair's resignation speech houses some of these characteristics. Additionally, it casts more light on the human aspects of his character, displays no/slight negative-other presentation, and is highly emotional.

Blair's major political purposes of the resignation speech could be broadly grouped under one label: image enhancement and image repair. Van Dijk (2005: 78) identifies three types of positive self-presentation: "when the

41

speaker speaks for his group or organization (the government), when the speaker speaks for his country, and when the speaker speaks for himself". The macrostructure of Blair's speech comprises three sections; each has the political function of image-positive presentation, argumentative strategies and evoked implicatures. Implicatures help shape and make these political functions explicit (Appendix).

3.1.   Argument types:

Blair's speech contains a number of arguments where Blair uses appropriate reasoning and persuasion devices ostensively introduced to convince audience of his point. In association with argument types, it is noted that the emotional arguments (**ad populum appeals, plain folks appeals, appeals to pity and appeals to fear**) are the most frequent ones, opening and closing the speech. Their frequent use is in line with: (1) Blair's "resignation" speech which is supposed to be overwhelmed by hot, emotional arguments, and (2) the setting (the place, time, participants and purpose) which enhances an intimate, personal tone where emotional language is ordinarily fitting. The second most frequent arguments are *argument from contrast/comparison* and *argument from example*. This is mainly due to the comparison/contrast Blair makes in order to highlight his fresh political ideology/vision that transforms Britain from dogmatism and dichotomous thinking to liberal, flexible, dynamic thinking. This comparison/contrast argument is ostensively guiding the audience to infer more aspects of comparison/contrast based on their political knowledge and mental models to complete the distinction. *Argument from example* is also ostensive, as it illustrates examples of political thinking in the past and at present. Also, occurring repeatedly is *argument from commitment*. This is in line with Blair's constant commitment to his beliefs that he exhibits throughout the entire speech. Blair sticks to his beliefs and up to the end remains faithful to his convictions, implicating that he is a consistent, firm, reflective P.M. The least occurring arguments are: (1) **special pleading,** where Blair focuses on the positive aspects of comparisons and positive examples, ignoring equally important negative aspects. *(2) argument from transfer , (3) argument from ignorance, (4) argument from rule and (5) red herring argument.*

3.1.   Reasoning and persuasion:

They are the two folds of an argumentative strategy. In relation to reasoning which has to do with the construction of arguments by providing an arguable claim and supporting it by relevant adequate data leading to a warrant that links the claim with the data, it is found that Blair's speech is not explicitly argumentative in nature. Arguments are not fully provided and the construction of the argumentative structures is partly left to the audience. Examining the arguments of the opening and closing sections, which are highly emotional

(most of them are ad populum appeals), shows that these arguments are not well-constructed; sometimes lacking the claim, sometimes the data and sometimes the warrant. Sometimes, only one of these components is supplied and the rest are absent. The audience complete the construction of such arguments by supplying the unsaid components through deriving implicatures based on their political background and the current situation. Thus the ostensive incomplete arguments introduced by Blair are relevant, as the audience complete them effortlessly, and thus gain the rewarding cognitive effect in working out meaning. The same is true of arguments by commitment, red herring, plain folks appeals, argument from transfer and from tradition. The audience participate in their construction by making the necessary implicatures and supplying the necessary information.

On the contrary, Blair's argument from comparison/contrast, argument from example and argument from consequences are relatively well-constructed where Blair states explicitly the claims and provides considerable data (though leaving implicit some examples and consequences for the audience to draw). In these arguments, the emotional language has scant room and the logical relations and links between the different components of the arguments are fairly made explicit. One possible explanation is that emotional argumentation is commonly processed peripherally where the audience is obsessed with the speech style, content and source, the speaker's character, etc. Emotional language sways people making them surrender to the speaker's opinions and unconsciously constructing the argumentative structure for themselves. On the other hand, in proposing fairly constructed arguments when tackling such core issues as his government achievements, his new philosophy which transfers Britain to today's world, and his commitment to his convictions which shows a consistent, formidable character, Blair intends to get the audience process his arguments both peripherally as well as centrally. Central processing casts light over Blair's reasoning skills which also help persuade the audience of his point.

3.3. Form and function of implicatures:

Analysis shows that there are two types of implicature: argument-construction implicatures and argument-outcome implicatures. The first type of implicatures, as mentioned previously, is derived in course of argument processing i.e. online. It is used to complete the construction of arguments by supplying the unsaid/implicated parts (the claim, the data or the warrant). The second type is derived after the argument is introduced by Blair and is constructed or reconstructed by the audience. Argument-outcome implicatures are purely pragmatic in nature and embody what Blair intends to say but does not say explicitly. The audience draw them through processing the ostensive stimuli and blending them to their mental models of similar events and messages stored in their episodic memory (Van Dijk, 2005).

3.4. Blair's audience awareness and the processing routes:

Blair's audience awareness is exceptional. His argumentative strategies offer ostensive processing stimuli (verbal and non-verbal) that secure the persuasion of the audience (friendly, neutral and sometimes the opposing audience). Blair's audience awareness is manifested in many respects: (1) he appeals to the audience's emotions and interests, (2) he offers the necessary background information needed for interpreting meaning, (3) he partly explains some of the audience's inquiries and concerns leaving the audience to draw the remaining parts, and (4) he also shows an awareness of the audience's beliefs, their evaluations and the strength of these beliefs. Furthermore, having placed his arguments/claims in the scope of acceptance of the audience (by using emotional arguments, logically well-constructed ones addressing the core issues in the speech and highlighting unquestionable assertions of patriotism, in group bonds, loyalty, putting Britain first, doing what is right, leaving people to judge him, 10 years are enough and are in the country interest, etc.), Blair secures a positive reaction. Even opposing audience hardly argue against these cherished values. Moreover, by drawing on the audience's prior knowledge, Blair's arguments enjoy many characteristics such as compactness and rationalization. They stimulate the audience's elaboration ability needed for central processing.

Two questions are to be raised here. Which parts in Blair's speech are processed peripherally and which parts are processed centrally, and can processing be exclusively central or exclusively peripheral? As mentioned previously, central processing hinges on checking the argument structure linking the claim to the data and warrant, while peripheral processing is based on such factors as the speaker's physical attractiveness, style, liking of the communicator, etc. In answering the first question, it is argued that the friendly audience process the whole speech peripherally and are able to derive the implicatures intended by Blair. The same is true of the way neutral audience process the speech, however, there is a possibility that some argumentatively well-structured sections are processed centrally as well, drawing rather similar implicatures. Opposing audience, armed by alert critical views, process the speech centrally and sometimes peripherally. Nevertheless, the two processing routes may co-occur. Friendly audience may process centrally and vice versa. Though current research is scarce, it is recommended that this issue should be thoroughly tackled in future research.

Major characteristics of resignation speeches:

Blair's resignation speech shares the following common characteristics of political speech:
1. The topic is political, tackled by a leader talking directly to the people.
2. The discursive strategies such as positive self-presentation, negative other-presentation, etc. prevail.

3. The rhetorical features such as hyperbole, metaphor, repetition, past-present contrast, begging, etc. also prevail.

However, the speech displays some unique characteristics:
1. Exaggerated positive self-presentation.
2. Slight negative other-presentation.
3. Frequent use of implicit messages.
4. Extra audience awareness
5. High frequency of emotional arguments.
6. Exclusive focus on achievements.
7. Ignoring faults and sticking to previous positions.

Pedagogic implications & suggestions for further research:

Blair's resignation speech offers genuine data for various pedagogic purposes. For instance, the RP approach could be further utilized in exploring how EFL learners understand the implicatures in Blair's speech. However, learners should search for the political, economic and historical factors underpinning the speech so as to be able to make the right inferences leading to the interpretation of meaning. Secondly, the reasoning aspects Blair highlights could be studied for the purpose of pulling their dynamics and flexibility (technically their descriptive rather than their normative nature) to the center of the stage in prospective studies. Thirdly, the social persuasive tools which express themselves in the attractive way the speaker introduces his argument through voice modulation, physical appearance, posture, style, tone, etc. should be magnified and taught to learners as persuasive means. Further, the cultural differences in employing these tools must also be discussed, assisting EFL learners to understand their functions and how these functions vary from one culture to another. Finally, further research is needed to explore experimentally the way argumentation is processed (centrally and peripherally). This area is still vague.

REFERENCES

Augoustinos, M., Lecouteur, A. & Soyland, J. (2002). Self-sufficient arguments in political rhetoric: Constructing reconciliation and apologizing to the Stolen Generations *Discourse and Society* 13(1): 105-142.

Bach, K. (2000). Quantification, qualification and context. *Mind and Language*, 15: 262-284.

Billing, M. (2006). Political rhetoric of discrimination. *Elsevier Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics.* Oxford: Elsevier, 9: 697-699.

Breheny, R. (2006). Communication and folks psychology, *Mind and Language*, 12(1): 74-107.

Cameron, D. (2005). Relativity and its discontents: Language gender and pragmatics. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 2(3): 321-334.

Carston, R. (2005). Relevance theory, Grice and the neo-Grecians: A response to Laurence Horn's "Current Issues in neo-Gricean Pragmatics" *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 2(3): 303-319.

Chilton, P.A. (2004). *Analyzing Political Discourse*. London: Routledge

Damer, T. (1980). *Attacking Faulty Reasoning.* Belmon, CA: Wadsworth.

Daniels, D. & Daniels, B. (1993). *Persuasive Writing.* Harper Collins Publishers.

de Paiva, B. & Foster-Cohen, S. (2004). Exploring the relationship between theories of second language acquisition and relevance theory. *Second Language Research*, 20(3): 281-288.

Emmel, B., Resch, P. & Tenney, D. (1996). *Argument Revisited, Argument Redefined: Negotiating Meaning in the Composition Classroom.* Sage Publications.

Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T.A. Van Dijk (ed.). *Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Sage, 256-284.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis, The Critical Study of Language.* London: Longman.

Festinger, L. (1964). *Conflict, Decision and Dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

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

Fishbien, M. (1967). A behavior theory approach to the relations between beliefs about an object and the attitude toward the object. In M. Fishbien (ed.) *Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement.* New York: Wiley.

Foster-Cohen, S. (2004a). Relevance theory, action theory, and second language communication strategies. *Second Language Research*, 20, 3: 289-302.

Foster-Cohen, S. (2004b). Relevance theory, second language learning/behaviour. *Second Language Research* 20(3): 189-192.

Garrett, M. & Harnish, R. (2007). Experimental pragmatics: Testing for implicatures. *Pragmatics & Cognition* 15(1): 65-90.

Geis, M. (1989). *The Language of Politics*: New York: Springer Verlag.

Giora, R., Fein, O., Ganzi, J. Levi, N. & Sabah, H. (2005). On negation as mitigation: The case of negative irony, *Discourse Processes* 39(1): 81-100.

Grice, H. (1975). Logic in conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics Vol. III: Speech Acts,* New York Academic Press.

Haring-Smith, T. (1994). *Writing Together: Collaborative Learning in the Writing Classroom.* Harper Collins College Publisher.

Harish, R. (2004). Folks psychology and literal meaning. *Pragmatics and Cognition*, 13(2): 383-399.

Harris, S. (2001). Being politically impolite: Extending politeness theory to adversarial political discourse. *Discourse and Society* 12(4): 451-472.

Horn, L. (1996). Presupposition and implicature. In S. Lappin (ed.) *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Jarvis, S. and Connaughton, S. (2005). Audiences Implicadas e Ignoradas in the English and Spanish Language 2002 Texas Gubernatorial debates. *The Howard Journal of Communications*, 16: 131-148.

Jørgensen, C., Kock, C. & Rørbech, L. (1998). Rhetoric that shifts votes: An exploratory study of persuasion in issue-oriented public debates. *Political Communication,* 15: 283-299.

Jovicic, T. (2006). The effectiveness of argumentative strategies. *Argumentation*, 20: 29-58.

Juthe, A. (2005). Argument by analogy. *Argumentation*, 19: 1-27.

Kallia, A. (2004). Linguistic politeness: The implicature approach. *Multilingua* 23: 145-169.

Kearns, M. (2001). Relevance, rhetoric, narrative. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 31(3): 73-92.

Kesckes, I. (2004). Lexical merging, conceptual blending and cultural crossing. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 1-1: 1-26.

Krieger, J. (2006). *Great Britain*. In M.K. Esselman, J. Krieger & W. Joseph (eds.) *Introduction to Comparative Politics*. New York: Houghton Miffilin.

Leinonen, E. & Kerbal, D. (1999). Relevance theory and pragmatic impairment. *Int. J. of Language & Communication Disorder*; 34(4): 367-380.

Leinonen, E., Ryder, N., Eills, M. and Hammond, C. (2003). The use of context in pragmatic comprehension by specifically language-impaired and control children. *Linguistics* 4(2): 407-423.

Levinson, S. (2000). *Presumptive Meanings: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature*. MA: MIT Press.

Moeschler, J. (2004). Intercultural pragmatics: A cognitive approach. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 1(1): 49-70.

Murray, W. & Murray, R. (1998). Early, mandatory, pragmatic processing, *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 27(1): 1-23.

Oswald, S. (2007). Towards an interface between pragma-dialects and relevance theory. *Pragmatics & Cognition*, 15, 1: 179-201.

Patty, R. & Cacioppo (1986). *Communication and Persuasion: Central and Peripheral Routes to Attitude Change*. New York: Springer Verlag.

Pilkington, A. (2000). *Poetic Effects: A Relevance Theory Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Racanati, F. (2002). Unarticulated constituents. *Linguistics & Philosophy,* 25: 299-345.

Sacristan, M. (2005). A critical cognitive-pragmatic approach to advertising gender metaphors. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 2(3): 219-252.

Saussure, L. de & Schutz, D. (eds) (2005). *Manipulation and Ideology in the Twentieth Century: Discourse, Language and Mind*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Schaffner, C. (1996). Editorial: Political speeches and discourse analysis. *Current Issues in Language & Society,* Vol. 3, #3.

Schellens, P. & Jong, M. (2004). Argumentation schemes in persuasive brochures. *Argumentation* 18: 295-323.

Sequeiros, X. (2004). Interpretation of reflexive anaphora in second language VP-Ellipsis: Relevance theory and paradigms of explanation. *Second Language Research*, 20(3): 256-280

Shavitt, S. & Nelson, M. (2002). The role of attitude functions in persuasion and social judgment, In P. Dillard and M. Pfau (eds.). *The Persuasion Handbook. Developments in Theory and Practice*. London; Sage Publication.

Sherif, M. & Hovland, C. (1961). *Social Judgment: Assimilation and Contrast Effects in Communication and Altitude Change.* New Haven, CT. Yale University Press.

Sperber, D., Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition.* Cambridge University Press.

Sperber, D., Wilson, D. (1995). Relevance. Oxford: Blackwell (2nd edition).

Sperber, D., Wilson, D. (1997). Remarks on relevance theory and the social sciences. *Multilingua* 16: 145-151.

Taguchi, N. (2002). An application of relevance theory to the analysiss of L2 interpretation processes. *IRAL* 40: 151-176.

Van der Henst, J., Carles, L. & Sperper, D. (2002). Truthfulness and relevance in telling the time. *Mind and Language*, 17(5): 457-466

Van Dijk, T.A. (2002). Political discourse and political cognition. In: Paul A. Chilton and C. Schaffner (eds). *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytical Approaches to Political Discourse.* Amsterdam: Benjamins, 204-236.

Van Dijk, T.A. (2003). Knowledge in parliamentary debates. *J. of Language and Politics*, 2(1): 93-129.

Van Dijk, T.A. (2005). War rhetoric of a little ally: Political implicatures and Aznar's legitimization of war in Iraq. *J. of Language and Politics* 4(1): 65-91.

Van Emeren, F. & Houtlosser, P. (2003). The development of pragma-dialectical approach to argumentation. *Argumentation* 17: 387-403.

Vianna, B. (2005). Simultaneous interpreting: A relevance-theoretic approach. *Interactual Pragmatics.* 21: 169-190.

Walton, D. (1992). *The Place of Emotion in Argument*. The Pennsylvania State University.

Walton, D. (2004). Argumentation schemes and historical origins of the circumstantial and ad hominem argument. *Argumentation*. 18: 359-268.

Walton, D. (2005). Begging the question in arguments based on testimony. *Argumentation* 19: 85-113.

Wilson, D. & Sperber, D. (2004). Relevance theory. In L. Horn & G. Ward (eds.). *Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 607-631.

Wilson, D. & Sperber, D. (2005). Reply to Rajogopalan. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 2-1: 99-103.

Wodak, R. (2007). Pragmatics and critical discourse analysis: A cross-disciplinary inquiry. *Pragmatics & Cognition, 15(1): 203-225.*

Wodak, R. (ed.) (1989). *Language, Power & Ideology. Studies in Political Discourse.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Wollman-Bonilla, J. (2001). Can first-grade writers demonstrate audience awareness. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 36(2): 184-201.

Zegarac, V. (2004). Relevance theory and second language acquisition. *Second Language Research* 20(3): 193-211.

Appendix:

Major sections	Argument types	Major implicatures
Opening section 1- Back to Sedgefield. 2- My resignation 3- People judgment of Blair's premiership	1- Ad populum appeal 2- Ad populum appeal 3- Ad populum appeal	I'm loyal to my constituency. I love my country most. My resignation is in the country's interest. I'm democratic and your judgment must be: Blair is an exceptional Prime Minister.
Body Section Yesterday's Britain vs. Today's Britain Some achievements of Blair's government	1- Argument by contrast and comparison - Argument from example - Argument form transfer - Argument for consequence - Argument from ignorance - Special pleading	I'm a historic prime Minister who makes unprecedented changes and introduces new ideology replacing he dichotomous political and social thinking that prevailed before I came to office. - I have been a phenomenal P.M. My achievements are numerous, bigger than statistics. - I transformed Britain from uncertainty to confidence, making it a leader. - May opponents should stop attacking me because they indirectly attack Britain.
His leadership and the party	Ad populum appeal	I love Britain most and put it first.
Decision marking is hard	Argument from contrast	- Those who work are criticized. - Making decisions requires firmness, energy, courage and a balanced character. All are symbolized in my decisions.
Your duty is to act according to your convictions	Argument from commitment Argument from example Argument from fear Argument from rule/norm	I'm faithful and committed to my beliefs. Some of my decisions were met with resistance but by time they prove fruitful and beneficial to the country. I have a clear vision. I protect you from the hand of danger. In backing America, I did what any PM would do due to the special Anglo-American relations.
The closing section	- Summarizing previous arguments (ad populum)	I did nothing wrong.
A final attempt of image repair	- Argument from commitment - Plain folks appeals - Red herring, ad populum	I'm still committed to my beliefs. However I apologize "for nothing" My job is not tough, I am blessed

Endnotes:

1) I do not have access to Tolumin's (1958) *The Use of Argument*, yet it is explained concisely and practically in many works (e.g. Daniels & Daniels 1993, Emmel *et al.*, 1996)).

2) Among the other persuasion theories reviewed in Jovicic 2006 are: information-integration model, cognitive dissonance theory, theory of reasoned action, theories of attitude functions and psychological reactance theory.Fishbein's (1967) Information-Integration Model suggests that successful persuasion should appeal to the belief constituents of attitudes which should compromise:

   a. Data about the audience's dominant relevant beliefs.
   b. Awareness of the strength and evaluation of the beliefs.
   c. Sensitivity in recognizing the persuasive appeals by adding new positive belief increasing the existing positive belief, decreasing the negative belief (Cited in Jovicic, 2006: 38).

Festinger's (1964) Cognitive Dissonance Theory is based on the proposition that people tend to neglect information contrary to their current beliefs. Accordingly, successful persuasion involves a reduction of cognitive inconsistency. Dissonance increases situations whereby the respondents encounter information inconsistent with their beliefs which could lead to misperception, misinterpretation, rejection or refutation of information. A change in attitude or behaviour could decrease dissonance (Hypocrisy paradigm). Fishbein & Ajzen's (1975) Theory of Reasoned Action rests on the assumption that persuasion is conditional on the respondent's intentions which are, in turn, determined by attitudinal and normative factors. Attitudinal factors are viewed as the person's weight of his own attitude toward a particular action, while normative factors are explained as the person's weight of the social consequences of a given action. Effective persuasion involves, among others, an awareness of the audience's beliefs, audience's evaluation of these beliefs, and strength of beliefs.

Shavitt & Nelson's (2002) *Theories of Attitude Functions* see attitude as "instrumental constructs designed to serve individuals' physical, social and emotional needs" (Jovicic, 2006: 45). Persuasion should involve attitude change, and therefore knowing the different functions of attitude serves in employing the relevant persuasive strategy. Among attitude functions are: knowledge function, utilitarian function, social adjustive function, ego-defensive (or self-esteem) function and value-expressive function. Research on the social adjustment and the value expressive functions reveals that they are correlated to the self monitoring construct. High-self monitors are more vulnerable to behavioural self-adjusting (and therefore easily persuaded by social identify-enhancing appeals). Low-self monitors are more inclined to be persuaded by value expressive function appeals (which enhance favorable individual traits such as honesty, courage, etc). The self-esteem construct is also related to persuasion. High self-esteem individuals examine the persuasive messages by looking for their pros and cons, whereas low self-esteem ones find it difficult to do that, and alternatively adopt the view proposed by the persuader.

Brehm's (1966) *Psychological Reactance Theory* holds that persuasion poses a threat to the individual's freedom and autonomy. Consequently, the respondents react in order to "restore" their freedom. Restoration "may be accompanied by perceptions

and feelings of an increased attractiveness of the persuasive message" (Cited in Jovicic, 2006: 47).

3) The full text of Tony Blair's resignation address is available at: www.archive.scotsman.com

4) By 2004, Labour's education and national health policies give an enviable record of success, enabling to win the 2005 elections (the third term in a row), despite the mounting criticism of Blair on his role in the war in Iraq.

5) The 1998 and 2000 two initiatives were launched to improve the life conditions and delivery of services to senior citizens: Better Government for Older People and All our futures.

6) Blair's neoliberal economic policies which boast competitiveness make Britain a magnate for foreign investment, an achievement praised by all.

7) Blair's government gives a huge boast to children care. This is evident in reducing child poverty, by paying the vouchers to the parents of all British children born since 2002 with the purpose of providing new generations with new economic opportunities. Labour launched a number of "family friendly work related policies; including parental leave and flexible work conditions (Krieger, 2006: 57); Employers were persuaded to help implement such policies.

8) Attempts to settle peace in Northern Ireland were previously made by many PMs, especially John Major. However, it is Blair who manages to make historic initiative with Sinn Fein leading to the IRA disarmament.