

**Elena Bonta, Liviu Druguș (Bacău)**

## The ЕММУ Style and the Management of the Political Discourse in Socio-Human Interactions and Transactions

### Кључне речи:

*ЕММУ, style, political discourse, political rhetoric, interaction, transaction.*

Циљ рада је да представи неке од главних аспеката стилистичких карактеристика у политичком дискурсу, интерпретираних из оригиналне перспективе: ЕММУ. Ово је нова визија, како тврде ауторке, људског битисања, која полази од чињенице да свако од нас има рационалне/емоционалне циљеве који могу бити остварени једино коришћењем сигурног средства.

### Foreword

Any theory is good or bad depending on the scope and the results of its applications. This is also valid for methods and methodologies. Sometimes, new established and tested methodologies shape the authors' mind and manners, so that they find out that a new style of thinking and doing things appeared.

ЕММУ (The End Means Methodology) is an already "old" corpus/body of thinking. Its

birth was in the 80s and it largely grew up in the 90s. This century, ЕММУ has realized that it represents simply another name for other disciplines: Management<sup>1</sup> and Ethics (as the very essence of Management). All of them (ЕММУ, Management, Ethics) are telling us about (good) human thinking and acting, about (future) ends and concrete (present) means. A short description of ЕММУ shall be given in the first chapter. The reader is invited to do her/his own exercise concerning the real scope of the three theories.

- 1) We shall use capitals when referring to a theory (e.g. Management) and small letters when referring to a practice (e.g. management). That is meant to draw attention that there is all the time a (small or big) gap between them. Modern denominations of scientific theories tried to put an equal between theory and practice.

 2007

Essentially, they are equivalent, but EMMY is the largest in scope having a philosophical (gnoseological, epistemological and ontological) human dimension. Management is the same thing but with an emphasis on the technical dimension of how to manipulate people, information, money, time, energy and materials. The management of the political discourse is but an application of EMMY and/or Management to a concrete human dimension: the political discourse or the political rhetoric. Of course, Ethics tells us IF there is an almost permanent biunivocal correspondence between established ends and used means. Ethics is the alarm clock invented in order to make human actions effective and efficient. Or, in other words, Ethics is about how to have good/performing management.

An effective political discourse is not only the one accompanied by storming applause, but the one which creates synergy and common goals. Also, a successful politician is not the one who wins elections. Indeed, this is the validation of her/his political rhetoric. But a successful politician is the one who may change other human habits, social practices and people's welfare. We shall try to demonstrate that the political discourse, as part of a political programme, should also be prospective and preventive in order to adapt to new and possible unfavourable contexts.

Finally, a political discourse is a first level of interaction between a politician and

people. Here we have a classic economic equation. It is about supply and demand. Of course, it happens in a very specific way. The equilibrium price is the number of votes collected. The payment (votes) is made later, after analyzing the discourse content, its quality and usefulness. There is, of course a political marketing and a management of this marketing. Unfortunately, many of the managerial marketing techniques stop immediately after the election process. The evaluation and possible corrections are, as a rule, the reason of being (*raison d'être*) of another seller: the opposition political forces.

What is the EMMY style? After knowing the real content of EMMY it is normal to ask: is there an EMMY style? Indeed, behaving in a certain way defines a style. Then, why not consider thinking processes themselves as defining a style? As a rule, new styles are hardly accepted. The same happened with EMMY, but every passing day means a plus in its social and scientific acceptance. It is proposed that EMMY should be a subject of study in the pre-university education<sup>2</sup>. The EMMY style is a pragmatic, future oriented, transdisciplinary and holistic approach to human behaviour. To know EMMY and to use it as your own style are two different things, so we urge those readers who try to adopt the new style to practise it for months and in as many contexts as possible. The results are tremendous: bigger speed in

- 2) See: Liviu Drugus, "The Bioeconomics-Bioethics-Biopolitics continuum. An attempt to create a postmodern, semiotic, transdisciplinary, teleologic, pragmatic and trialectic/tri(u)nitary space of knowledge", paper delivered at the first AROSS international Conference, October 2006, Slanic Moldova, Bacau, Romania. The author used the term "postmodern" in a very large meaning: that of non-modern or transmodern thinking. His belief in going away from modern thinking fits very well with another denomination, transmodernism, self defined as opposed and more consistent to what was defined as postmodern thinking. So, if postmodern and transmodern thinking are new styles of thinking, so EMMY is a well defined new style of thinking and doing things.

thinking, connective thinking and easiness in communication just because the empathization process is implied all the time.

We are using the word “political” as a quasi synonym for “social”. As a matter of fact, “polis” is the whole society that tries to manage in an as good as possible way. The politician is like a messenger of societal groups (i.e. parts of society called, of course, “parties”) that pretend to have solutions to a lot of human problems: poverty, frustration, as well as bad working and living conditions.

Authors are very fond of dialogue and discussion. This is at least one reason for the fact that there are two authors of this paper. But they would also like to have a rapid and direct feedback from readers in order to adapt themselves to the real market of (theoretical) supply and (practical) demand. Future common projects may appear together with some of our readers as a result of accepting this new style and applying it to different fields of research. EMMY is, finally a very concrete application of the new transdisciplinary and transmodern thinking.

### I. What is EMMY and the EMMY style?

Creating the End Means Methodology (for short EMMY) is an attempt of creating a simple and efficient tool in managing human actions in a close relation with a very simple and efficient thinking. This body of concentrate knowledge has the advantage of being used in or instead of a lot of former “scientific” disciplines that generate inefficiency by themselves. Why by themselves? Because they do not succeed in serving people as real instruments meant to improve the human condition. The so called Social Sciences corpus of knowledge should be a homogenous, congruent and

not segmented by feudal “domains” “fields” or “borders” between them. Or, as the state of the art shows us, they are not such a corpus. The modern style of doing science and scientific research is still a very feudal one and the industrial revolution didn’t change the feudal foundations of research and science building. Postmodern thinking is the protest of different forms and consistencies towards the feudalism of science promoted by modern thinking (Cartesian logic, rigor, and specific methods). The Ivory Tower is a syntagm describing the feudal isolation of the researcher seen as a senior and a prince with full authority and even power to influence the future of other people. In modern times the criticism addressed to Ivory Tower style of doing research was perceived only as a way of establishing new “domains”, “fields” or “sciences” built as “schools” having a Chief/Pater/Founder/Father etc. The transmodern/postmodern times rose against this feudal reminiscences and proposed integrated, holistic and complex scientific tools able to study and improve the realities. EMMY is such a new style in science, applied to a lot of concrete realities.

This transdisciplinary approach is a postmodern, holistic and integrative model which is accepted and applied more and more frequently all over the world. The general human thinking and acting equation is as follows:

$$H = f(E, M, E/M), \text{ where:}$$

- *H* stands for *human beings* viewed simultaneously and continuously as individuals (micro-level), social groups/societies (macro-level) and mankind (global or mondo level)
- *E* stands for any *human ends* proposed and accepted by the vector resulting from calculating the “parallelogram of forces” between

individuals, societies' and mankind's ends in function of the real dimensions of the means they have. **E** is studied by a classical discipline called Politics.

- **M** stands for any *means* (be they viewed as substance, energy or information) that are created, collected, combined and consumed for attaining the proposed and/or accepted ends at the three levels of human realities (micro, macro, mondo). **M** is studied by the (neo) classical discipline called Economics.
- **E/M** ratio stands for the permanent process of comparing ends to means and means to ends and then matching them. The name of this ratio could be "to adequate"<sup>3</sup> (means to ends and ends to means) or "ad equation". **E/M** ratio is studied by the classical discipline called Ethics, which includes and transcends Politics and Economics.

**EMMY** is a transition from dialectics to trialectics, from modernity to postmodernity, from the study of disciplines to the transdisciplinary approach. Its main attributes are holism, triadicity, and simultaneous and continuous thinking. The logic of **EMMY** is based on triadicity and on the abduction logic. In this model, humanistic disciplines could be concentrated in order to offer the student a holistic picture of the human being. Finally, the result could be a real and complete Anthropology.

The complete dimension of all our concepts (the theoretical aspect) and realities (the practical aspect) is a triadic one. In order to use **EMMY** in a pragmatic way, it is necessary to know seven fundamental triads that may explain the human existence, its knowledge (learning) and behaviour. We think that

the most important part or component of it is the third one. The most important triads we need to study and learn are depicted in the *Table 1*:

Of course, there are many other possible triads important for specific fields of research, but those just mentioned are fundamental for any human thinking and acting. **EMMY** has exactly the same content that management theory and practice deal with. We make a plea for this new way of teaching and learning the managerial tools.

**EMMY** is a referential framework for promoting the transdisciplinary way of thinking. Transdisciplinarity itself, once implemented in the education process, is a concrete part of the transformation economy.

## II. The political discourse and discourse style analysis

The meaning attached to the concept of *political discourse* in our analysis is derived from the already presented points of view expressed, where **EMMY** should be understood as a steering instrument for the analysis we are going to make, as an on-going approach to the topic under discussion.

The term *discourse*<sup>4</sup> makes reference to

- a dynamic fact
- a social reality
- a way of organizing the daily experience (as a sum of verbal or nonverbal actions or processes)
- a means of thinking/re-thinking/evaluating and re-evaluating the social practices we perform
- a means of organizing knowledge, ideas or experience

3) We use "to adequate" as a synonym for fitting and matching two components.

4) Alteration of L. *discursus* "a running about," in L.L. "conversation," from stem of *discurrere* "run about," from *dis-* "apart" + *currere* "to run." Sense of "formal speech or writing" is first recorded 1581 (Online Etymological Dictionary).

Table 1.

The fundamental triadic dimensions	Simple and clear*	Complex and less clear*	Very complex and unclear*
Temporal	Past	Present	Future
Spatial	Micro	Macro	Mondo
Structural Existence	Substance	Energy	Information
Human Action	(Collecting, combining and consuming) Means	Establishing and harmonizing Ends	Permanently analyzing the level of harmonization of Ends and Means
Levels of human reality	Economic	Politic	Ethic
Theoretic/anthropological dimensions	Economics	Politics	Ethics
Holy Trinity**	Son (Jesus Christ)	Holy Spirit	Father (God The Father)

119

\* We do consider that the content of the three columns could be characterized as follows:

1. “simple and clear” just because it refers to the best known things, regularly used in our everyday speech;
2. “complex and less clear”, motivated by the fact that our present surroundings/ environments are less clear than the past ones, and for sure, more complex, as the society evolves;
3. “very complex and unclear” refers to future possible events that will be more complex as a result of the dynamics of the society, and quite unclear as the predictions are more difficult to make.

\*\* God as a triadic model of cosmic existence.

- a means of building/rebuilding the social reality/world we live in.

Thus, by *discourse* (a word with a profound semantic value and which makes communication and inter-subjectivity possible) we understand a form of concrete manifestations/the actual use of both verbal and behavioural language (with psychological and sociological dimensions) within certain contexts in which individuals can influence one another through communication.

As a matter of fact, the discourse essence may be revealed by applying EMMY to this

social reality. So, any discourse has a very strong teleological dimension. There is no discourse without having clear ends/purposes/objectives and interests. Even a purely theatrical or rhetorical discourse has a clear finality in it. As a result and as an application of EMMY, we understand that any discourse has in it, or as part of it, a political strategy. That is why the syntagm “political discourse” is a quasipleonastic one. Yet, we shall use it in order to indicate the “field” of its application: the association of human beings called “polis”. Nowadays, “polis” designates

a state/country/nation, but the integration and globalization processes generate new organizational realities (continental states or, possibly in future, a world/global state and government). It is possible to argue that exactly the same reasons that created the Greek polis generated the nation state polis and, in future, will generate the world/global polis.

120

The pragmatic approach of the discourse helps us to identify some of its traits, such as:

- 1) the discourse orientation (having in view the interlocutor it is addressed to, the ends to be attained, as well as its development in time);
- 2) the discourse power (that springs from the speech acts performed, the particular choices of linguistic and nonlinguistic markers and the skills in handling strategic means effectively);
- 3) the discourse interactive character, its contextualization (that contributes to the definition of the context it continually modifies). If the upper “discourse orientation” was identified as the political dimension of the discourse, (ends = political dimension), the “discourse power” means collecting, combining and consuming specific resources/means in order to have the necessary power to attain the desired ends. Or, as EMMY says, all these means describe the economic dimension of the discourse.
- 4) the fact that it is assumed;
- 5) the permanent constraints exercised by (social and discursive) norms upon it;

6) the fact that it must be evaluated in relation to a set of discourses.

The term *political*<sup>5</sup> designates the area/field of investigation, but as seen earlier, the political dimension cannot be separated from the economic and the ethical ones, as they represent a continuum.

By *political dimension* we understand that *intimate* and *intricate* part of the political-economic-ethic continuum that stresses the future/prospective/promised/teleological aspects of the social life. So, when speaking about/referring to *political discourse* we mean, at the same time, and almost in the same measure, the economic and ethical dimensions.

The benefit of this mode of interpreting things is the potential insight it may provide into the *political discourse*. This means, in fact, that the scope of the political discourse is re-shaped; it becomes the domain of analysis of three intricate sub-discourses: of *ends*, of *means* and of the way in which *ends* and *means* fit/match permanently and continuously. Their congruence ensures efficacy, effectiveness and efficiency to any human action.

The analysis of this type/style of discourse has to start from some basic assumptions:

- 1) individuals are to be interpreted as social actors on a social “stage” whose performance is conditioned by an intentionality/purposeful behaviour;
- 2) purposeful behaviour is triggered by the individuals’ desires and attempts of fulfilling certain ends; the ends represent but

5) From Latin *politicus* “of citizens or the state, civil, civic”, from Gk. *politikos* “of citizens or the state”, from *polites* “citizen”, from *polis* “city”. (Online Etymological Dictionary). By extension, we may attach to the word “polis” the meaning of creating an association of people with the explicit or implicit end of gaining more security, prosperity and liberty, as compared with a previous non-associative situation or with other similar associations/organizations/polis/states. The democratic governing process is keenly interested in the idea of polis. EMMY throws a new and strong light on the real significance/meaning of “polis” as a transdisciplinary and holistic approach.



individuals' needs (basic needs, safety, psychological survival or personal high-ideals needs), to which certain values are assigned in terms of truth (true/false), aesthetics (beautiful/ugly), ethics (good/bad), hedonism (happy/unhappy), pragmatics (useful/useless), thus transforming these needs in desired ends;

3) individuals' ends are shaped within the social contexts (factual/referential, pragmatic, interactional, as well as presuppositional ones) structured by the social community they live in;

4) individuals engage in social practices which, being performed in semiotic settings, with semiotic resources, become semiotic practices, endowed with meanings;

5) politicians (understood as messengers of societal groups) have /pretend to have/ think about solutions/means to meet individuals' social ends;

6) ends are achieved through different means;

7) if ends are matched/fitted to means and means to ends, then we may speak about ethical behaviour.

The above mentioned assumptions lead us to the need of operating a subdivision within the framework of the political discourse. Thus, we shall analyse

a) the political dimension of the discourse (with reference to politicians, voicing the ideologies/interests of "parties");

b) the social dimension of the discourse (with reference to all individuals, as members of the "polis").

#### *a) The political dimension and its management*

The basic idea supporting the analysis was already voiced in the Foreword: two parameters establish the ranking of any politician among the "successful" ones: the quality,

content and usefulness of his/her discourse, on the one side, and the number of votes (s)he receives from those to whom (s)he addresses, on the other side. It is easy to notice the fact that the relationship established between these two elements is a cause-effect one and, at the same time, a teleological one: i.e. individuals voice needs/desires/ends and politicians promise to fulfil them by attracting/combining/consuming different means/resources. If these means fit the expected ends, we may speak about the morality of politicians' thinking (that is, a form of discourse which is characteristic for each and every politician, as it "voices" his/her own conception; a discourse understood as politics in its pure/essential form) and acting (that is, discourse as "put into practice"/applied to particular situations and individuals: governing/dissemination of his/her political conception).

The political discourse – in this sense – displays traits at different levels of analysis, in terms of *what* is said and *how* it is said (having in view that political constraints shape both the political rhetoric and the political economy).

Thus, from a pragmatic point of view, the discourse is understood as a form of action generated by the others and a form of interaction with the others/the people it is addressed to. It represents an attempt to attain satisfactory ends not only for politicians themselves (such as building a certain established powerful position within the party, a certain identity and public recognition) but also for the others: satisfying the people's needs/ends, establishing social order, giving a sense to the socio-political events, maintaining/changing them.

More than this, a politician tries to influence people. His discourse aims at producing certain effects upon the addressees and this fact becomes a premise for winning elections

(*winning* and *gaining* are twin terms that suggest that political and economic dimensions are similar/almost identical).

Such type of discourse is frequent during the election campaigns, when the politician resorts to a wide range of means that help him/her become an effective persuader, as (s)he is perfectly aware of the fact that (s)he has to deploy all possible means in order to reach his/her main objective: power legitimized by votes. Among these means, newspapers, radio/TV programmes, public meetings and interviews (as concrete manifestations) give him/her the possibility of projecting possible future events, actions, contexts and worlds. All his/her “performances” on the socio-political stage are meant to influence the public opinion (an end that gets priority on his/her agenda). His/her rhetoric is a well chosen strategy whose end is to win the electors’ souls by discourse (according to Plato), and also to make them believe (s)he will be able to fulfill all their ends. After elections, the economic aspect prevails.

His/her discourse finds an important support in argumentation; the arguments are set in motion and guided by the politician’s ends. The whole mechanism of “mise en argumentation” resorts to discursive techniques and structural procedures; this makes one talk about a true “art” of speech, whose final goal is to persuade people. Pragmatically, it aims at transforming any type of dissension into consensus, in order to obtain the necessary power able to “give life” to individuals’ ideals.

The discourse, based on action, generated by situation and addressing a certain interlocutor gets an explicit and implicit power (conveyed through the pragma-semantics of

the discourse and through the presuppositions it is based on). The sustained interest in *the alter*, seen as potential voters, conditions the whole production of the discourse.

From the point of view of cohesion and coherence, this type of discourse represents a set of structurally organized utterances, within the framework of a logical order whose efforts are directed towards making/building sense for the addressees. Coherence, to be noticed at three levels (syntactic, semantic and pragmatic) is meant to ensure the discourse effectiveness and make it credible, at the same time. Cohesion is based on cross references made to the past-present-future events/actions/practices, in the politician’s efforts of understanding, describing, evaluating and re-evaluating the existent social world, of making comparisons, drawing conclusions, pointing out drawbacks of past/present opponents’ experience and highlighting her/his own ideology. (S)He tries to observe the two attributes of the discourse both in public meetings/formal situations and in casual ones, where the political discourse is mostly intended to deceive. Deception is accomplished through manipulation of information (at all its levels: informative, semantic, pragmatic) and tries to establish relationships with the addressees and sustain the politician’s image.

Thus, the *management*<sup>6</sup> of the politician’s discourse has manipulation strategies at its basis, as a specific means for maximum influence. It manipulates not only information and people’s beliefs, way of thinking and behaviour, but also time, money, energy and materials. In fact, politicians use/manage all sorts of means (all the previously mentioned ones and many others included). Manage-

6) Understood as the “act of managing”, (Online Etymological Dictionary). Etymologically, “management” comes from the Latin “manus” (hand); it is interesting to observe that the translations of the word “management” in different languages are based on the Latin “manus”.



ment and manipulation become identical terms meant to define the processes of collecting, combining and consuming the means.

An important role is played by the non-verbal communication, the signs of which attach a touch of dynamism to the whole discourse, already dynamic and sometimes having theatrical elements. The choices made operate at the organizational level of the discourse (the relations between concepts and facts adapted to ends) and the presentational one (the way in which the discourse is presented). Thus, we can talk about an Economics of the political discourse and, at the same time, an Ethics of the political discourse (fitting the “manipulated”/used means to expected ends).

The actional power/force of this discourse (the power “in discourse” and “behind the discourse”) [Fairclough 2001: 38-46] is directed not only towards the potential vote givers, but also to the forces labelled “opposition”. The promises the politician makes try to “respond” people’s ends, offering them the illusion/conviction of a better life, and, at the same time they try to become “counter-offers” to the opponent forces’ promises, surpassing them, going beyond their limits. In front of the opponents, promises are replaced by threats, counter-arguments, paradoxes, harsh words, refutation. The whole discourse becomes one of competing and contradictory voices.

Generally speaking, the politician does not step backwards any minute/moment/event/situation that is able to place him/her into a “favourable light”. (S)He plays the role of seductive, altruistic or attractive manipulator/manager, whose “strategic moves” oscillate between dissimulation and sincerity,

in his/her permanent “struggle” of exercising her/his influencing power and transforming her/his discourse into an instrument/means of action, interaction and transaction.

#### b) *The social dimension and its management*

Each individual’s discourse becomes the domain of her/his trying to achieve ends according to the existent or possible to be attracted means. This shows the fact that each individual is able to “politicize”. Her/his activity helps her/his socialize, become the “craftsman” of the social order through those means which are proper and agreed upon by the community (s)he lives in. Her/his acts are to be noticed in his/her everyday discourse of the social/semiotic practices endowed with a teleological dimension,

*Socialization* is but the key that helps her/his accomplish her/his explicit and implicit hopes/ends. Her/his means are tools, concepts, linguistic, nonlinguistic cues as well as strategies to be used within the framework of the social practices (s)he performs. They also contribute to the building of relationships or images and to the shaping of identity. All of them have to be interpreted as individual’s continuous adaptations to ever-changing contexts, to newer ends and means; such adaptations can be observed at the structural and referential levels of the discourse. The result is a better and better matching of ends and means; this means we can discuss about the increased value of the moral dimension of the political discourse and social actions.<sup>7</sup>

The coherence of her/his discourse is based on her/his consciously and continuously pursuing her/his ends, making choices

7) Talking about the moral dimension we think about such concepts as “adequate” and “adequacy” in terms of an on-going process (gliding on a scale from “less adequate” to “more adequate”).

from among the means at her/his disposal (linguistic, nonlinguistic, strategic ones), self-adjusting (exercising a permanent control over her/his discursive production, checking its agreement with his own reference systems, ends and contextual data), fitting/matching ends to means and means to ends (that is, ensuring their dynamics) and choosing the best strategies ever possible. It contributes to the meaning of the discourse by specifying all the relations between/among semantic events.

The cohesion of this verbal discourse finds the linguistic support in cross references (anaphora, cataphora, associations, logical linkers, presuppositions, adverbs and discourse particles). Cohesion facilitates coherence and helps one understand how individuals integrate forms, meanings and actions in order to make overall sense of what is said, in a certain type of discourse associated to a field of social life. The performed speech acts display a wide range of illocutionary functions that help individuals socialize, establish/maintain relationships, co-operate and enter competitive relationships (co-opetition)<sup>8</sup>.

The correct decoding of the overall discourse has to take into consideration all the means that are used, their explicit and implicit meanings, as well as the close relationship between them.

As for the problem of strategies as *means*, their concrete manifestations at the level of management have to take into account some considerations:

1) one chosen strategy/means may serve immediate or long-term ends (politeness strategy, for example, can initiate a social relationship at a given moment, in a certain

context, but it can also serve to maintain the relationship for a longer period of time);

2) some strategies include others as “means” and they work so as to meet the same end (the active listening strategy may help maintaining communication, but it also serves the effort of detecting lies /irony/manipulation in social interactions);

3) the same end can sometimes be achieved through more strategies/means (in order to maintain co-operation, one can resort to negotiation or to manipulation strategies);

4) each individual influences the chosen strategy; this makes that one and the same strategy may have different forms through which it manifests itself (the individual can use either positive politeness or negative politeness [Brown & Levinson 1987] in order to maintain communication/co-operation and avoid conflict).

The individual has the possibility of evaluating the chosen strategy in terms of the context, her/his position in the social group, the relationships with the others in the group, as well as in terms of effectiveness. (S)He has also the possibility of anticipating possible effects of the strategy (s)he has chosen, thus being able to adapt and re-adapt it when necessary.

The individual, as a “strategic player” [Bonta 2004: 98] puts into practice all the skills (s)he possesses in order to finally attain /he/his ends. Thus, her/his management includes: her/his strategically “entering” and “leaving” the stage, interacting with the others having the same or opposed ends in mind, adapting to formal/informal rituals, dissimulating, choosing and changing speech acts and “performances” according

8) The term makes reference to the strategy based on both cooperation and competition/cooperative competition (a concept developed by Adam Branderburger and Barry Nalebuff in *Co-Opetition: A Revolution Mindset That Combines Competition and Cooperation*, 1996).

to situation, “tuning” the discourse with the preceding ones, qualitatively and quantitatively choosing the aspects of the messages (s)he transmits, trying to skillfully organize the information according to argumentative techniques, trying to influence and persuade, minimizing/maximizing distances between herself/himself and the others and sometimes “shrewdly” handling nonlinguistic and paralinguistic cues, all used according to her/his ends.

To put it in short, the individual takes different “strategic steps” in her/his permanent desire of getting what (s)he wants, for both herself/himself and the group (s)he belongs to, as a result of her/his permanent awareness of her/his acts as interactions and transactions.

### III. Interactions and transactions continuum – as a new model of political discourse

In a broad sense, *interaction*<sup>9</sup> makes reference to an action/process through which two or more objects/phenomena/individuals influence each other/one another. The daily life reality is constructed only within the interactions individuals establish with those around together with whom, they share experiences in a concrete context. The term is derived from sociology, where the *social interaction* is considered to be the permanent feature of all societies, the very essence of the social life. [Goodman 1992: 127–142]

Each individual’s activity is conceived, organized and accomplished in close relation with the activity of the Other One (a socially integrated individual who must not and cannot be absent in the social life).

Through reciprocity of images, perspectives and motivation [Bange 1992: 119–211], the Other is acknowledged as an active participant, taking a “role”. Role taking represents the core of the individual’s socializing action: (s)he “occupies” a “place” and “asks” (explicitly or implicitly) that her/his dialogue partner should “take” herself/himself a complementary role, meant to ensure the development of the interactional exchange. Each of the two participants to any interaction tries to understand the other one, interprets her/his activity and proves that in an explicit or implicit way. In order to do this, (s)he resorts to different semiotic codes: verbal, nonverbal and paraverbal ones. All these codes represent another category of means used to attain other possible ends or even to contribute to the attaining of other ends in combination with other means. In this respect, EMMY is able to build a consistent economic theory of signs, ways and codes as means collected, combined and consumed in order to attain specific and suggested/accepted ends. Quite similar, but also applying EMMY, it is possible to build a political theory of the desired interactions and transactions, viewed as future ends to be attained by the above-mentioned means. Needless to say that already consumed interactions and transactions are used as new means for future ends. Of course, the ethical theory is permanently built in the economic and political theory.

Exchanges between individuals develop at horizontal/vertical, formal/informal, co-operation/competition/cooperation levels, thus giving them the possibility of socializing through a dynamic process noticed at the linguistic level and at that of the mechanisms

125

9) Etymologically, it presupposes reciprocal meetings during which individuals influence each other; , from *inter-* + *action*. The verb *interact* is first attested 1839 (Online Etymological Dictionary).

that are involved in different daily rituals. In any type of interaction (purely nonverbal, verbal and nonverbal) individuals have to prove *interactional competence*, in an *interactional context* (continuously created and re-created by their choices). During the interaction, individuals coordinate their efforts of meaning production (*interactional timing*) through a wide range of procedures (*interactional mechanisms*) and *interactional moves and strategies* that allow them to co-operate. At the same time, interactions give individuals the possibility to protect their social relationships, to anticipate the interlocutors' attitudes and reactions, to identify their positions, behaviours and meanings through *interactional negotiations*. All these observe certain *interactional norms* and *interactional constraints*, meant to guide the interaction and ensure its good functioning.

The functions of interactions are:

- shaping individuals' social identity (Self-shaping is a consequence of the individuals' socializing activity); this function has a dominant political dimension;
- constructing social reality; this function is economic in its essence;
- building social relationships; this function has both political and economic content;
- constructing the meaning (through a continuous interactive activity based on co-adjustment/adaptation/reformulation); this function has a dominant ethical dimension;
- management of the discursive forms (the linguistic forms help meaning construction and relationship building); this function is essentially an ethical one.

Interactions are completed by *transactions* through which individuals affect/influ-

ence each other/one another in such a way that one's attitude/action is a direct "response" to the other's; thus, transactions involve interaction accompanied by a permanent adaptation between individuals. In the EMMY terminology, present actions and interactions have an economic dimension, future interactions have a political dimension and transactions have an intimate ethical content. Communicative transactions satisfy a wide range of social needs/ends: articulating identity, displaying appropriate self-expression, sharing information, sharing feelings, managing impressions, solving problems, motivating ends, motivating means. The interactional and transactional theories based on the idea that each individual becomes, in turn, source/means/supply and receiver/end/demand and the latter's verbal/nonverbal answer guides the decoding process of the first, gives an account for the cyclic character of the communication process.

The social activity becomes the very place/stage on which the individual performs her/his actions in the presence of and together with the others (individuals become co-actors/participants). The interaction/transaction between them gets its significance, dimension and forms according to each individual's status and role, two elements that determine the ways in which the others are perceived and treated.

The interaction/transaction becomes a complex game of actions, expectations and behaviours. Determined by the individuals' long-term or immediate common ends, any interaction/transaction brings into focus the individuals' efforts of cooperation, a thing that makes them permanently adjust the situation and the relationship between themselves, in an attempt of clarifying meanings. Individuals in interactions accomplish – through their behaviour – an exchange of energy and information between/among

them and are permanently engaged in an activity based on mutual understanding, agreement and cooperation.<sup>10</sup> The interaction/transaction helps them convey (or hide) the information (during the communicative activities) and establish different symmetrical or complementary relationships within the framework of a dynamic process easily to be noticed at the level of the linguistic material circulation and at that of their actions. Any individual and her/his entire activity/discourse gets meaning only in the environment (s)he lives in. Each individual interacts with the environment, in a dynamic way: (s)he acts on the things around on the basis of the meanings these things have for her/him.<sup>11</sup> The goals/ends of individual's interactions/transactions with one another are to create shared meanings and to develop self-concepts.

Language represents a means by which individuals negotiate meanings through symbols. The verbal/nonverbal commentary/response of the receiver shows his/her level of understanding and agreement, evaluates, stimulates the interaction/transaction, and offers reward (encourages the partner) or punishment (discourages exchanges or certain communicative moves /behavioural ones).

In interaction/transaction the individual can build the illusion of the social order<sup>12</sup> established through mutual agreement. The self is developed only during the social experience; because only in interaction/transaction has the individual got the possibility of observing his/her own actions from the other's perspective. The interaction/transaction also offers the possibility of individuals' reciprocal positioning and their interpreting of the social "role"<sup>13</sup>. Their "performances" represent the core of their social interactions in which they behave like actors, while presenting their self in front of the "audience"/the others. Individuals engage in interaction rituals meant to allow them show reverence to each other. This is why polite address terms, as well as exchanges endowed with the same function (compliments, greetings, excuses) play an important part.

At the same time, the interaction/transaction is a social exchange<sup>14</sup> in which the individuals' actions are motivated by costs and rewards. Individuals explain their actions as springing from the preferences they have, as well as from the short or long-term ends and means that meet these ends. Any interaction is established and goes on as long as individuals admit the existence of some rewards worth obtaining, because they

- 10) Ideas sustained by the psychological and psychiatric approach of the Palo Alto School (represented by Watzlawick, Beavin and Jackson).
- 11) According to Symbolic Interactionism, a theoretical approach to understanding the relationship between humans and society, developed between 1920-1930; the basic concepts are *interaction*, *symbols*, *interpretations* and *self*.
- 12) According to Ethnomethodology (represented by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson) – a sociological perspective on communication, developed by H. Garfinkel at the beginning of the 60's.
- 13) E. Goffman (*La mise en scène de la vie quotidienne*, 1973; *Les rites d'interaction*, 1974) developed the Dramaturgical conception on communication (derived from the Symbolic Interactionism).
- 14) According to the Social Exchange Theory (a social psychological and sociological perspective) whose main premise is that the exchange of social and material resources represents a fundamental form of human interaction.

stimulate their actions (a certain identity, appreciation, affection, reciprocal agreement) and the costs (waste of time and energy, loss of self-image/esteem) are not too high. This is what people could name (in the *EMMY* terms) an ethical behaviour.

A basic concept is that of interactional/transactional competence: a set of abilities (discursive, pragmatic, and strategic) meant to help individuals handle different interactional/transactional situations/processes by which discursive practices are co-constructed by them within socio-cultural systems. It is through this process of co-construction that individuals share knowledge, interpret things, analyse problems, find solutions, understand concepts and make meaning specific to their practice. Participants to interaction have got a triple perspective: self-knowing (the analysis of their own actions and feelings in different moments of interaction and in different situations), self-disclosure (their wishes, interests, aptitudes, activities, qualities, drawbacks) and “negotiation” of self (including the elements of a process through which individuals answer their self-images and the others’ images).

The discourse in interaction is the product of two or more participants and has got rules governing it. The exchange of messages is that which determines interactions/transactions and their cohesion. The verbal interactions/transactions are governed by the Cooperative Principle [Grice1980: 57], as a form of fitting/matching means to ends.

The whole politicians’ activity/discourse is based on interactions and transactions with people, as they always try to achieve satisfactory results for themselves and for the others. The politician’s role – as individual or representative of a party – helps her/him construct a discourse based on giving opinions/attitudes, disclosing beliefs, offering arguments that require a direct or indirect re-

sponse from the addressees. Always present or future-oriented, such discourse tries to “fit” the world around, the same way means try to fit the ends.

During election periods politicians engage in different sorts of interactions and transactions that have a dynamic character; they are based on competing ends, values and visions. The main end is to win votes through their persuasive discourse. That is why their discourse includes many elements of both personal disclosure and disclosure concerning political issues<sup>22</sup>, all patterned within the boundaries of a speaker’s policy. Sometimes in an official address style, sometimes in a colloquial one, with occasional uses of humour, slogans, references to domestic issues or foreign policy principles, their discourses are most often given non-verbal response from the audience: applause or votes in the ballot box.

#### IV. Election speeches – a stylistic analysis

We suggest an analysis of four randomly chosen election speeches (Michigan, September 13, 2004; Iowa, October 20, 2004; Wisconsin, October 26, 2004; Ohio, October 27, 2004) which George Bush delivered in the 2004 campaign, when, after having been America’s President for four years, he is again face-to-face with his prospective electors. His end is to maintain power and to win it, using most effective Means (discursive ones included).

The analysis is meant to illustrate:

- the ways in which short and long-term ends are explicitly or implicitly voiced by the speaker;
- the various means to match the ends, openly suggested by the speaker or inferred by the audience;



- the interaction between the speaker and the receivers;
- the syntactic, semantic, pragmatic and oratorical elements or structures;
- the persuasive effects of the message (persuasion is used as a means);
- the stylistic markers of the election political discourse, as characteristic for the political rhetoric (in general) and George Bush's style (in particular).

As any political election discourse whose main end is to persuade, the four speeches follow the same pattern, supported by a wide range of techniques (i.e. means) with both rational and affective value. This means that throughout their organization, two main aspects can be easily detected: the argumentative and the oratorical ones, in a direct relation with the candidate's main ends: to convince the audience and to stir the electors' emotions (that are means to attain the main end). This also means that the speaker does not only pay attention to the concepts that are at the basis of his discourse; he is also interested in the emotions he may create as a result of the "images" he introduces through his discourse. Thus, the four discourses display quite a balanced structure; they are both emotional and rational policy oriented.

The analysis brings into light three characteristics; one of them is connected with the content and the other two are connected with the structure:

- each discourse deals with the same "big issues", although in each of them one issue is predominant (economy/culture/security/environmental problems);
- the discourses are balanced in respect to the structure of sentences: sometimes long, full of

digressions, sometimes short and strictly to the point;

- the pattern of the four discourses invariably follows the same main points, though not always in the same order, as a manifestation of its ritualized character. Thus, we always have:

1) the candidate's address to the specific audience, thanking them for being present at the meeting, followed (or not) by references to his own feelings, at that respective moment, in an attempt of "drawing" the audience "closer" to him and getting their attention:

*It's such an honor to be here. ... We're honored you are here. (Wisconsin).*

Bush is aware from the very beginning that the more positive reactions in the interlocutors are raised, the more persuasive his discourse becomes.

2) the candidate's disclosure of his personal self.

This type of disclosure appears only in some of his discourses, but it is formulated in the same terms and springs from the same end: the candidate's desire to be popular, to transform the audience into some good and trustworthy friends, to create some likeness between him and the others:

*Listen, in the last few years the American people have come to know me. They know my blunt way of speaking. I got that from my mother. They know that sometimes I mangle the English language. I got that from my dad. Americans also know I tell you exactly what I'm going to do and I keep my word. (Iowa)*

If the first sentences were received with laughter by the audience, the last remark got their applause (as a sign of interaction and encouragement).

Bush also discloses things related to his family, especially to his wife.

*I don't know if you know the history of... of me and Laura.* (Wisconsin).

There follows the story of their life, of their coming to be good friends and then getting married. It is based on a humorous tone up to some point (mentioning the fact that he had to promise her she would never deliver speeches in public, in exchange of her promise to marry him), but then, he immediately becomes serious and offers the audience the image of a President's wife:

*She's giving a lot of speeches, and when she does, the American people see a warm, compassionate, great First Lady.* (Applause – Wisconsin)

3) the candidate's sincere presentation of his immediate end/goal, as a direct expression of his desire of disclosing position, beliefs and future policy:

*I am going to tell the people where I stand, what I believe, and where I'm going to lead this nation for the next four years.* (Michigan – Applause).

In Iowa he is even more specific:

*I am traveling in Iowa today to give you reasons why I think you ought to put me back into office, but perhaps the most important one of all is so that Laura is the First Lady for four more years.* (Applause – Iowa).

The reference to “reasons” is meant to stir the audience's expectations for what is to come, while the modal “ought to” stresses on the candidate's belief that his reasons will definitely convince them and he will get their trust/vote again for four more years, as a result of their moral duty to do that.

4) a clear expression of the candidate's main short-term/long-term end: to gain the electors' vote and help:

In a very friendly tone he addresses the masses:

*I'm here to ask for your vote, that's what I'm doing today.* (Michigan

– Applause)

Or even

*I've come... to not only ask for your vote, but to ask for your help.* (Ohio)

*I'm here to ask your vote. I'm here to ask for your help.* (Wisconsin).

Mentioning the special moment he addresses to them,

*We're less than two weeks away from voting time.* (Iowa)

*We're only one week away from vote.* (Wisconsin),

Bush is asking not only the people present there to vote; his urges are also addressed to the large masses of voters possible to be attracted by those present (a clear proof of his trust in the power the large masses exercise):

*I'd like you to get your friends and neighbors...* (Iowa).

The candidate insists on the idea and mentions the importance of their vote and the confidence he has in the final result:

*There is no doubt in my mind if we turn out our vote in Wisconsin, we'll win a great victory on November the 2nd* (Applause – Wisconsin)

At this particular moment, Bush identifies his main end with the American people's end(s), through a dissimulation of his own interest for all the Americans' welfare:

*I am running for President with a clear and positive plan to build a safer world and a more hopeful America.* (Michigan).

The use of comparatives (“safer”, “more hopeful”) is meant to strengthen the idea and give it more importance. We can notice the candidate's power of the verbal elements, as part of his rhetorical organization of the discourse at the lexical level.

The same strategic line is to be noticed in the reference to the people's duty and obligation to vote, as an appeal to the audience's general knowledge, expressed in a very colloquial manner, in which the level of the language is adapted to the audience:

*We have a duty in our democracy to vote. We have an obligation to vote.*  
(Ohio; Iowa).

This thing empowers him with the right of using a direct urge, in a more or less imperative tone, as a characteristic of the political discourse and as a sort of verbal instrument in the "struggle" for attaining ends. Knowing/remembering about "the duty" and "obligation to vote" is, in fact, finding out means for matching ends:

*So I'm asking you to tell your friends and neighbors about that obligation.*  
(Ohio)

*Remind them we have a duty in democracy to vote* (Iowa)

*Get them headed to the polls.* (Iowa)

*Get our Republicans to go out there.*

*Get independents to go out there.*

*And find discerning democrats like Zell Miller and head them to the polls.* (Ohio).

The messages are clear addresses to joint efforts/consensus, no matter the parties electors belong to; they are based on verbs implying decisive actions and appeal to judgment, in which the name mentioned plays a very important role (especially due to the qualities he displays).

Bush considers himself and his team as the only solution that the Americans can take so as to continue his political actions:

*And when you get them to the polls, remind them if they want a safer America, and a stronger America and a better America, to put me and Dick Cheney back in the office.*  
(Ohio)

Again, the insistence on adjectives in the comparison degree ("safer", "stronger" and "better") as well as the repetition of "America" for three times enhances the message through the appeal to both ethos and pathos.

Bush offers arguments when mentioning Dick Cheney's traits, in a mixture of serious and humorous address. He seems to be a little bit ironical when referring to Cheney's hairdo, but he succeeds in highlighting the qualities that will make Cheney trustworthy and appreciated by the American people:

*I am proud of my running Dick Cheney... he does not have the waviest hair in the race. You'll be pleased to know I did not pick him because of his hairdo. (Laughter). I picked him because of his experience and his judgment and his ability to get the job done.* (Applause  
– Wisconsin)

The interaction with the audience is marked by the presence of nonverbal elements (applause), and paraverbal ones (laughter) as well as a chorus verbal expression from them: "Four more years! Four more years!" Their manifestation is an evidence of the efficient perlocutionary effect of the discourse.

5) the candidate's reference to the election campaign and the American people's ends/desires to be attained:

Bush mentions the "big issues" of his campaign, transforming them into ends to be attained by himself (as a President) and by his team, although not explicitly formulated:

*I am focusing on the big issues that are facing our... our country's families. This election comes down to five clear choices for our families: your family security, your family's budget, your quality of life, your retirement, and the bedrock values*

*that are so critical to our country's future. (Applause – Wisconsin).*

It is interesting to notice the inclusive “our (families)”, used in order to obtain that absolutely necessary identification with the others and their problems, as a common persuasive technique. The switch that operates at the level of the pronoun (“your family/budget/quality of life/retirement”) is meant to show the candidate’s deep concern for the most desired issues that the Americans have always dreamt of.

132

His discourse is structurally well organized, through the candidate’s use of compositional procedures (“The first” [...] “The second...”):

*This election comes down to some clear choices for America's families, choices on issues of great consequence. The first clear choice is the most important because it concerns the security of your family. All progress on every other issue depends on the safety of our citizens... [...] The second clear choice in this election concerns your family budget. (Ohio)*

This procedure takes into consideration the social context in which the discourse takes place:

*It is the first presidential election since September the 11<sup>th</sup>. [...] Americans will go to the polls in a time of war and of ongoing threat unlike any we have faced before. (Ohio)*

The information he conveys is a reference to the past and present history: the terrorists’ attack that has changed the American people’s life for ever and the possibility of new attacks. Giving priority to this topic is part of the candidate’s means to attain his end, as security represents the main issue and preoccupation of all Americans.

At the same level of analysis, Bush resorts to rhetorical questions, giving the impression of a fictitious dialogue with his audience; in fact it is he who gives the answers:

*And so the fundamental question in this campaign is: Who's got the best strategy....who's got the idea...who understands and who can best make sure that more small businesses grow in America? First, in order to make sure... (Wisconsin)*

6) the candidate’s reference to the means which can match the exposed ends:

*...to keep this economy strong we'll continue to stand with our farmers. (Iowa);*

*And to make sure this economy continues to grow, we must keep your taxes low. (Applause – Iowa)*

*...to keep jobs here, we've got to make sure we open up foreign markets to our products. (Michigan)*

*...to make sure jobs remain here, America must be the best place in the world to do business. (Iowa)*

*...to create jobs here in America, to make sure this economy continues to grow we've got to be wise about how we spend your money. (Applause – Michigan)*

*Listen; to keep jobs here in America, we need an energy plan. (Michigan)*

*To make sure – to make sure that this economy is strong and the small business can flourish, we've got to do something about the frivolous and junk lawsuits. These lawsuits cost our economy about \$2230 billion a year. (Wisconsin)*

*...to make sure health care is affordable, we'll help over small business. (Ohio)*

One can easily observe that Bush delivers a relevant message as long as it contains

solutions to the mentioned problems. He addresses people in a colloquial style (“Listen...”) and all the verbs he uses are verbs of action: “to continue”, “to make”, “to open”, “to create”, “to do something”, “to help”, which do not only show what is to be done, but, at the same time, they become promises, due to the use of the agents under the form of the inclusive pronoun “we” (with reference to himself, his team and the whole American people), as well as to generalizations as expressed by “America”. He is sure that success is ensured by this underlying of solutions/means presented in a logical manner as well as by defining of priorities.

The idea expressed is that all the ends can be attained only by joint efforts, as to be seen in his beliefs:

7) the candidate's beliefs.

Addressing a universal audience, the candidate formulates his beliefs in clear terms, his words becoming the expression of his individuality, but at the same time, of a collective mentality. On the one hand, Bush considers that his success depends on the people he addresses; the verb he uses is a marker of his confidence:

*I believe with your help we will carry Michigan and win a great victory in November.* (Michigan).

On the other hand, Bush makes reference to different categories of people and to the whole nation, implicitly “sketching” America's ends:

*I believe every child can learn and every school must teach.* (Applause – Michigan)

*I believe we have a moral responsibility to provide our seniors with good health care.* (Applause – Michigan)

*I believe this nation wants steady, consistent, principled leadership and that's why, with your help,*

*we're going to win a great national victory in November.* (Applause

– Michigan)

*I believe in policies that empower people to improve their lives, not try to run their lives.* (Iowa).

The repetition of the structure (“I believe”) as a marker of intensification and of his desire of attracting the audience's attention, as well as the accumulation of adjectives (“steady, consistent, principled”) represent an example of the power of the words he uses. The same thing can be noticed in the choice of words with a strong impact on the audience, as they meet their expectations as regards a better future: “moral responsibility”, “good health care” and “to improve”. The message has got a strong pragmatic value; it makes reference to three of the main problems the Americans are interested in: education, health care and a good leader for the whole nation.

Bush also mentions

*I believe in the energy, innovation, and spirit of America's workers and farmers and small business owners.* (Michigan)

highlighting some of the traits of a large category of people, able through their vote to help him win “a great national victory”. This technique is thought to be of a strong persuasive value, as it resorts on flattering.

The candidate is fully aware of a President's duty:

*I believe a President – I believe it's a job of a President to confront problems, not pass them onto future presidents and future generations.”* (Michigan); *“I believe the most solemn duty of the American president is to protect the American people.* (Applause – Michigan).

The use of short sentences are meant to gain attention from the part of the au-

dience and the message gets much more relevance.

8) the candidate's promises

The candidate's promises for a "safer and better America" are expressed either indirectly

*If America shows uncertainty and weakness in this decade, the world will drift toward tragedy. This is not going to happen on my watch.*  
(Applause – Michigan)

or directly, with reference and insistence on his own ability and his team's abilities. Thus he says:

*So, over the next four years we're going to transform these systems so that all citizens are equipped, prepared and thus, truly free to be able to make their own choices and to be able to realize the great promise of this country.* (Applause – Michigan)

*We will open markets around the world. We will make sure that we were wise about how to spend your money.* (Iowa)

*We will expand and strengthen our economic recovery.* (Wisconsin)

*We'll continue to improve life for our families.* (Ohio).

At the lexical-morphological level, the choice and use of words are meant to guide the interlocutors towards the conclusive effect – the one desired by the speaker: to be re-elected. The arguments immediately follow

*We will be relentless, determined, steadfast, and strong. We will not relent.* (Wisconsin).

Mentioning the joint efforts while using repetition, a careful choice of words, and even resorting to metaphors, Bush renews his promises with reference to symbols so dear to the Americans:

*We've been through a lot together. We've been through a lot together during the last nearly four years. Because we've done the hard work of climbing the mountain, we can see the valley below. The next four years, we'll work to protect our families, build our prosperity, and defend our values. We will work to spread freedom and liberty so we can achieve the peace we want for generations to come.* (Ohio)

9) the candidate's presentation of facts

Being aware of the fact that the efficacy of his discourse is ensured by the convincing reasoning and by the proofs he offers, Bush mentions some of the past and present actions he was/is involved in. As facts belong to reality, their presentation becomes a means and not an end, meant to legitimize his power:

*...we've laid out a plan to make sure that this economy of ours continues to grow.* (Michigan)

*I submitted a plan to the United States congress, and it's stuck in there."* (Michigan)

*I signed a good farm bill that's helping our farmers.* (Iowa)

*We have strengthened the protections for the homeland.*

*We're reforming our intelligence capabilities.* (Ohio)

*By the way, we passed tough laws.*

*We had made it abundantly clear; we will not tolerate dishonesty in the board rooms of America.* (Wisconsin)

*We're spreading freedom and liberty.* (Ohio)

*We have extended contracts in the conservation reserve program, to help protect our wildlife, to help improve land and to help our farm*



*families. (Iowa) We're expanding broad-band technology to make high-speed Internet access available to all Americans by 2007. (Iowa) We're helping men and women find the skills and tools to prosper in a time of change. We're helping people realize their dreams so they can find dignity and independence in America and this is how I will continue to lead our country four more years. (Applause – Iowa) We stand for a culture of life in which every person matters and every being counts. (Wisconsin)*

The short, concise sentences give a clear account of the candidate's attention and concern to introduce the basic ideas of his political programme. They are also meant to make the audience trust the candidate and hope for what is best for them. The oscillation between "I" and "We" comes to underline the power he has and the power his team is invested with, while the verbs chosen belong to the same category of verbs of action (as the ones already mentioned), stressing on the idea of an ongoing process permanently under his control.

The audience's reaction is immediate again, proving the efficient perlocutionary effects of his discourse. The audience is shouting and asking repetitively: *Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!* (Iowa)

10) the candidate's appeal to the past vs. the present moment

In a very colloquial style, Bush mentions some of the past moments the Americans passed through, putting them into contrast to the present moments, whose "artisan" he pretends to be:

*When you are out there rounding up the vote, I want you to remind people that six months prior to my*

*arrival; the stock market was in serious decline. Our economy was declining in the last half of the year 2000. We fell into recession. We had corporate scandals, which affected our economy... (Iowa) Think about what happened in the workplace. Years ago fathers and grandfathers worked for one job, one company; they had one pension plan, one health care plan; today people change careers and change jobs often. And the most startling change of all is that women now work not only in the house but outside the house. (Applause – Michigan).*

All these make up a coherent argumentative discourse in which the arguments are based on analogy.

11) the candidate's reference to the past ends that were attained through his former policy

In order to be more persuasive, Bush mentions his past kept promises:

*When I campaigned in your state in 2000, I told the people of Iowa I support ethanol. I kept my word. (Applause – Iowa)*

*When I ran for president four years ago, I pledged to lower taxes for American families; I kept my word. (Applause – Ohio).*

He also mentions the key for his and his team's success:

*We are relentless, we are determined. (Ohio).*

Through this characterization, Bush wants to move his interlocutors along to his conclusion: he and his team deserve to be re-elected.

12) the candidate's reference to his opponents:

Every action, every kept promise he mentioned were meant to certify the fact

that Bush was pursuing to establish order, solve domestic issues and accomplish “the American dream”, which has become a symbol for all the Americans. That is why whenever he mentions his opponent he resorts to irony, mockery or criticism. This is done in a natural tone, in which humour mingles with sarcasm and the audience’s reaction is immediate.

136

*See, earlier this year, my opponent said a decision about Great Lakes water diversion would be a delicate balancing act. (Boo – Michigan)*  
*Now, my opponent has his own history on the economy. (Laughter)*  
*He has voted to raise taxes 98 times. (Boo – Iowa)*  
*My opponent promises to raise your taxes (Boo – Wisconsin)*  
*My opponent and I have a different approach. (Wisconsin)*  
*My opponent has very different plans for your budget. He’s going to take a big chunk out of it. (Boo). He voted against the child tax credit; he voted against marriage penalty relief; he voted against lower taxes. (Boo). He voted for higher taxes 98 times. (Ohio).*

The discourse is “sprinkled” with humorous remarks, direct questions addressed to the audience in order to strengthen interaction with them and get their approval:

After the audience’s reaction (“boo”) he says:

*That kind of sound like him doesn’t it? (Applause – Michigan)*  
*Now, we’ve heard that before, haven’t we? (The audience: Yes! – Iowa).*

Talking about the taxes the opponent made reference to and the way he wanted to solve the problem, Bush underlines:

*And guess who usually gets to fill the gap? (Audience: We do) Yes,*

*you do. But we’re not going to let him tax you. We’re going to win on November the 2<sup>nd</sup>. (Applause*

*– Wisconsin)*

*And guess who usually gets to fill the gap...? (Audience: We do.)*

*You do. The good news is we’re going to carry Ohio and we’re not going to let him tax you. (Applause – Ohio)*

The whole discourse about his opponent has the following characteristics:

a) the colloquial address to the audience ensuring closeness/friendly sharing of ideas (“See”; “Now...”);

b) insistence on their divergent opinions on the big issues (*My opponent and I have a different approach*) and presentation of the opponent’s actions/accomplishments” (*He voted against...*)

c) no mentioning of the opponent’s name;

d) the interaction between Bush and the audience manifests in the paraverbal elements of the latter: their “boo” and laughter, as markers of their disapproval, dislike, discontent, criticism (all meant to ensure a sense of friendliness and receptivity on the part of the audience);

e) the attack against the opponent is sustained by logical arguments (*Now, we’ve heard that before, haven’t we?*);

f) the repetition at the syntactic and oratorical level of some sentences, meant to illustrate the difference existing between himself and the opponent (*He voted for higher taxes 98 times vs. But we’re not going to let him tax you.*). He also mentions contrastively, the means the opponents are going to resort to, in order to match the ends (the opponent’s ends and means are both negative, bad and non-human):

*The bottom line about our economic vision is this: to pay for all his*

*new spending he's proposed, my opponent will have to raise taxes not just on small business owners but on everyone who's ever worked for a small business, shopped at a small business, or walked by a small business. (Laughter). We're not going to let him tax you. We're going to win. (Applause – Wisconsin)*

### Conclusions

As a conclusion, through his whole political discourse, Bush is able to get the audience's attention and make them interact with him,

as he organizes the discourse carefully and pays much attention to both argumentative and emotional aspects. His ends and means to attain them are clearly expressed and structurally well organized, so as to "respond" people's expectations. The three main levels of the discourse: the syntactic, lexical and oratorical ones contribute a lot to its persuasive function. Today as we already know the results of the Americans' votes, we can definitely say that the discourses during the election campaign had a strong perlocutionary effect on the audience, as they were all examples of the candidate's art of persuasion.

137

## summary

### Σ The EMMY Style and the Management of the Political Discourse in Socio-Human Interactions and Transactions

The aim of this article is to present some of the major aspects of style characteristic for the political discourse, as interpreted from an original perspective: EMMY. This is a new vision on the human being, starting from the fact that each of us has rational/emotional ends that could be fulfilled using certain mean and is permanently adequating (fitting, matching) ends to means and means to ends.

We start from two premises concerning the political discourse: it is a particular type of communication in terms of participants, objectives and strategies to be used; its analysis has to take in view both the political, economic and ethical dimension.

From a pragmatic point of view, the political discourse is understood not only as a form of action upon the others but also as a form of interaction/transaction with the others/the people/the audience. Through the discourse, politicians try to attain ends for themselves and for the others: satisfying the people's needs/objectives, establishing the social order, giving a sense to the socio-political events, maintaining/chaniging them, bulding/shaping identity and gaining a certain position within the political background. From the point of view of cohesion and coherence, this type of discourse is based on a set of very well organized structures obeying a logical order.

The paper offers a theoretical presentation of the problem under discussion followed by an analysis of texts (speeches of George Bush delivered during the election campaign in 2004), in an attempt of disclosing the management of the political discourse and the influence it has upon the audience, due to the style it adopts.

CASA 2007

## Bibliography

138

- Bange 1992: **Bange P.** *Analyse conversationnelle et théorie de l'action*. – Paris : Les Editions Didier. – 223 s.
- Bonta 2004: **Bonta E.** *Conversația – ipostază a interacțiunii verbale*. – Bacău: Alma Mater. – 471 s.
- Brown, Levinson 1987: **Brown P., Levinson S.** *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. – 352 s.
- Chruszczewski 2003: **Chruszczewski P.** *American Presidential Discourse Analysis*. – Berlin: Logos Verlag. – 166 s.
- Drugus 1995: **Drugus L.** *The Scope of the economic, the politic and the ethic. What is, at last, studying the Political Economics?* in “Economica”, Vol. 3. – Nr 3–4. – 35–51. – Chisinau.
- Drugus 2003: **Drugus L.** *Ethics and Ethical Behavior in Education and Health Care. A Postmodern View*, (2), in “The Romanian Journal of Bioethics”, Edited by The Romanian Physicians’ Collegium, Iasi, Romania, Vol 1. – Nr. 2, April–June. – S. 27–33.
- Drugus 2003: Drugus L.** *(Re)defining the Essence(s) of Politics, Economics and Ethics. Is this Possible only by Ends and Means?* Paper delivered at the 1 SSEI Conference on “The Narrative of Modernity”. – Pamplona.
- Drugus 2004: **Drugus L.** *Ethics is Political Economics. Moral behavior is Good Management*, in: “Philosophy for Business”, Issue number 9. – See: <http://www.isfp.co.uk/businesspathways/>
- Drugus 2005: **Drugus L.** *Applied Research as a “Doxa-Praxis Continuum”*. – *The case of ЕММУ applied to Social Sciences*, paper delivered at the Vilnius EURASHE Conference, 29th of April. – Vilnius.
- Drugus 2006: **Drugus L.** *The Bioeconomics-Bioethics-Biopolitics continuum. An attempt to create a postmodern, semiotic, transdisciplinary, teleologic, pragmatic and trialectic/tri(u)nitary space of knowledge*, paper delivered at the first AROSS international Conference. – October 2006. – Bacau.
- Drugus 2006: **Drugus L.** *Education Management: Good teachers as perpetual students*. – Paper presented at the International Conference “Economic Integration and Social Change”, organized by “George Bacovia” University, 19–29 Mai 2006. – Bacau.
- Drugus 2006: **Drugus L.** *The Bioeconomics-Bioethics-Biopolitics continuum. An attempt to create a postmodern, semiotic, transdisciplinary, teleologic, pragmatic and trialectic/tri(u)nitary space of knowledge*. – Paper delivered at the first AROSS international Conference. – October 2006. – Slanic – Bacau.
- Drugus, Gherasim, Cmeciu 2007: **Drugus L., Gherasim T., Cmeciu C.** *Shaping the practical role of a transdisciplinary higher education in (sustainable) transdevelopment. ЕММУ as a transmodern communication tool for a better living*. – Paper delivered at the 19th Annual Conference of SPACE (A European University Consortium located in Ghent, Belgium) on “Learning by Sharing in Higher Education”, 20–24<sup>th</sup> March 2007. – Nicosia.
- Goffman 1973: **Goffman E.** *Les rites d’interaction*. – Paris : Les Editions de Minuit. – 230 s.
- Goffman 1973: **Goffman E.** *La mise en scène de la vie quotidienne*, vol. II. – Paris: Les Editions de Minuit. – 363 s.
- Goodman 1992: **Goodman N.** *Introducere în sociologie*. – București: Editura Lider. – 490 s.
- Grice 1980: **Grice H. P.** *Logique et conversation*, in “Communications”, no.30. – Paris. – 274 s.
- Watzlawick 1972: **Watzlawick P.** *Une logique de la communication*. – Paris : Editions du Seuil. – 280 s.
- Online Etymological Dictionary; <http://www.etymonline.com/>, <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/campaign/index.html>.