

Examples of Propaganda in Tony Blair's political speech

An analysis of the political language used in Tony Blair's speech, dated 5 March, 2004.

Dan Kristensson
C-Essay in English
Högskolan Dalarna
Autumn term, 2004
Supervisor: J. White

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	3
1.1 Background.....	3
1.2 Aim.....	5
1.3 Method.....	5
2. PROPAGANDA AND PERSUASION.....	8
3. EXAMPLES OF PROPAGANDA IN TONY BLAIR’S SPEECH.....	10
3.1 The ideology and purpose of the propaganda campaign.....	10
3.2 The context in which the propaganda occurs.....	12
3.3 The target audience.....	13
3.4 Special techniques to maximise effect.....	14
3.4.1 Creating resonance.....	14
3.4.2 Source credibility.....	16
3.4.3 Group norm.....	17
3.4.4 Language usage.....	18
4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	21
REFERENCES.....	25

APPENDICES

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

One of the most debated decisions in recent time is the decision made by the USA and the British Government, and some other allies, to go to war against Iraq and to put an end to Saddam Hussein's regime. Many people all around Europe have protested against the war, calling it illegal and against the will of the United Nations. Others have defended and supported the war, claiming that it was unavoidable and that getting rid of Saddam Hussein was a necessary thing to do. In newspaper articles, television debate programs and in political speeches different arguments have been put forward, either defending or rejecting the idea that the war was necessary. The most important argument for invading Iraq was that Saddam Hussein's regime possessed weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and by having access to these weapons Iraq was a huge threat to the rest of the world. Whether or not Saddam Hussein's regime actually was in possession of WMD, and if therefore the decision to invade Iraq could be justified or not, is still an issue of many a debate.

In Britain, Prime Minister Tony Blair on several occasions has been forced to defend the decision to go to war and the British public are deeply divided either for or against this decision. Even within the ruling Labour Party there are different views on this matter. Many support Tony Blair and the presence of British troops in Iraq, while others, on the other hand, strongly believe that the war is illegal and that the invasion should never have taken place, at least not at that particular point in time. In defending the decision to go to war against Iraq, along with the USA and some other allies, Tony Blair has often used political speeches as a mean of presenting his ideas and asking for support. What, then, is a political speech?

This essay will show that a political speech is often used to try to convince, and even to try to persuade, an audience and that there is often propaganda involved as well. It is very interesting to study all the different arguments there are, and all the proclamations that have been made, when discussing the legality of the Iraq war. How, then, do debaters, especially politicians, formulate their arguments and what are the real motives behind different speeches or articles? This question is the starting point for this essay.

Language is a very powerful tool for presenting ideas and to communicate with other people. We obviously use language for all kinds of reasons, but the way we express ourselves can be very effective and is something that is worth taking a closer look at. Trask mentions that we use language to try to persuade people, but that is not all there is to it (1995 p.141):

But we don't only use language to try to persuade people to do things. We also use it to persuade other people to believe us, to accept our own view of the world. Sometimes this use of language is more or less honest and above-board [- - -] But, sadly, we also use language to bamboozle, mislead, deceive and intimidate.

According to Trask we use language both with an honest intention and with the intention of misleading and deceiving. Politicians also use language in many ways: in order to present political ideas, to persuade an audience or to argue with political opponents. Not only do politicians present their ideas, they most often want their audience to agree with them and also want to persuade the people into supporting and following their political decisions. Language is also used for propaganda, a term that will be explained and analysed in this essay. But how can propaganda be identified in a political speech of today?

1.2 Aim

The methods and language politicians use in order to persuade and convince an audience is something that can be studied by analysing what words and expressions politicians use, but also what words they avoid. A political speech most often has a clear purpose and therefore the message is often very well formulated and the words used are deliberately picked out. Pragmatics is a linguistic field where one can study this phenomenon. The Longman dictionary defines pragmatics as “the study of how words and phrases are used with special meanings in particular situations” (1995 p. 1105).

The aim of this essay is to analyse the language in Tony Blair’s political speech, dated 5 March 2004, in order to identify different elements of propaganda and to show how expressions and choice of words are used for special meanings. It is not the intention of this paper to cover all aspects of pragmatics or to identify every example of propaganda today. This would be an impossible task. Therefore the analysis is limited to just one political speech and to study what Prime Minister Tony Blair actually says when he defends the Iraq war. What language does he use and how does he formulate his ideas?

1.3 Method

When choosing a method for an analysis it is important that the work is replicable. An analysis of a political speech, in order to see how phrases and words are used and to identify what purpose the speech has, needs to have a certain structure. Otherwise it could be tempting to interpret the speech quite freely, without considering that the analysis has to be replicable. Another person should be able to come to the same result. It is, however, almost impossible to avoid interpretation when studying a text. In fact,

interpretation is what it is all about when analysing a text, for example a speech.

Fairclough (1989) describes this as follows (p. 80):

Notice that, paradoxical as it may seem, both the production of a text and the interpretation of a text have an interpretative character. The producer of the text constructs the text as an interpretation of the world [...] formal features of the text are *traces* of that interpretation. The traces constitute *cues* for the text interpreter [...] Thus text interpretation is *the interpretation of an interpretation*.

According to Fairclough both production of a text and the interpretation are creative constructive processes which involve interpretation (p.81). Having this in mind it is important to choose a good method for analysing a text.

The method used in this essay to analyse Tony Blair's speech is part of a 10- step plan of propaganda analysis, as described by Jowett and O'Donnell (1999 p. 280). Not all 10 steps will be followed, only those which are relevant for studying a political speech. The following four divisions will build the framework for the analysis (p.280):

1. *The ideology and purpose of the propaganda campaign*
2. *The context in which the propaganda occurs*
3. *The target audience*
4. *Special techniques to maximise effect*

The last division, *Special techniques to maximise effect*, is most relevant for the essay and will therefore be focused on in more detail than the others. This is done by adding four principles of propaganda techniques, also from Jowett and O'Donnell (1999), in

order to see if they can be identified in Tony Blair's speech: *Creating resonance*, *Source credibility*, *Group norm* and *Language usage*.

The reason for not concluding all 10 steps is that not all the aspects of propaganda can be covered in this essay – there has to be a limit – and that the four divisions chosen are the ones most relevant for analysing a political speech. It is also impossible to analyse the speech word for word, from every possible angle. Therefore it is necessary to only deal with a few aspects of Blair's speech.

First a short description of what propaganda and persuasion is, according to Jowett and O'Donnell, will be presented. Then Tony Blair's speech will be analysed, following the four steps mentioned above. It is also important to mention that only the written text of the speech will be studied. A political speech includes many other aspects as well, not only spoken words. Among these are, according to Bollinger (1980 p. 11):

Eye contact, head movements, gestures with arms and hands, posture, facial expression, distance from another speaker, noises such as clearing the throat, loudness and softness, high pitch and low pitch, the real or pretended quaver that accompanies emotion – all communicate singly, together, and in concert with language.

These ingredients are very important when making a political speech, for example to emphasise what one wants to say, to make the speech more interesting or to evoke emotions. In the analysis of the written speech chosen for this essay these aspects will not be commented on. What, then, is persuasion and propaganda?

2. PROPAGANDA AND PERSUASION

The word *propaganda* is a very loaded word that brings back to our memory pictures of Hitler and the Nazi Party of World War II. Propaganda is also strongly connected to the Cold War between the USA and the Soviet Union, with the exaggeration of the other side's evilness and threat to world peace. But there are many different kinds of propaganda, and not all propaganda is as extreme as the examples given above.

According to Jowett and O'Donnell the word *propaganda* in its most neutral sense means "to disseminate or promote particular ideas" (1999 p. 2). So propaganda is not only a tool for dictators or totalitarian regimes to bring out their message and to deceive people. It can be used for many purposes and looks different in different contexts. Jowett and O'Donnell describe propaganda as follows (p. 1):

Propaganda is a form of communication that attempts to achieve a response that furthers the desired intent of the propagandist. [---] Public opinion and behavioural change can be affected by propaganda.

The purpose of propaganda is to present an ideology to an audience with a related objective (p. 3). It can be anything from a government trying to create a massive wave of patriotism, to a military leader trying to frighten the enemy by exaggerating casualties, or a company seeking to sell a product and to fight the competition.

According to Jowett and O'Donnell propaganda is almost always in some form of activated ideology, although it may take many different forms (p.11). It is also described as white, grey or black, related to the accuracy of information and depending on what source it comes from. White represents correctly identified propaganda, black has a false source and spreads lies, while grey propaganda is something in-between (p

12-15). This essay will deal with white propaganda, where the information in the message tends to be accurate.

As mentioned above propaganda can take many different forms. It is closely related to persuasion and is not so easy to separate from it. Jowett and O'Donnell even claim that propaganda can be seen as a sub category of persuasion, as well as information (p.5). The difference between propaganda and information, according to Jowett and O'Donnell, is that while information is thought to be neutral, reduces uncertainty and helps people to understand the world, the purpose of propaganda "exceeds the notion of mutual understanding" (p. 26). The purpose of propaganda is also to promote a competitive cause in the best interest of the propagandist but not necessarily in the best interest of the audience (p.26).

Persuasion is described as a "communicative process to influence others" (p.27). The process of persuasion is interactive, so the recipient is included. There is a mutual interest involved, because both parts need to fulfil their needs. Jowett and O'Donnell explain the difference between persuasion and propaganda as follows (p. 28):

Because both persuader and persuadee stand to have their needs fulfilled, persuasion is regarded as more mutually satisfying than propaganda.

So there is a difference between persuasion and propaganda. But to show that this difference is not very clear Jowett and O'Donnell mention that "Propaganda may appear to be informative communication, where ideas are shared" (p.41). The purpose, however, is not to promote mutual understanding. It is to promote the propagandist's own objectives.

Finally, Jowett and O'Donnell claim that propaganda is a "subset of both information and persuasion" (p. 46) and shares techniques with both information and persuasion. What separates propaganda from the other two forms of communication is that it goes a step further by "controlling the flow of information, managing the public opinion and manipulating behavioural patterns" (p. 46). Propaganda, compared with information and persuasion, is not so much a dialogue, but rather one way communication.

What examples of propaganda can be identified in Tony Blair's speech then? How does he express himself in order to fulfil his objectives?

3. EXAMPLES OF PROPAGANDA IN TONY BLAIR'S SPEECH

3.1 The ideology and purpose of the propaganda campaign

When analysing propaganda it is important to find out what ideology and what purpose the campaign has. Jowett and O'Donnell suggest that the analyst looks for "ideology in both verbal and visual representations" (p. 281). These representations reflect pre-existing struggles, future goals and reference to value systems. The purpose of propaganda, according to Jowett and O'Donnell, may be to "influence people to adopt attitudes that correspond to those of the propagandist or to engage in certain patterns of behaviour" (p. 281).

The ideology in Tony Blair's speech can be identified by looking at the speech to see if there are any pre-existing struggles, future goals or references to value system mentioned. One of the most important statements in Blair's speech is when he explains the background to the war in Iraq. After mentioning different terrorist acts in the past, Tony Blair explains why he thinks the war against terrorism is necessary. The most important event he mentions as a reason to go to war is the bombing of the World

Trade Centre in New York on September 11th 2001 (p. 3: 27): “September 11th was for me a revelation. What had seemed inchoate came together”. According to Blair this terrorist act was a “declaration of war” (p. 3: 30). By using such strong words as *revelation* and *war*, Blair emphasises the importance of the event and also the importance of continuing the war against terrorism. In the beginning of his speech Blair claims that (p. 1:9):

[...] the nature of the global threat we face in Britain and round the world is real and existential and it is the task of leadership to expose it and fight it, whatever the political cost [...].

By this statement Blair shows his main purpose with the political speech: to defend the Iraq war. The purpose of propaganda is also to achieve acceptance of the propagandist's ideology by the people (Jowett and O'Donnell 1999 p. 282).

Following Jowett and O'Donnell's description further – that the purpose of propaganda is to influence people to adopt attitudes – Blair in his speech uses the word “freedom” on several occasions. One example of this, and of the ideology of Blair's political speech, is when he claims that “We value the freedom and dignity of the human race and each individual in it” (p. 6:23). But what does the word “freedom” really mean? Does it have the same meaning to all people, or is it possible that different people interpret the word differently?

According to May it is common to manipulate language use and the content of specific words. This phenomenon is described as follows (May 1985 p.36):

Suppose we listen to a political speech, in which the word 'freedom' is used. Given a moment's reflection, we realize that what the speaker must *mean* is something like 'freedom as I see it', or 'freedom in the sense that I, the speaker, intend'. However, by lexical license, so to speak, politicians are allowed to say, instead of 'my kind of freedom' [...] simply 'freedom' *tout court*, 'freedom *as such*'.

3.2 The context in which the propaganda occurs

Jowett and O'Donnell claim that it is important, in an analysis of propaganda, to know and understand the historical background. In what context does the propaganda occur? Tony Blair made his speech on the 5th March 2004 about the terror threat facing the United Kingdom and the reason for going to war in Iraq. The war in Iraq had already started a year earlier and is still going on, today. The decision to go to war, made by the USA, the UK and a few other countries, is much debated and not all believe that it was the right decision to make. The starting point for the decision was a strong belief that Saddam Hussein was in possession of weapons of mass destruction and that this was a threat also to the UK. In this context Tony Blair makes his speech, explaining the reasons for going to war, but also spelling out the terror threat facing the UK. He describes the terror threat as follows (p. 2:35): "The threat we face is not conventional. It is a challenge of a different nature from anything the world has faced before".

Further on Blair explains his view of the terror threat, when he refers to the September 11th attack in the USA (p.4:1): "From September 11th on, I could see the threat plainly. Here were terrorists prepared to bring about Armageddon". The word *Armageddon* comes from the Bible and is, according to Longman, "a terrible battle that will destroy the world" (1995 p. 58). It is a very strong word and is used by Blair to

emphasise how seriously he looks upon the terror threat, and how important he believes it is to defend the UK against terror.

According to Jowett and O'Donnell it is also important, in an analysis, to relate to the prevailing mood of the times, especially the mood of the people (1999 p. 282). How can this be described?

Mike Mardell, BBC's chief political correspondent, in an article comments on the decision to go to war, and on Tony Blair's speech, as follows (Mardell 2004 p. 1:11): "Never before has a politician in a modern democracy taken his country to war when around half the country was against it". This shows that there is opposition against Tony Blair in the decision to go to war, and that many people do not agree with him. Mardell continues (p.2:20): "Many of these doubters are potential Labour members, or at least voters. They might, just might, stay at home in an election". The context of the speech can be seen in the light of this statement. He has to convince voters that the decision to go to war was the right decision.

3.3 The target audience

One way of describing the target audience in Blair's speech is, as Mardell does, by claiming that they are voters. Another way of describing it is by using Tony Blair's reference to "the public", as he does in the beginning of his speech (p.1:2): "I know a large part of the public want to move on". This description is supported at the end of Blair's speech, when he speaks directly to the audience (p.7:15) "[...] Believe your political leaders or not, as you will". According to Jowett and O'Donnell an audience is selected by a propagandist for its potential effectiveness (1999 p.286). In the case of Blair's speech, where he wants to defend the war and to spell out the threat facing the

UK, Blair addresses the whole country. Therefore the target audience is most likely the public, called “mass audience” by Jowett and O’Donnell (p. 286).

3.4 Special techniques to maximise effect

After having analysed Tony Blair’s speech in order to see what ideology and purpose it has, what context it occurs in and to describe the target audience of the speech, it is also important to study what Tony Blair actually says. What words does Blair use and how does he express himself, in order to fulfil the purpose of the speech? As mentioned earlier this essay in this section analyses Blair’s speech according to four principles of propaganda techniques, or special techniques to maximise effect, described by Jowett and O’Donnell (1999 p. 290-295). These techniques are *creating resonance*, *source credibility*, *group norm* and *language usage*. Tony Blair’s speech contains nearly 5000 words and it is not possible to cover all aspects of what he actually says. Therefore the analysis in this section is limited to the four propaganda techniques mentioned above.

3.4.1 *Creating resonance*

For messages to have a greater impact it is important that they are in line with existing opinions, dispositions and beliefs, according to Jowett and O’Donnell (1999 p. 290).

This can be achieved in many ways. One way is that the propagandist (p.290):

[...] uses belief to create belief by linking or reinforcing audience predispositions to reinforce propagandistic ideology or, in some cases, to create new attitudes or behaviours or both.

Further on Jowett and O'Donnell suggest that there are some techniques that are obvious when analysing propaganda (p.291): "links to values, beliefs, attitudes, and past behaviour patterns of the target audience". These techniques are used in order to make the propaganda successful.

Examples of Blair in his speech wanting to create resonance can be noticed in some passages. In the beginning of his speech he says that (p 1:2):

I know a large part of the public want to move on. Rightly they say that the Government should concentrate on the issues that elected us in 1997: the economy, jobs, living standards, health, education, crime.

Blair tells the audience by these words that he is aware of that the public want the Government to also concentrate on matters than just the terror threat. By saying so Blair shows that he takes the public seriously and that he wants to give the impression that he listens to what people say, although they may have different opinions.

Another example is when Blair talks about people who disagree with the divisive decision to go to war in Iraq. Some people, according to Blair, are not serious when criticising the war – he mentions lawyers and some former officials. At the same time Blair says that he respects people who disagree with him (p. 2:16-18):

Sure, some were anti-American; some against all wars. But there was a core of sensible people who faced with this decision would have gone the other way, for sensible reasons. Their argument is one I understand totally. It is that Iraq posed no direct, immediate threat to Britain.

Blair uses words like “sensible people”, “sensible reasons”, “I understand totally” as links to values, attitudes and beliefs of the target audience, in order to create resonance. What he actually implies, though, is that not all people are sensible. Blair mentions a “core of sensible people”. Others who have other opinions do not belong to this “core”. Blair’s choice of words imply that those persons cannot be taken seriously, at least not when discussing the decision to go to war in Iraq. But by not pointing out explicitly who he refers to as “sensible”, Tony Blair makes the impression that he is understanding and sympathetic and that he listens to arguments people have. Who does not want to be sensible?

3.4.2 *Source credibility*

It is important that a propagandist is reliable and that the audience feels that the message is accurate and true. According to Jowett and O’Donnell source credibility is a contributing factor that seems to influence change and that expert opinion is effective in “establishing the legitimacy of change” (1999 p. 291). Jowett and O’Donnell also claim that “people have a tendency to look up to authority figures for knowledge and direction” (p.191). This intention to be regarded as being accurate and true can be seen in Tony Blair’s speech, when he refers to some inquiries that have been made recently concerning the reliability of the British Government.

Mardell (2004) claims that there are doubts as to whether Tony Blair and the British Government are reliable when defending the decision to go to war. He presents his view of what British voters think of Blair’s arguments for going to war (p. 2:10):

More damaging still is the impression among some voters that the prime minister was not entirely straight with them; that he wanted the war and his reasoning varied with time and his audience.

This statement shows that there are some doubts in the UK as to whether Tony Blair and the British Government tell the truth about the reasons to go to war in Iraq.

Tony Blair comments on this and wants to make the impression that he really is reliable by referring to the openness the British Government has shown in the last year. In his speech Blair refers to three inquiries that have been made and claims that no mistake has been made and no intelligence has been falsified. He states that there has been no attempt to mislead the British public (p. 1:12-14):

Each week brings a fresh attempt to get a new angle that can prove it was all a gigantic conspiracy. We have had three inquiries, including the one by Lord Hutton conducted over six months, with more openness by government than any such inquiry in history, that have affirmed there was no attempt to falsify intelligence in the dossier of September of 2002[...].

By claiming that there has been more openness than in any other inquiry and that there have been three inquiries – one lasting six months – Blair wants to point out that the intelligence the British Government had was accurate and true. The public should therefore believe him and “accept the message on the basis of leadership alone” (Jowett and O’Donnell 1999 p. 291).

Bollinger (1980) makes an interesting remark regarding truth. He describes the difficulty of knowing whether a statement is true or not, as follows (p. 106):

Ultimately, intentions are the arbiter of truth in the broad sense, in reporting as well as promising. Only the person who makes the statement knows whether he is speaking truly or not. There may be external evidence of the ACCURACY of the statement, and this is called 'objective truth', but the fact that the statement does not conform to the evidence does not make it a lie – the speaker may be honestly mistaken.

3.4.3 *Group norm*

When analysing the role of propaganda concerning group norms, it is important to look for conforming tendencies (Jowett and O'Donnell 1999 p. 293). Group norms can be beliefs, values and behaviours derived from membership in groups (p. 293).

Tony Blair refers to group norms in his speech indirectly by mentioning persons and beliefs that are not at all supported by him. These persons, according to Blair, do not believe that going to war in Iraq was the right decision to make, or that the terror threat facing the UK is that serious. By mentioning these people and what they stand for, Blair wants the audience to support his norms and values instead. One example of who Blair calls his opponents can be seen in the following passage (p. 5:1): “only the utterly naïve would believe” [people who think that the weapon inspectors should have stayed and finished their job]. Another example is about the terror threat (p. 5:21): “Yet it is monstrously premature to think the threat has passed”. By calling those who believe that the invasion in Iraq was wrong “utterly naïve” and “monstrously premature”, Blair clearly shows what he think of them. At the same time Blair states that “I have never disrespected those who disagreed with the decision” (p. 2:7).

In his speech Blair also emphasises what he believes is important to have in mind, when discussing the terror threat, with a clear address to his opponents and for

the public to consider: “Here is where I feel so passionately that we are in mortal danger of mistaking the nature of the new world in which we live” (p. 2:30-31).

Tony Blair also states what he believes are British society’s norms, values and behaviours. He claims that it is “our duty to rebuild Iraq and Afghanistan” (p. 6:7). In another passage he claims that “The best defence of our security lies in the spread of our values” (p. 6:18). A third example of that Blair mentions group norms is “The essence of a community is common rights and responsibilities. We have obligations in relation to each other” (p. 6:21). Finally, at the end of his speech, Tony Blair appeals to the public to support him and his norms (p.7:15): “In the end, believe your political leaders or not, as you will. But do so, at least having understood their minds”.

3.4.4 *Language usage*

The use of language in a political speech is very important in many aspects. Without choosing the right words it is difficult to make the speech efficient. By using certain words it is possible to emphasise what the speaker wants to say. The message has to be well formulated in order to be well received by the audience. In the previous sections of *Special Techniques to Maximise Effect*, the language used by Tony Blair in his speech has already been analysed from different angles. Another way of analysing the language in a political speech is to look at pronouns. Jones and Wareing (1999) claim that this can be quite revealing (p. 45):

The way a political speaker refers to themselves and to their audience can also be very significant. The pronouns applied to the speaker, to their allegiances and to the audience can be used to foreground or hide agency [...] and responsibility, depending on what the politician is talking about.

In the first passages of his speech Tony Blair uses the pronoun *I*: “No decision *I* have made (p. 1:1), “*I* know a large part” (p. 1:2), “*I* share that view” (p. 1:4). This choice of pronoun makes the beginning of the speech personal and puts the decisions Tony Blair has made in focus. It also makes Blair look resolute and determined as a prime minister. As mentioned earlier the main purpose of the speech is to defend the decision to go to war in Iraq. By using *I* at the beginning Blair appears to be a responsible leader defending his decision. A statement in the speech that supports this is when Blair refers to himself in third person (p. 4: 34-35): “Prime ministers don’t have the luxury of maintaining both sides of the argument [...] leadership is about deciding”.

An interesting passage is when Blair uses both *I* and *we*: “*I* share that view, and *we* are” (p. 1:4). Here *we* refers to the government. In the following passages *we* is used: “It is said *we* claimed Iraq” (p. 1:24), “Had *we* believed” (p. 1:35). *I* seems to be used when Tony Blair defends his decisions or when he talks about his judgement: “And *my* judgement then and now” (p. 5:10). *We* is used when the whole government is involved: “So was *our* duty” (p. 4:21), “*we* acted in Sierra Leone” (p. 3:8) and “Do *we* want to take that risk” (p. 5:10). *We* is also used when Blair refers to the public: “We have obligations” (p. 6:21), “*We* value the freedom” (p. 6:23). It is interesting that Tony Blair’s opponents are referred to as “the utterly naïve” (p. 5:1), “monstrously premature” (p. 5:21) and *they*, as in “when *they* talk, as *they* do now” (p. 5:15). This choice of pronouns creates a distance between Blair and the people opposing him.

Finally, *they* is also used when Blair mentions the terrorists, along with other pronouns as well: “we know, that *they*” (p. 3:33), “religious fanatics” (p.3:30), “Islamic extremists” (p. 4:11). The only person Blair mentions by name is Saddam Hussein. For the most part only his first name, Saddam, is used, not Mr Hussein or

Saddam Hussein: “the threat *Saddam* posed” (p. 2:37), “the horrible injustice done to its people by *Saddam*” (p. 3:13), “Saddam alone had used CW” (p. 4:27). The use of the first name in this context might imply that the role of Saddam Hussein as a dictator and political leader has diminished and that Tony Blair’s respect for Saddam Hussein is not that great. No other political leader is named by his or her first name in Tony Blair’s speech.

4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The political background to the decision by the USA, the UK and some other allies to go to war in Iraq is a complex matter and is something that is not easily described in a few words. One event has led to another and the conflict in the Middle East is not easily solved. There are many different thoughts and opinions about the causes of the conflicts and how to react to the global threat that many politicians claim exist, involving terrorism and the possession of weapons of mass destruction. There are also different opinions about the legality of invading Iraq, as mentioned in this essay.

The role of propaganda has been studied closely. It has been suggested that propaganda is something that not only existed in the past, but also can be noticed today, in modern, western countries and in political speeches of today. The difference between propaganda and persuasion is not so easy to point out. Jowett and O’Donnell claim that propaganda and persuasion are closely related to each other and that they are not so easy to separate. Propaganda, though, is more of one way communication compared to persuasion; the latter being more interactive.

The aim of this essay was to analyse the language in Tony Blair’s political speech, dated 5 March 2004, in order to identify different elements of propaganda and

to show how expressions and choices of words are used for special meanings. The method chosen for analysing Tony Blair's speech in the context of propaganda was part of a ten step plan of propaganda analysis, described by Jowett and O'Donnell (1999). Following a set plan in the analysis increased the possibility of making the work replicable in order to avoid a free interpretation of the speech. As mentioned in the method section it is almost impossible to avoid interpretation when analysing a text. As a matter of fact interpretation is what it is all about. It could be argued that there are other methods as well for analysing a political speech. The four divisions chosen only show some aspects of propaganda; there is much more to analyse. But there had to be a limitation in the analysis as such, in order not to make the essay too extensive.

Focusing on Tony Blair's speech it was interesting to notice that there are indeed some examples of propaganda techniques used in the text. The ideology and purpose of the speech could be seen in some passages, where he emphasises the importance of continuing the war against terror. This essay showed that isolated words like *freedom*, used by Blair in his speech, may seem straightforward and natural, but at a closer look only reflect what the speaker means by the word, in this case *freedom* as Tony Blair sees it.

This essay also showed that the words chosen for describing the purpose of the speech, the threat facing the UK and for creating resonance are quite deliberate and powerful. Some examples of this, mentioned in the analysis, were words like *Armageddon* (for describing the gravity of the terror threat), *revelation* (for showing Blair's strong belief that the war against terror is necessary), *utterly naïve* and *monstrously premature* (for discrediting opponents). Expressions used by Blair to create resonance were also put forward in the analysis of propaganda techniques.

The final section of the analysis, *language usage*, showed that the use of pronouns may help the propagandist to emphasise certain values and can also be quite significant.

Blair in his speech used *I* when referring to himself as a responsible leader and defending the Iraq war. *We* was used both as a reference to the government and to the British public. When referring to his opponents Blair, along with the words mentioned above, used *they* and *them*. These pronouns were also used when mentioning terrorists. An interesting observation made in the analysis of which pronouns Blair used was that Saddam Hussein was only named by his first name, not his whole name. An interpretation of the reason for Blair's choice was that Blair, by only using Saddam Hussein's first name, implied that the role of the former dictator has now diminished and that Tony Blair's respect for the man is quite low.

Analysing a political speech can be done in many different ways. Focusing on different propaganda techniques is only one way of studying a text closer. Another way of studying a political speech would be to look at it from a rhetorical point of view; how a politician uses different rhetoric techniques to make the speech convincing and successful. But the important thing is that, by following a set plan as the one presented by Jowett and O'Donnell (1999) for analysing propaganda, this essay could be limited and not too extensive. This also increased the possibility of making the analysis replicable.

One conclusion that can be drawn from the close study of Tony Blair's political speech is that there are indeed elements of propaganda involved, as described by Jowett and O'Donnell. These examples of propaganda are used by Tony Blair in various ways. If it is intentional or not is hard to say. Most probably, though, Britain's Prime Minister is fully aware of how different expressions and choices of words might

affect an audience or not. Another conclusion drawn is that it is difficult to separate propaganda from persuasion – they are closely linked together.

The word *propaganda* is a loaded word that brings back to us the rhetoric of the Cold War and World War II. But propaganda is also something else and is used today too in various fields, in politics as well as in other areas. Therefore this essay has shown that propaganda can exist even today in a modern, political speech made by Prime Minister Tony Blair, and that the dramatic, loaded meaning many people associate with propaganda also might be something less dramatic.

REFERENCES

Books

- Bolinger, Dwight. 1980. *Language, The Loaded Weapon. The Use and Abuse of Language Today*. Longman Group Limited. Edinburgh Gate, England.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1989. *Language and Power*. Longman Group Limited. Burnt Mill, England
- Jones, Jason and Wareing, Shân. 1999. Language and Politics. In Thomas, Linda and Wareing, Shân (eds.). *Language, Society and Power*. Routledge. London (p 45).
- Jowett, Garth and O'Donnell, Victoria. 1999. *Propaganda and Persuasion*. Sage Publications Inc. Thousand Oaks, California.
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. 1995. Longman Group Ltd. Barcelona.
- May, Jacob. 1985. *Whose Language: A Study in Linguistic Pragmatics*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam.
- Trask, R.L. 1995. *Language: The Basics*. Routledge. London.

The Internet

Blair, Tony. 2004. Story from BBC NEWS:

http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/uk_politics/3536131.stm

Mardell, Mark. 2004. Story from BBC NEWS:

http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/uk_politics/3524440.stm