

ARGUMENTATIVE STRATEGIES AND TACTICS IN PRESIDENT B. OBAMA'S DISCOURSE

Y. V. Simakova

Ryazan Secondary Comprehensive School 51 "Centre of Education"

Communication is based on information, knowledge, views and values exchange. Because of different personal experience the ways we perceive the reality are different. That explains the frequency of conflicts between the values of interlocutors, the so called **cognitive dissonance** that is "a situation involving conflicting attitudes, beliefs or behaviors that produces a feeling of discomfort leading to an alteration in one of the attitudes, beliefs or behaviors to reduce the discomfort and restore balance etc" (Фестингер, 1999). The cognitive dissonance makes the partners incline each other to their standpoints. So we consider the cognitive dissonance as the momentum of argumentation.

Argumentation is recipient oriented and restricted by certain laws intellectual and speech activity aimed at bringing the recipient's value paradigm to conformity with that of the speaker.

Knowledge of argumentation, its laws, rules, strategies and tactics is especially required when the skills of upholding one's opinion, arguing one's views and proving one's thesis become a guarantee of effective professional communication. Thus argumentative skills can be considered as a part of discursive competence.

Everything stated above allow us to regard argumentation as a particular discursive strategy (ред. Манаенко, 2009) or "a peculiar discourse form characterized by the usage of linguistic devices aimed at elimination of conflict" (Фестингер, 1999). A communicative situation driven by the cognitive dissonance creates certain communicative space for the development of argumentation that is **argumentative or persuasive discourse**. Analyzing an argumentative situation one should pay special attention to extralinguistic factors that determine positions of the interlocutors.

Speech activity aimed at alteration of the interlocutor's values is a strategic process as specific audience determines the speaker's choice of linguistic devices that would be efficient in a particular situation. In this connection we are to consider the notion of **argumentative strategies and tactics**, the purpose of which is "providing rational reasons of a viewpoint by means of actualization of meanings that are valid for society and relevant for an individual" (Петрухина, 2009). This notion is derivative from communicative strategies and tactics.

Communicative strategy includes "planning and realization one's speech operations in order to achieve the communicative goal". Whereas **communicative tactics** is "an action or a series of actions that help to fulfill the strategy" (Иссерс, 2006).

Having analyzed the research works by A.N. Baranov, O.P. Petruhina, A.Y. Mordovin, N.A. Oschepkova, we came to the conclusion that the types of communicative strategies and tactics are not completely elaborated in modern linguistics. So we are going to illustrate the usage of argumentative strategies and tactics described by the authors with the examples from President Barack Obama's speeches delivered in 2012 and aimed at convincing the citizens in the correctness of his policy and holding political power during the election campaign. We have tried to find out how these argumentative strategies and tactics help to achieve the goal of the argumentative discourse.

The strategy of rational argumentation (logical) is directed to the recipient's mind. Rational arguments are based on factual information: statistics data, results of research, references to laws, decrees, quotations, all these appeal to the truth. **The strategy of emotional argumentation (irrational, psychological, rhetoric)** aims at the recipient's feelings. Both rational and emotional influence can be fulfilled by means of certain tactics that we are going to analyze in the article. (Among others strategies that B. Obama resort to are deductive and inductive argumentation, two-sided argumentation, multiple argumentation, argumentative manipulation, retrogressive presentation of the viewpoint).

Rational Argumentation Tactics

1. Providing an example tactics is used for the visual demonstration of the verity of the thesis, it inclines the recipient to the necessary generalizations. It is also called **verification** that emphasizes the task of this tactics that is to consolidate the recipient's confidence.

2. Paradoxical thesis argumentation is (Петрухина, 2009) based on the opinion opposite to the common one.

3. Appeal tactics (Ощепкова, 2004) often fulfills the rational argumentation strategy, but can influence one's emotions as well: *Meanwhile, companies that choose to stay in America get hit with one of the highest tax rates in the world. It makes no sense, and everyone knows it. So let's change it* (Barack Obama, State of the Union Address, January 24, 2012).

4. Distancing from undesirable starting points (Мордовин, 2004) helps to create a positive image of the speaker: *Folks at the top saw their incomes rise like never before, but most hard-working Americans struggled with costs that were growing, paychecks that weren't, and personal debt that kept piling up. It was wrong. It was irresponsible* (Barack Obama, State of the Union Address, January 24, 2012). This example helps the politician to create an image of successful man striving for positive changes.

Emotional Argumentation Tactics

1. Appeal to values or axiologeme (Петрухина, 2009) is a very powerful means of persuasion, especially in political discourse as recipients share common values: *Producing more oil and gas here at home has been, and will continue to be, a critical part of an all-of-the-above energy strategy. ... So to be extra careful that the construction of the pipeline wouldn't put the health*

and the safety of the American people at risk, our experts said that we needed a certain amount of time to review the project. (President Obama's Cushing speech March 22, 2012)

2. Appeal to the recipient (Баранов, 1990) gives an impression that the speaker is not indifferent to the audience: *Students from all over the country who are making their voices heard and engaging deeply in our democratic debate. You carry with you an extraordinary legacy of more than six decades of friendship between the United States and Israel. And you have the opportunity - and the responsibility - to make your own mark on the world* (Barack Obama, AIPAC speech, March 4, 2012). In this case the President appeals to students emphasizing their significance and thus trying to make them more socially active.

3. Identification of the speaker **with** some **authority**, their agreement with one's standpoint is considered to be one of the most efficient means of emotional influence: *What America has always been about is building the future. We're always ahead of the curve. Whether it's Thomas Edison or the Wright Brothers or Steve Jobs, we're always thinking about what's the next thing.* (President Obama's Cushing speech March 22, 2012). Another kind of this tactics is **identification** of the speaker **with the audience** that is underscoring some fact common for all the participants of the discourse: *Your President knows that some of you are anxious about the unemployment numbers; let me assure you that I share your concerns, and I have been busy enacting simple solutions* (Barack Obama, Weekly Address To The White House, May 5, 2012).

4. Promise tactics is aimed at establishing trust between the speaker and the listener: *As long as I'm president, I will work with anyone in this chamber to build on this momentum. But I intend to fight obstruction with action, and I will oppose any effort to return to the very same policies that brought on this economic crisis in the first place. ... Our workers are the most productive on Earth, and if the playing field is level, I promise you: America will always win* (Barack Obama, State of the Union Address, January 24, 2012). Barack Obama resorts to promise tactics quite often that is associated with his personal responsibility for the political course in listeners' minds.

5. Concealed threat and accusation of the opponent is typical of political in particular election discourse (Ощепкова, 2004): *Why is it that Mitt Romney refuses to join the rest of his fellow Americans in commemorating the first year anniversary? Does he think that killing Osama bin Laden wasn't the right thing to do, or that it wasn't "gutsy"? Why all this sympathy for a terrorist? ... He's weird* (Obama Address Cold Open, May 6, 2012). On the one hand, this tactics displays the speaker's power and courage, but on the other hand it can evoke negative emotions and antagonize the listener, so it is not to be abused.

6. Self-presentation tactics (Петрухина, 2009) is used to create a necessary image of the speaker in the opinion of the audience: *You know that your President is above all, a pragmatist. And I think we can do both: not focus*

on the war, and fix the nation so it works for the returning soldiers and other Americans (President Barack Obama Weekly Address To The White House May 5, 2012).

7. **Emphasized sincerity tactics** helps the speaker to win trust of the audience and intensifies psychological influence on the recipient: *My grandfather, a veteran of Patton's Army, got the chance to go to college on the G.I. Bill. My grandmother, who worked on a bomber assembly line, was part of a workforce that turned out the best products on Earth* (Barack Obama, State of the Union Address, January 24, 2012). *I've already promised Michelle and the girls, for the Tenth Anniversary, I'm taking them to Orlando* (Obama Address Cold Open, May 6, 2012).

It goes without saying that the choice of arguments, argumentative strategies and tactics depends on the particular features of the recipient and the aim of the discourse. The ways of argumentation mentioned above are very often combined with each other in order to intensify the persuasive effect.

To sum it up, argumentation should be considered as a particular discursive strategy and **argumentative discourse** as a peculiar type of discourse. As speech activity aimed at alteration of the interlocutor's values is a strategic process we have made an effort to single out major types of **argumentative strategies and tactics**. Having analyzed the US President's discourse, we can see that the range of argumentative strategies and tactics used is rather wide, and **emotional argumentation strategy** realized in the series of tactics is of great importance.

REFERENCES:

Иссерс О.С. Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики русской речи. Изд. 4-е, стереотипное. М.: КомКнига, 2006. 288 с.

Фестингер Л. Теория когнитивного диссонанса Текст. / Л. Фестингер. СПб.: Ювента, 1999. 317 с.

Баранов А.Н. Аргументация как языковой и когнитивный феномен // Речевое воздействие в сфере массовой коммуникации. М.: Наука, 1990. С. 40-52.

Язык. Текст. Дискурс: Научный альманах Ставропольского отделения РАЛК / Под ред. проф. Г.Н. Манаенко. Выпуск 7. Ставрополь: Изд-во СГПИ, 2009. 448 с.

Мордовин А.Ю. Аргументативные стратегии языковой личности североамериканского политика: Автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. Иркутск, 2004. 19 с.

Ощепкова Н.А. Стратегии и тактики в аргументативном дискурсе: Автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. Калуга, 2004. 24 с.

Петрухина О.П. Аргументативные стратегии британского политика: Автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. Абакан, 2009. 18 с.