

VILNIUS UNIVERSITY

Vilma Linkevičiūtė

CONFLICT COMMUNICATION DISCOURSE OF POLITICAL LEADERS
OF LITHUANIA AND GREAT BRITAIN (1998–2008): RHETORICAL-
COGNITIVE PECULIARITIES

Doctoral Dissertation
Humanities, Philology (04 H)

Vilnius, 2011

The research was carried out from 2006–2010 at Vilnius University, Kaunas Faculty of Humanities.

Research supervisor:

Prof. Habil. Dr. Eleonora Lassan (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04H).

Research consultant:

Dr. Jurga Cibulskienė (Vilnius Pedagogical University, Humanities, Philology – 04H).

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	4
I. METHODOLOGY AND METHODS OF RESEARCH.....	9
1.1. What is Discourse?.....	9
1.2. Political Discourse.....	14
1.3. Conflict Communication.....	19
1.4. Importance of Ideology.....	24
1.5. Language in Political Discourse.....	29
1.5.1. Usage of Nominations.....	34
1.5.2. Conceptual Metaphors	42
1.6. Review of Political History and the Political Situation in Great Britain, 1998 – 2008	47
1.7. Review of Political History and the Political Situation in Lithuania, 1998–2008	52
II. CONFLICT COMMUNICATION DISCOURSE OF THE POLITICAL LEADERS OF GREAT BRITAIN	56
2.1. Oppositions and their Member Nominations in the Political Discourse of Tony Blair	57
2.2. Conceptual Metaphors in Blair’s Discourse	90
2.3. Oppositions and their Member Nominations in the Political Discourse of Gordon Brown	97
2.4. Conceptual Metaphors in Brown’s Discourse	121
III. CONFLICT COMMUNICATION DISCOURSE OF THE POLITICAL LEADERS OF LITHUANIA	128
3.1. Oppositions and their Member Nominations in the Political Discourse of Rolandas Paksas	129
3.2. Conceptual Metaphors in the Discourse of Paksas	145
3.3. Oppositions and their Member Nominations in the Political Discourse of Artūras Paulauskas	155
3.4. Conceptual Metaphors in the Discourse of Paulauskas.....	160
3.5. Oppositions and their Member Nominations in the Political Discourse of Valdas Adamkus	163
3.6. Conceptual Metaphors in the Discourse of Adamkus	197
CONCLUSIONS.....	209
LIST OF REFERENCES	212
SOURCES	217

INTRODUCTION

In modern democratic societies, political life is embodied through the actions of political parties, their duly elected leaders, and various political ideologies. In this context, political discourse, which records a variety of opinions and, frequently, their conflict, becomes an inseparable element of political culture.

Political discourse is an object of discourse analysis, which studies political language with special consideration of its contextual factors; political linguistics is treated as a new, institutionalized subject of cognitive linguistics. Conflict communication in political discourse may be perceived as the main research object of political linguistics, because the attack and winning of governmental positions occur in the context of the conflict of various political forces. That conflict is expressed through discourse.

The object of the research. The object of this research is the linguistic means of political conflict communication that are characteristic of the political discourse of the political leaders of Great Britain and Lithuania (1998–2008). Conflict communication has become a research object of modern conflictology, which has mainly focused on interpersonal conflict and effective methods of managing conflict solution. Political conflict communication, which is generally analysed on the basis of parliamentary debates, does not have a precise definition. Conflict communication can be defined as verbalizing conflict situations, which are conditioned by variances with set objectives or their means of implementation, and by discrepancies between the interests and wishes of the sides involved in the conflict. In political communication it is possible to talk about the fact that an initial situation of verbal and non-verbal actions can become a source of conflict, while disapproval of such a situation is verbalized in political communication. Any individual who wants to influence political events becomes the subject of such communication.

The relevance of the research. Research into political discourse is an accelerating trend of modern linguistics that includes the findings of different branches of the humanities such as logic, philosophy, political psychology, sociology, etc. A conflict communication analysis of two countries with differing histories of democratic traditions enables the audience to form an opinion about their political culture, which is primarily a communication culture. Political communication in this study is perceived as a form of political existence. Doris A. Graber in the article “Political Communication Faces the 21st Century” states that the field of political communication “encompasses the construction, sending, receiving, and processing of messages that potentially have a significant direct or indirect impact on politics” (Graber 2005: 479). Degtiarev (2005) points out that there are two types of political communication – “horizontal” and “vertical.” The first type is defined as communication which takes part between comparatively close institutional components or social agents. This scholar presents communication between different elite groups as an example of “horizontal” communication. Degtiarev (2005) defines the “vertical” type of communication as relationships between different hierarchical levels of macropolitical structure. The requirements of different groups of the electorate concerning changes of social politics, as expressed through the declarations of political parties, may be presented as an example of this communication type.

Politics is also influenced by propaganda and political advertising, where conflict between different political powers is expressed in a covert form because one power is contrasted with another. It is possible to state that the speech of a head of state addressed to the partners who are on the horizontal axis includes features of political propaganda and political advertising. Political propaganda is a means which helps to persuade the listeners that some particular position or attitude of the politician is correct. Political advertising is regarded by many scholars as a part of political propaganda whose aim is to present certain political actions in a beneficial and positive light.

This dissertation discloses the fact that linguistic means are closely related to the ideology of the speaker and linguistic practices are conditioned by culture. Furthermore, it analyses one of the main forms of political culture – conflict communication, which is only possible in democratic countries. The analysis of such forms enables the comparison of political cultures existing in different countries, and it reveals how the subjects of public conflict communication may influence the electorate’s consciousness. This research is particularly relevant because it investigates aspects of political life in Great Britain and Lithuania and discloses the state of their political cultures.

The aim of the research. The aim of this research is to analyze how conflict communication manifests itself in two countries with different political traditions and histories, i.e., Lithuania and the UK. Moreover, the research discloses the differences arising between the two countries, and thus investigates the lingua-pragmatic means prevailing in conflict communication, which is expressed in the political discourse of the mentioned countries.

Objectives of the research. The following tasks have been set out in accordance with the main aim:

1. To identify and compare meaning fields significant for the communication of the British and Lithuanian political subjects.
2. To identify the linguistic means of the discourse of British and Lithuanian political leaders:
 - a) to define nominations as a rhetorical means of image formation;
 - b) to describe linguistic metaphors and to reconstruct the conceptual metaphors which determine the origin of these linguistic metaphors.
3. To identify the particularity of the political communication of British and Lithuanian political leaders as an expression of political conflict.

Methodology of the research. The main methodological conception may be defined as follows: communicative behaviour in conflict communication and a rhetorical form of argumentation depends on the

cognitive conceptions of the speaker – knowledge, intentions, feelings. This is the main concern of cognitive linguistics. Such cognitive linguistic concepts as conceptual metaphors, domain, meaning field and such linguistic means as nominations are analysed in this dissertation.

Looking from the narrow perspective of linguistic methodology, comparative analysis and descriptive-analytical methods are applied in the conflict communication discourse research of the political leaders of Lithuania and Great Britain (1998–2008).

This is a cross-disciplinary approach encompassing cognitive linguistics, political rhetoric, argumentation theory and political science.

The hypotheses. This dissertation addresses the following hypotheses:

1. Conflict communication discourse is based on the opposition *WE–THEY* which may be modified in relation to the extra-linguistic situation and the attitudes of the speaker into: *I–THEY, WE–HE*.

2. The conflict which is expressed in the conflict communication discourse has both an open and a hidden nature. Open conflict is based on the extra-linguistic situation and particular linguistic means – the explicit opposition *We (I)–THEY* and direct accusations of opponents. Hidden conflict does not have definite extra-linguistic features and it is expressed implicitly, through indirect reproaches and through the implicitly expressed opposition *I–THEY*.

3. The conflict which is expressed in the political discourse of Lithuania and Great Britain has both similarities and differences. Resemblance is determined by the general essence of conflict communication, i.e., the discrepancy between positions taken by political forces and interests. Differences are based on the peculiarities of the two political cultures. The British political culture has traditions of political fighting in the situation of democracy, while the Lithuanian political culture has just started to develop in the democratic situation.

4. Political competition in both Lithuania and Great Britain is based on the domain *change*.

5. The particularity of conflict communication discourse in Lithuania and in Great Britain is determined by the peculiarities of the extra-linguistic situation and by the politician as an individual.

6. The conflict communication discourse of political leaders enables the audience to form an opinion about their political willpower and political feelings.

Scientific novelty of the research. Political discourse has been widely analysed in Lithuania by such scholars as Lassan (1995, 2002), Cibulskienė (2005), Makarova (2008), and elsewhere by Chilton (2002), Connolly (1993), Hall (1992), Laclau (1985, 1996), Mouffe (1985), Schäffner (2002), Van Dijk (1995, 1997, 1998, 1999), etc. Conflict has been investigated by Gurdjan (2008), Lassan (1995), Lasswell (1936, 1948), Littlejohn (1999), Sillars (1982), Van Dijk (1995), etc. However, conflict communication in political discourse has not been investigated until now.

Significance of the research. This analysis will be relevant for linguists, political scientists, public relation specialists, politicians, and for every person who is interested in political topicalities, as it presents the particularity of conflict communication in different political cultures and helps to reveal the means which influence the addressee's consciousness. Moreover, this research shows that conflict communication is public discourse aimed not only at opponents but also at the electorate. Furthermore, this discourse helps to form a particular image of the antagonists.

Data of the research. The data are randomly selected speeches and interviews delivered in the period of 1998–2008 by British and Lithuanian political leaders. 11 speeches made by the former prime minister of Great Britain Tony Blair, 6 speeches made by the former prime minister of Great Britain Gordon Brown, 10 speeches made by the former president of Lithuania Rolandas Paksas, 5 speeches made by the former president of Lithuania Artūras Paulauskas, and 19 speeches made by the former president of Lithuania Valdas Adamkus have been investigated. The data has been taken from the official government and media internet sites (see Sources).

Structure of the research. The dissertation consists of the following parts: Introduction; a theoretical part which includes chapters on Discourse, Political Discourse, Conflict Communication, Ideology, Language of Political Discourse, Nominations, Conceptual Metaphors, and the Political Situation in Lithuania and Great Britain; an analytical part, including the following chapters: Oppositions and their Member Nominations in Blair's Discourse, Conceptual Metaphors in Blair's Discourse; Oppositions and their Member Nominations in Brown's Discourse, Conceptual Metaphors in Brown's Discourse; Oppositions and their Member Nominations in the Political Discourse of Rolandas Paksas, Conceptual Metaphors in the Discourse of Paksas; Oppositions and their Member Nominations the Political Discourse of Artūras Paulauskas, Conceptual Metaphors in the Discourse of Paulauskas; Oppositions and their Member Nominations the Political Discourse of Valdas Adamkus, Conceptual Metaphors in the Discourse of Adamkus. Conclusions, a List of References and Sources are presented at the end of the dissertation.

I. METHODOLOGY AND METHODS OF RESEARCH

1.1. WHAT IS DISCOURSE?

There are numerous definitions of discourse, therefore it is impossible to present one unanimous definition. Chudinov (2001) points out that the term *discourse* is the most important term in cognitive linguistics which does not have single definition. As a result, various scholars introduce their own descriptions of this concept. For this reason, the fundamental definitions of discourse will be introduced in this dissertation.

According to the Merriam-Webster Dictionary, discourse is a multidimensional term which includes such definitions as “verbal interchange of ideas; formal and orderly and usually extended expression of thought on a subject; connected speech or writing; a linguistic unit (as a conversation or a story) larger than a sentence; a mode of organizing knowledge, ideas, or

experience that is rooted in language and its concrete contexts (as history or institutions)” (<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/DISCOURSE>).

According to the French semiotician and linguist Emile Benveniste (1979), “discourse is language in so far as it can be interpreted with reference to the speaker, to his or her spatio-temporal location, or to other such variables that serve to specify the localized context of utterance” (Benveniste, cited in Honderick 2005: 217).

Discourse is a popular object of various branches of science, including literature theory, semiotics and philosophy. The French social philosopher Michel Foucault (1972) supposed that it is impossible to exist within the boundaries of discourse; Hall (1992) points out that when an individual orientates himself/herself in some particular type of discourse, he/she must acknowledge himself/herself as the discourse subject. Riabova’s ideas (2008) supplement Hall’s (1992) words with the conclusion that social groups, political parties and individuals may be considered as such subjects, expressing power. She also points out that “truth regime makes discourse similarly truthful with the help of sanctions or by inducing those, who have high social status or legitimation to become the subjects of discourse” (Рябова 2008: 18).

According to one of the leading discourse analysts, Joseph Grimes, “linguists might feel ‘like the Dutch boy with his finger in the dike’, fearfully imagining ‘the whole sea out there’ – business letters, conversations, restaurant menus, novels, laws, movie scripts, editorials, without end” (Grimes 1975: 2). Widdowson ironically points out that “discourse is something everybody is talking about but without knowing with any certainty just what it is: in vogue and vague” (Widdowson 1995: 158).

The compilers of the encyclopedia *Krugosvet* (www.krugosvet.ru) state that there may be distinguished three types of discourse usage, associated with particular authors and different national traditions. The first type introduces the linguistic usage of the term, which was first used by the American linguist Harris in 1952, in the title of the article “Discourse Analysis.” This scholar defined discourse analysis as providing information on

the text structure or type and the role of each element in that structure. In linguistics this term was finally established only after two decades. The compilers of the encyclopedia ascribe the definition of discourse, which has extended far beyond the boundaries of science and become popular in publicity, to the second type of discourse usage. This type is derived from the ideas of the French structuralists and post-structuralists Foucault, Derrida, Greimas and Kristjeva. According to the French Discourse school, discourse may be defined as a combination of stylistic particularity and the ideology standing behind it. Riabova (2008) asserts that one of the most important features of discourse is its usage in the design of social meanings. This author bases her words on Foucault's ideas of the "power/truth regime," where power and truth are closely interrelated. Riabova (2008) also points out that power itself creates truth by imposing meanings, therefore discourse should be perceived as constraint. On the other hand, discourses, in some way, inform the representatives of power about the world and so influence them. Furthermore, the way of speaking mainly determines and creates the objective field of discourse and corresponding social institutes. The third type of usage of the term discourse is associated with the name of the German sociologist and philosopher Habermas. In this type, discourse is defined as a special, ideal type of communication, happening at a maximum distance from social reality, traditions, authorities, etc., and having the objective to critically survey and ground the actions and attitudes of the communication participants.

According to one of the most famous researchers in the field of discourse, the Dutch scientist Teun A. Van Dijk (1998), discourse in the broad meaning is a communicative act, which takes place between the speaker and the listener in a particular temporal, spatial, etc., context. Such a communicative act may be verbal or written, and it can also have verbal and non-verbal features. In the narrow sense, discourse is defined as text or conversation.

The social conception of discourse is linked with the work of Foucault (1972), who describes discourses as systematically organized sets of statements that give expression to the meanings and values of an institution.

Fairclough (1992) defines discourse as language use conceived as social practice; for him discourse is formed on the basis of specific areas of experience and knowledge.

According to Kieran O'Halloran, the term "discourse" refers to two different phenomena: "discourse (1) refers to the coherent understanding the reader makes from a text. It can include how the values of the reader, the reading context and so on affect the reading of the text in the production of coherence. 'Foucauldian discourse', or discourse (2), refers instead to the way in which knowledge is organized, talked about and acted upon in different institutions" (O'Halloran 2003: 12).

In today's postmodern society, the definition of discourse introduced by Laclau and Mouffe (1985) is very significant. They claim that knowledge helps discourse to form the social world. Language is inconstant, and as a result, meaning is also inconstant. Rusakova claims that Laclau and Mouffe treat discourse "as an attribute of any social activity and any social institutionalization" (Русакова 2006: 15). The conception of discourse presented by these scholars is very closely related to political discourse, and will therefore be discussed in detail in the chapter "Political Discourse."

The concept of discourse has been comprehensively investigated not only by Western scholars but by Russian scientists as well. Chudinov (2001) presents discourse as a concept which goes beyond the limits of the text. It includes the social context of communication, and characterizes participants and processes with regard to background knowledge.

Karaulov and Petrov (1989) draw the conclusion that "discourse is a complex communicative phenomenon which includes not only text but extralinguistic factors (knowledge about the world, opinions, orientations and goals of the addressee), which are important for comprehension of the text, as well" (Караулов, Петров 1989: 8).

Moreover, Rusakova (2006), in an article on modern discourse theories, presents a classification of discourse theories associated with particular scholars – Teun. A. Van Dijk, Jacob Torfing, Marianne Jorgensen, and Louise Phillips, as well as their scientific theories.

Discourse analysis emerged from a variety of disciplines: sociolinguistics, anthropology, sociology, and social psychology. Thus, discourse analysis takes different theoretical perspectives and analytic approaches. It is very important to mention that discourse is bound to a particular reading context and to a particular sociocultural context.

As mentioned above, discourse is closely related to communication and context. Poškienė (2007: 14) points out that discourse is also related to the applicant and addressee, their context or situation. As she maintains, “discourse conveys and creates social and institutional values or ideologies (discourses of politics, mass media, norms and regulations). Frequently, discourse is defined as a text or it is emphasized that text is included into discourse” (Poškienė 2007: 14).

Discourse analysis is very significant because it helps to analyse the non-explicated aims of the discourse subject. Because discourse provides an opportunity for him/her to manipulate the consciousness of the addressee, Lassan (1995) arrives at the conclusion, based on the ideas of Fillmore, that every scholar must answer two questions while investigating discourse:

- 1) Why did the speaker say this particular thing? This is communication context analysis and analysis of the speaker’s consciousness structure (the speaker speaks like this because he/she has some particular knowledge concerning reality).
- 2) Why did he/she say it in this particular way? This is a rhetoric pragmatic analysis, which helps to reveal both the aim and effect intended by the speaker, and how to achieve these aims with the help of some particular rhetorical means and information about the addressee.

Despite the versatility and complexity of the definition of discourse, the humanities still direct attention towards discourse analysis, especially towards the description of political discourse.

1.2.POLITICAL DISCOURSE

“Discourse and politics can be related in essentially two ways: (a) at a socio-political level of description, political processes and structures are constituted by situated events, interactions and discourses of political actors in political contexts, and (b) at a socio-cognitive level of description, shared political representations are related to individual representations of these discourses, interactions and contexts” (van Dijk 2002: 204–205).

Lassan (1995) approaches discourse as an ideologized phenomenon, which is based on binary oppositions where one member of the opposition is perceived as positive and legitimate and the other member as negative. The aim of political discourse is to consolidate the content of the positive member as the society’s value landmark, while denying that the content of the other member of the opposition could be feasible in social life.

There are various genres of discourse (e.g., academic, institutional, scientific) which are defined as professional discourses. They may also be divided into medical, legal discourses, etc. Discourse genres can be related to the discourse subjects presented by Rusakova (2006) in the discourse analysis theory. Such subjects supplement and concretize the conception of political discourse that is being analysed in this chapter. Moreover, they also define the object of political discourse. Rusakova (2006) distinguishes 10 such subjects:

“1. *Discourses of everyday communication* (daily conversations, friendly chats, rumours, domestic conflicts, etc.);

2. *Institutional discourses* (administrative discourse, office discourse, bank discourse, pedagogical discourse, medical discourse, army discourse, church discourse, etc.);

3. *Public discourse* (discourses of civil initiatives and speeches, diplomatic discourse, discourse of public relations, etc.);
4. *Political discourse* (discourses of political ideologies, discourses of political institutes, discourses of political moves, etc.);
5. *Media discourses* (TV discourse, cinema discourse, advertising discourse, etc.);
6. *Art discourses* (literature discourse, music discourse, fine art discourse, model discourse, etc.);
7. *Discourse of professional communication* (negotiation discourse, business communication discourse, etc.);
8. *Marketing discourses* (advertising discourse, sale discourse, consumer discourse, service discourse, etc.);
9. *Academic discourses* (discourses of scientific societies, discourses of scientific and humanitarian subjects, etc.);
10. *Cultural-world-view discourses* (discourses of cultural periods, discourses of different philosophical and religious tendencies, etc.)” (Pycakova 2006: 27).

It is obvious that discourse is initially classified according to the field of communication (academic, media, etc.) and according to the subject discussed in the discourse. Therefore, considering such a classification, political discourse can be defined as belonging to politicians and related to their actions and political social life.

William E. Connolly in his book *The Terms of Political Discourse* points out that “by the terms of political discourse, then, I refer first to the vocabulary commonly employed in political thought and action; second, to the ways in which the meanings conventionally embodied in that vocabulary set the frame for political reflection by establishing criteria to be met before an event or act can be said to fall within the ambit of a given concept; and third, to the judgments or commitments that are conventionally sanctioned when these criteria are met” (Connolly 1993: 2).

Van Dijk in “Structures of Discourse, Structures of Power” (1989) investigates the concept of power discourse which is one of the most important elements of political discourse. He presents five dimensions of power:

1. Major power institutions, which Van Dijk associates with government, parliament, political parties, the media and even churches.

2. The hierarchy of position, status and rank within such institutions.

3. Group power relations. Van Dijk presents such relations as existing between the rich and the poor, adults and children, believers and nonbelievers, the healthy and the sick. This scholar concludes that such relations may be defined as *we* and *they*.

4. “Domain of action or scope and type of influence” (1989: 29). This dimension presents the influence of institutions on society and its members.

5. Social control, which may be associated with the control of power.

It is very important to understand that the discourse belonging to the institutions of the first power level is the most influential in society. It influences the principles of state organization, society’s ideology and morals, etc. The power discourse that is analysed in this dissertation may be attributed to the first level suggested by Van Dijk.

Van Dijk has made numerous investigations regarding political discourse. His article “Political Discourse and Political Cognition” (2002: 206–207) introduces the idea that political cognition is very important in the study of political discourse:

Typical topics of political cognition research are: the organization of political beliefs; the perception of political candidates; political judgement and decision making; stereotypes, prejudices and other sociopolitical attitudes; political group identity; public opinion; impression formation; and many other topics that deal with memory representations and the mental processes involved in political understanding and interaction (ibid: 206–207).

Khmelcov (2004) bases his ideas on Van Dijk’s contextual theory and states that context should be defined not in terms of the social situation where discourse takes place, but rather as a mental representation of its participants

(mental model). Khmelcov (2004) points out that every mental model is unique because it is based on personal attitudes and experience. This scholar gives an example where a member of parliament, when discussing ethnic conflict, refers to the personal interpretation of this conflict that exists in his mental model. Mental models are formed with the help of situation analysis experience. Therefore, the analysis of political speeches must also analyse speakers' mental models, including their knowledge about certain phenomena, their stereotypes and values, etc.

Van Dijk (2002) concludes that context models are also very important in analyzing political discourse genres. Political discourse genres are similar to other discourse genres, although "specific are the elements of the context of political text and talk, viz., the overall domain and definition of the situation, the setting, circumstances, participant roles, aims, opinions and emotions" (van Dijk 2002: 216). This scholar also points out that "political discourse genres are essentially defined by their functions in the political process, as represented by the categories of the political context model" (ibid: 216). Context includes numerous categories of communicative situations:

- overall domain (e.g., politics);
 - overall societal action (legislation);
 - current setting (time, location);
 - current circumstances (e.g., the bill to be discussed);
 - current interaction (political debate);
 - current discourse genre (speech);
 - the various types of role of participants (speaker, MP, member of the Conservative Party, white, male, elderly, etc.);
 - the cognitions of the participants (goals, knowledge, beliefs, etc.)
- (ibid: 225).

According to Van Dijk, political discourse is a contextual concept which is defined by "who speaks to whom, as what, on what occasion and with what goals" (ibid 2002: 225) and having parallels with Lasswell's statement

that “politics is who gets what, when, and how” (which became the title of his 1936 book).

Van Dijk (2002) introduces a model of political discourse structures which supplements the notion of discourse. This model includes topics, schemata, local semantics, style and rhetoric. Topics include the information which is essential in political discourse. Schemata are the schematic models of discourse which cannot be variable as they are limited by the context. In this case Van Dijk uses an example related to opposing British parties: “thus, a parliamentary speech has the same constituent categories whether engaged in by a Conservative or Labour MP” (van Dijk 2002: 229). Local semantics includes local meanings that exist in text, talk and context models which are shared by social groups. Style and rhetoric, according to T. van Dijk, are the tools which help to emphasize or de-emphasize meaning. They are like a weapon which helps to achieve the intended goals of political leaders.

Laclau and Mouffe’s conception of political discourse has become very popular in modern cognitive linguistics. Rusakova (2006) assumes that politics for these scholars is a method of social world formation, reconstruction and reorganization. Laclau and Mouffe (1985) state that their theory is based on political articulation and that they treat hegemony as the central category of political analysis. They define hegemony as the competition of discourses for a dominant interpretation of political form.

Jorgensen and Phillips (2004) arrive at the conclusion that in hegemony theory, the conceptions of “class”, “social group” and “nation” are regarded as the product of discursive hegemony. Laclau and Mouffe suppose that groups in society are always formed during a political discursive processes. The question of identity is also very important in political discourse. According to Jorgensen and Phillips (2004), a subject acquires identity through discursive practices. An individual may have different identities, which may also vary. When shared underlying identities emerge, people start to cluster into groups; on the basis of such groups, they ignore other identities and so eliminate them from political games. Therefore, the identities that are being

ignored become classified as *others*. This aspect is of crucial importance in conflict communication as analysed in this dissertation, where one side is defined as *we – insiders* and the other as *they – outsiders*.

The semiotician Landowski compares political discourse with advertising because “these discourses are related by similar type of persuasion” (Landowski 2007: 155). The nature of political discourse presented by this scholar may be related to the already presented *we – they* identity, as it is concluded that in elections, those politicians who introduce themselves as equal to the electorate and emphasize the “sensuous relationship,” are more successful than those who do not (ibid: 158).

In conclusion, it is possible to state that political discourse influences the life of every cell of society. This phenomenon is inseparable from politics and politics is inseparable from ideology. As already mentioned, political social life may be regarded as the object of political discourse. The combination of these phenomena is society’s ideology. It is seen every day on TV, in newspapers and daily conversations, making it impossible to avoid. The subject of political discourse not only explicitly or implicitly presents his/her ideology (the social groups a person belongs to, and where that person formed as an individual and as a political subject), but also “advertises” his/her attitude (because this subject wants to get votes from the electorate in order to stay in power or to change it).

In this study, the peculiarities of discourse are related to British and Lithuanian political contexts (1998–2008), the political culture and the social roles of political leaders and their opponents in these countries.

1.3. CONFLICT COMMUNICATION

The democratic system divides political power between a political majority and an opposition. Van Dijk (1995) suggests that from the ideological point of view there are *us* versus *them* dimensions, “in which speakers of one group will generally tend to present themselves or their own group in positive terms, and other groups in negative terms” (van Dijk 1995: 22). The political

majority is the political leader himself/herself and his/her colleagues from the same political party who won the majority of votes from the electorate. The political majority has the aim to motivate their right to be in power and, for this reason, they legitimate their actions. The opposition, on the contrary, carries out power control by watching the majority and expressing declarative protests, if necessary. Such a situation conditions disapproval of power actions and leads to the emergence of reasons for conflict communication.

Littlejohn (1999) introduces the following explicit definition of a conflict, which is based on the investigations made by Charles Watkins (1974):

1. Conflict requires at least two parties capable of invoking sanctions on each other.
2. Conflicts arise due to the existence of mutually unobtainable objectives.
3. Each party in a conflict has four possible types of action alternatives:
 - a. To obtain the mutually desired objective
 - b. To end the conflict
 - c. To invoke sanctions against the opponent
 - d. To communicate something to the opponent
4. Parties in conflict may have different value or perceptual systems.
5. Each party has resources that may be increased or diminished by implementation of action alternatives.
6. Conflict terminates only when each party is satisfied that he or she has “won” or “lost,” or believes that the probable costs of continuing the conflict outweigh the probable costs of ending the conflict (Littlejohn 1999: 275).

Lasswell (1948) pointed out that in conflict communication, “one ruling element is especially alert to the other, and relies upon communication as a means of preserving power” (Lasswell 1948: 222). This statement complements the idea that conflict communication is inevitable in political life, whenever there is a fight for power.

The reasons for conflict communication may be related to the explanation of ideology. Lassan (1995) points out that ideological discourse expresses conflict with a different value system. In other words, ideological discourse presents a cognitive conflict taking part between the supporters of

various political values, which may be expressed through value oppositions and then through conceptual metaphors. Text is a rhetorical development of metaphors. It is intended for both the opponent(s) and the public.

This approach coincides with Van Dijk’s conclusion that conflict discourse is ideological discourse which usually has “the social function of legitimating dominance or justifying concrete actions of power abuse by the elites” (van Dijk 1995: 23).

Researchers of conflict communication stress its cognitive nature and indicate reasons for such cognitive conflict. According to Gurdjan (2008), there are two reasons for the emergence of conflict: conflict can emerge inside a personality and be expressed by speech which may be specifically dedicated to a listener or not; and conflict can emerge as the result of the listener’s disapproval of the ideas uttered by the speaker. Gurdjan also arrives at the conclusion that cognitive conflict may be attributed to communicative-pragmatic factors which appear as the result of violations of cognitive-communicative norms. Cognitive conflict emerges as the clash of two conditions, two possible worlds, and is expressed by the interlocutors in real (explicit) and virtual (implicit) propositions. The relevance of such propositions is denied during the resolution of the cognitive conflict. According to Phillips and Jorgensen (2008), political conflict communication helps to eliminate alternative ways of perceiving the world and suggests that only one attitude is possible.

The linguistic means of conflict communication in particular political discourses are the object of this research. Allan L. Sillars (1982) has introduced a theory of conflict which is based on the idea that how a person deals with conflict depends on how he/she places blame. Littlejohn (1999: 279) presents a table of conflict management strategies, which is based on the research of Sillars.

Table 1. Conflict Management Coding Scheme (Littlejohn 1999: 279)

<p>Avoidance Behaviors Denial and Equivocation 1. <i>Direct denial.</i> Person explicitly</p>	<p>3. <i>Disclosure.</i> Providing 'nonobservable' information: i.e., information about</p>
--	---

<p>denies a conflict is present.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. <i>Implicit denial.</i> Statements that imply denial by providing a rationale for a denial statement, although the denial is not explicit. 3. <i>Evasive remark.</i> Failure to acknowledge or deny the presence of a conflict following a statement or inquiry about the conflict by the partner. <p>Topic Management</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. <i>Topic shifts.</i> A break in the natural flow of discussion that directs the topic focus away from discussion of the issue as it applies to the immediate parties. Do not count topic shifts that occur after the discussion appears to have reached a natural culmination. 5. <i>Topic avoidance.</i> Statements that explicitly terminate the discussion of a conflict issue before it has been fully discussed. <p>Noncommittal Remarks</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. <i>Abstract remarks.</i> Abstract principles, generalizations, or hypothetical statements. Speaking about the issue on a high level of abstraction. No reference is made to the actual state of affairs between the immediate parties. 7. <i>Noncommittal statements.</i> Statements that neither affirm nor deny the presence of a conflict and that are not evasive replies or topic shifts. 8. <i>Noncommittal questions.</i> Unfocused questions or those that rephrase the questions given 	<p>thoughts, feelings, intentions, causes of behavior, or past experience relevant to the issue that the partner would not have the opportunity to observe.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. <i>Soliciting disclosure.</i> Asking specifically for information concerning the other that the person himself or herself would not have the opportunity to observe (i.e., thoughts, feelings, intentions, causes of behavior, experiences). 5. <i>Soliciting criticism.</i> Nonhostile questions soliciting criticism of oneself. <p>Conciliatory Remarks</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. <i>Empathy or support.</i> Expressing understanding, support, or acceptance of the other person or commenting on others' positive characteristics or shared interests, goals, and compatibilities. 7. <i>Concessions.</i> Statements that express a willingness to change, show flexibility, make concessions, or consider mutually acceptable solutions to the conflict. 8. <i>Accepting responsibility.</i> Statements that attribute some causality for the problem to oneself. <p>Competitive Behaviors</p> <p>Confrontative Remarks</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Personal criticism.</i> Stating or implying a negative evaluation of the partner. 2. <i>Rejection.</i> Rejecting the
--	---

<p>by the researcher.</p> <p>9. <i>Procedural remarks.</i> Procedural statements that supplant discussion of the conflict.</p> <p>Irreverent Remarks</p> <p>10. <i>Joking.</i> Nonhostile joking that interrupts or supplements serious consideration of the issue.</p> <p>Cooperative Behaviors.</p> <p>Analytic Remarks</p> <p>1. <i>Description.</i> Nonevaluative, nonblaming, factual description of the nature and extent of the problem.</p> <p>2. <i>Qualification.</i> Discussion explicitly limits the nature and extent of the problem by tying the issue to specific behavioral events.</p>	<p>partner's opinions in a way that implies personal rejecting as well as disagreement.</p> <p>3. <i>Hostile imperatives.</i> Threats, demands, arguments, or other prescriptive statements that implicitly blame the partner and seek change in partner's behavior.</p> <p>4. <i>Hostile questioning.</i> Questions that fault or blame the other person.</p> <p>5. <i>Hostile joking or sarcasm.</i> Joking or teasing that is used to fault the other person.</p> <p>6. <i>Presumptive attribution.</i> Attributing thoughts, feelings, intentions, and causes to the partner that the partner does not acknowledge. This code is opposite of 'soliciting disclosure'.</p> <p>7. <i>Denial of responsibility.</i> Statements that deny or minimize personal responsibility for the conflict.</p>
--	---

Methods of avoidance behaviors and cooperative behaviors are very rarely used in political discourse and conflict communication. It is also possible to state that the partner's concept, as provided in the latter strategy, becomes replaced with the opponent's concept. It is obvious that politicians often benefit from the application of competitive behaviour in discourse, because political competition is an inseparable part of democracy; in turn, politicians influence the consciousness of the electorate through conflict communication. Moreover, in the analysis of conflict communication of the political leaders of states, monologic discourses, rather than dialogic interactions among the subjects taking part in the conflict, are the norm. Features of conflict appear during the process of monologic discourse development. Therefore, *a priori* looks that criticism of the opponent,

requirements to change the situation, attribution of some aims to the opponents is a customary discursive practice in the situation, where one side is dissatisfied with another.

It is also important to point out that the conflict communication expressed through the discourse of the President or the Prime Minister has its own peculiarities, as it is not finally clear if the political ideologies of the countries taking part in the conflict coincide or not. The features of this communication depend on the political functions of the political leaders and on the political situation in the country.

1.4. IMPORTANCE OF IDEOLOGY

Ideology is one of the least definite concepts, having acquired numerous definitions during its long term of existence, starting from the theory of Karl Marx where it is called “false consciousness.” The conception of ideology has long been related to the social practices of totalitarian regimes, where on the basis of verbally expressed orders, opposed by the orders of differently organized societies, the actions of all state institutions are regulated.

According to Van Dijk (1995), ideologies are essential for the formation of social cognition. “In this respect, ideologies are *both* cognitive *and* social” (van Dijk 1995: 18). Ideology is discussed in this dissertation because, on the one hand, it is asserted as a subconscious resistance of political actors (agents) against some phenomena while, on the other hand, it serves as the right to the power legitimization of some individuals and as the basis for opposition (protest) from the side of the others.

Legitimization and protest are inseparable from political discourse. Khmeltsov points out that “political situations and political processes are related to the levels of discourse organization, which, through the medium of subsidiary or mediate levels, are called ‘strategic functions:’ a) ‘constraint;’ b) ‘resistance, opposition and protest;’ c) ‘simulation;’ d) ‘legitimization and delegitimization’” (Хмельцов 2004: 61). Khmeltsov does not describe these

functions in detail, though he does state that the analysis of linguistic behaviour, as based on the presented functions, may be called research into political or politicized behaviour.

Van Dijk (1995) presents an even more comprehensive model of ideology analysis:

Table 2. Ideologies and discourse: Levels of analysis (van Dijk 1995: 144).

<p><i>1 Social Analysis</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Overall societal structures, e.g., parliamentary democracy, capitalism,• Institutional/Organizational structures, e.g., racist political parties,• Group relations, e.g., discrimination, racism, sexism,• Group structures: identity, tasks, goals, norms, position, resources. <p><i>2 Cognitive Analysis</i></p> <p><i>2.1 Social cognition</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sociocultural values, e.g., intelligence, honesty, solidarity, equality.• Ideologies, e.g., racist, sexist, anti-racist, feminist, ecological, etc.• Systems of attitudes, e.g., about affirmative action, multiculturalism, etc.• Sociocultural knowledge, e.g., about society, groups, language, etc. <p><i>2.2 Personal cognition</i></p> <p><i>2.2.1 General (context free)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Personal values: personal selections from social values,• Personal ideologies: personal interpretations of group ideologies,• Personal attitudes: systems of personal opinions,• Personal knowledge: biographical information, past experiences. <p><i>2.2.2 Particular (context-bound)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Models: ad hoc representations of specific current actions, events,• Context models: ad hoc representations of the speech context,• Mental plans and representation of (speech) acts, discourse,• Mental construction of text meaning from models: the text base,• Mental (strategic) selection of discourse structures (style, etc.).
--

3 Discourse Analysis

- The various structures of text and talk.

“Ideologies are the basis of our social judgements, and ideologically controlled propositions often are opinion statements” (van Dijk 1995: 143). This statement can be applied to the investigation of those linguistic means typical of conflict communication in the discourse of the political leaders of Great Britain and Lithuania, because each statement may be treated as based on ideology, both social and cognitive. Political identification takes place through the division into “insiders” and “outsiders,” which is based on affinities or differences of ideology. Khmeltsov (2004) claims that ideology analysis leads to the formation of dominant stereotypes, the “insider” and “outsider” dichotomy, the analysis of well-established clichés, narrowed collocations and discourse automation. This scholar raises two questions, which are very closely related to political conflict communication and its analysis- “What do ‘They’ say about ‘Us?’” and “How do ‘They’ speak about ‘Us?’” (Хмельцов 2004: 62).

According to Laclau (1996), it is impossible to perceive society without ideology because ideology is objectivity. As a result, instead of the term *ideology*, the term *objectivity* is used. Phillips and Jorgensen define objectivity as “sedimentary power in which footsteps of that power have already disappeared, where it has already been forgotten that the world has been formed politically” (Филиппс, Йоргенсен 2008: 75).

Tuzikov (2003), in his PhD dissertation on the theory of ideology in Western sociology, states that the theory of ideology from 1970–1990 was broadly discussed in the works of such scientists as Selinger, Pickert, Zizek, Habermas, Van Dijk, etc. Tuzikov also points out that ideology is closely interrelated with culture, as both concepts are used as a means of interpretation, helping to reveal what, and in what way, the aim of society’s life has become. Tuzikov writes that ideology may be regarded as the constituent of culture

which creates models of “reality” perception and interpretation and which later, consequently, provokes some particular actions. In modern society, ideology is more related to the pervasiveness of ideas in society’s information space and the performance of social institutions than to the propaganda spread by political parties or individual politicians. Tuzikov (2003) arrives at the conclusion that ideology influences both mass and group consciousness; it also plays an important role in the process of socialization, by influencing cognitive structures which are helpful in analysing social phenomena. In recent years ideology has increasingly been defined with the help of the “technological” potential of leading social institutions, rather than with the help of classical “false consciousness” or “value system” conceptions, to create a system of cultural practices, values, attitudes and symbols which can legitimize social order. This idea is also emphasized by Van Dijk, Thompson, etc. According to Tuzikov (2003), these scholars analyse ideology taking into account both cultural and linguistic structures and the communication context. Moreover, for Lukeman and Berger, the supporters of the conception of social reality design, ideology greatly influences social life.

As discussed above, ideology is a complex concept with many different definitions. Therefore, in this dissertation, it would be purposeful to discuss the definition and analysis suggested by Eco. In the book *La struttura assente* (1998), Eco defines ideology as a whole that the addressee is familiar with in one or another way; it is also the social group that he/she belongs to, and in addition it includes his/her systems of psychological expectations, all his/her intellectual skills, life experience and moral principles. This semiotician states that ideology is perceived when it becomes a code during the process of socialization. In the world of signs, codes form a set of expectations, which is called ideology in the world of knowledge. According to Eco (1998), ideology influences perception because the addressee construes the message on the basis of his/her ideology or the ideology that he/she, regarding the communication conditions, attributes to the sender of the message. In his book, Eco defines ideology as closely related to rhetoric and as providing the final,

comprehensive form for the completeness of connotation. As a result, ideology may be regarded as a subconscious phenomenon. However, in this dissertation, the prevailing view is that in political life, where political parties exist, then the attitudes that form the ideologies of parties should also exist.

Summarizing all the statements on ideology that have been presented above, it is possible to draw the conclusion that discourse cannot exist without ideology and vice versa, ideology cannot exist without discourse. They are closely interrelated. Thus, if political discourse is being researched, it is naturally impossible to do without an analysis of the ideological attitudes of the political subjects. According to Laclau and Mouffe (1996), conflict communication in political discourse exists as a “battle of discourses.” The reasons for such communication may stem from ideological disagreements between the representatives of different political parties, as well as from non-ideological disagreements (if a political doctrine may be treated as ideology) such as the fight for survival in power (in this case, legitimization and justification of power actions are expressed in discourse) and, contrarily, the fight to achieve power (in this case, some space for the indictment of power for non-legitimized actions, or for resistance to its actions, should appear in discourse). In any case, political identification takes place via the opposition “we” and “they.” Furthermore, this identification should be based on a particular ideological platform. An analysis of the linguistic characteristics of discourse – rhetoric and stylistics – allows the audience to perceive the apparent ideological attitudes of the opponents – their “world-view,” i.e., knowledge, values, and schemes of reality interpretation. Moreover, rhetoric is closely related with the cognitive attitude(s) of the subject. Synchronic and diachronic comparative analyses of the discourses of different political powers demonstrate that differences of strict linguistic form take place in a particular stage of the ideological conception of a social life and, moreover, that changes take place in the ideologies of some communities. As already discussed, according to the theory of Laclau and Mouffe, political reality is designed by

discourse. The extra-linguistic reality exists, but discourse indicates how it should be treated.

1. 5. LANGUAGE IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Chudinov (2006) introduces political linguistics as a science which formed in the 2nd half of the twentieth century. He presents George Orwell and Victor Klemperer as the predecessors of this trend. Chudinov points out that the concepts of *doublethink* and *newspeak*, introduced in Orwell's novel *1984*, and fascist communication, described in Klemperer's book *LTI: Lingva tercia imperii*, lay the foundations for political linguistics.

“The language of politics is not a neutral medium that conveys ideas independently formed; it is an institutionalized structure of meanings that channels political thought and action in certain directions” (Connolly 1993: 1). The definition of political language conveys the idea that politicians use particular words or utterances not only to express their ideas and opinions but also to achieve some specific intentions and goals. It is possible to state that some scholars treat political language as a professional language, while others treat it as a language used by politicians to communicate with the masses and for intercommunication. In this case, the formula “discourse = professional language-text-context,” suggested by Sheigal, could be applied (Шейгал 2000: 15). The scholar refers to the language of political discourse as a constituent of discourse.

According to Chudinov (2001), it is impossible to investigate political language as an autonomous phenomenon because it is too closely related to the political and economic situations of a particular country. Moreover, “political language is perceived as a specific subsystem of the national language, which is designed for political communication” (Чудинов 2001: 2). This scholar associates political communication with propaganda, its emotive influence on society, and the intentions of politicians. Indeed, many scholars equate the terms of political language with political discourse in their works. According to

Demjankov (2002), the term “political language” has entered widespread use since its appearance in 1978 in Sieyès *Qu'est-ce que le Tiers Etat?*. Initially it was treated as political discourse, intended for the elimination of privileges. Demjankov (2002) also discusses such features of political language as evaluation and aggressiveness. As he maintains, political discourse is distinguished from other discourses for its polemics, which determine the choice of words and permit military actions to be transferred from the battlefield to the theatre stage. “Such sublimation of aggressiveness (in the opinion of some social psychologists) is determined by human nature. Therefore, polemics in political language are a particular theatricalized aggression” (Демьянков 2002: 33). In discussing evaluation, Demjankov (2002) points out that polemics are aimed at the formation of a negative image of the opponent, and at the obtrusion of other values and conceptions. As a result, terms evaluated positively by the supporters of a particular attitude are perceived as negative or even offensive by the other side.

Sheigal asserts that the main function of political language is the “fight for power” (Шейгал 2000: 35). To this author, political language reflects the political reality and changes in accordance with it. For the analysis of political language, Sheigal (2000) introduces the term “political narrative,” which he defines as the whole of various discourse genres existing together with a particular political event. Chudinov presents parliamentary elections as an example of “political narratives” (Чудинов 2001: 117).

Lauras Bielinis points out that a “political text is a communicative tool, where the factors existing in text/speech have a huge importance because they are intended to affect the actions and evaluations of the addressee (reader/hearer) and his/her perception of the situation” (Bielinis 2002: 52). This scholar has formulated a postulate which could complement definitions of political discourse and political linguistics: “every act of political communication is pragmatically oriented and designed in accordance with social context” (ibid: 49). In other words, an act of political communication is

a speech act, which has the aim (illocution) to influence the addressee in some particular way.

As already mentioned, political language is used in order to present some information and to materialize the intentions of politicians. According to Algis Krupavičius (1999), political information is the basis of political communication, a tool which helps to define political goals, to make decisions and to evaluate if the politics is successful or not. He supposes that political information is especially important in a democratic system because it forms society's attitude towards particular politicians, political parties and ideologies. Krupavičius (1999) points out that information leads to meaningful political behavior and political choices. Information helps people decide whether to support or oppose individual political leaders, parties, governments, and their political actions.

It follows that the political information conveyed by political language forms society's opinion about a political situation and political behavior; it can also form attitudes towards particular politicians, parties and ideologies. It is important to mention that the person who is able to create and circulate texts has the possibility to influence social opinion. This dissertation analyses the political discourse of two democratic countries, and it is therefore possible to conclude that the societies in these countries may be influenced by power and opposition, as freedom of speech is a key indicator of democracy. According to Janda et al. (1995), political opinion is based on the following factors: selfish (private) interests, political leaders, political information and opinion schemes.

From the aspect of political language, influence on an addressee is very closely related to the peculiarities of the meanings of words chosen by the politicians. Blakar, in the book *Language as Means of Social Power. Language and Modeling of Social Interaction* (1987), introduces the following meanings: referential, emotive and associative. Referential meaning is aimed at the addressee's consciousness; emotive is intended to evoke particular emotions; and associative meanings relate to the subconscious. Blakar (1987) provides the following examples illustrating the indicated meanings. He explains

referential meaning with the help of the English word *ball*, which could mean both a ball and a party. Associative and emotive meanings are illustrated with the help of the English word *cottage*. Many people associate this word with mountains, snow, a warm fireplace, etc., which do not have any direct relation to the interpretation of the word *cottage*, but are provided by an associative net activated by the given word. Talking about emotive meaning, this word and its associations typically evoke positive emotions. According to Blakar (1987), the use of different words to define the same phenomenon, thing or person may evoke positive or negative emotions. This scholar points out that the English words describing black people – black, negro, colored, and nigger – activate totally different emotions and disclose the speaker’s attitude towards them.

Lassan (1995), in her analysis of rhetorical text elements, discusses the influence on the addressee’s aims and ideology, as discussed above in reference to Eco (1998), for whom ideology and rhetoric are especially coherent. According to Lassan (1995), all the linguistic means of political texts are rhetorical means, performing the function of influencing the consciousness of the addressee. Different ideologies use different linguistic means, appealing to the emotive field of the addressee’s psychology, his/her subconscious, or rational conscious structures.

Language is a means of political communication. Bielinis writes that “in politics, communication is transformed into one of the main instruments of the expression and implementation of will. Because nowadays there can be neither politics nor politicians without communication” (Bielinis 2005: 2). In another article Bielinis points out that “political communication can be called an instrument of political power with the help of which politicians influence society: they form its political behavior, attract like-minded people, implement political decisions, organize ideological structures” (Bielinis 2002: 49). This scholar also points out that political communication reveals the intentions, plans and attitudes of politicians. Moreover, it indicates the position of a politician in his/her party – his/her ideological system and level of independence or dependence on other politicians or the party itself. According

to Bielinis, political language performs some particular functions in political communication. These functions are represented by various types of strategies:

1. *Instrumental function*. Such strategies help to control the attention of the listener/reader, they help to induce him/her to capture some particular information and to overlook such information which is not beneficial to the politician.

2. *Justification function*. These are the strategies which help to justify the appearance of some particular proposition (or its absence) in the speech of the politician.

3. *Self-presentation function*. Many language strategies are used not in order to materialize some political aim but in order to form a positive personal image (sometimes this is the only aim of political language). These strategies form stereotypes and control emotions (Bielinis 2002: 53).

These strategies may be related to the “strategic functions” introduced by Khmeltsov. They are: constraint; resistance, opposition and protest; simulation; legitimization and delegitimization. The *justification* and *self-presentation* functions are closely related to legitimization because they help to justify some particular actions of politicians or their striving to acquire power. These politicians, correspondingly, help to legitimize their “own” actions and to delegitimize the behaviour of “others”.

The situation model introduced by Bielinis in his article “Linguistic Aspects of the Comprehension of Political Communication” (2002) is closely related to the language functions discussed above. This model helps to emphasize the separate features of a particular situation and provides it with its intended goals and aims. According to Bielinis (2002), the situation model is a very significant argumentation tool in a politician’s speech. It is essential in the investigation of conflict communication because such a model can help to form a negative attitude towards political opponents, to design negative stereotypes of the political leaders of the opposition. Furthermore, the situation model is “always formed with the help of specially chosen facts and arguments which are beneficial to the politician” (Bielinis 2002: 55). This indicates that, with the

help of such models, politicians can present themselves as the only worthy leaders and their political actions as the only ones which are beneficial to the society and the state.

Kupina (2002) presents a set of genres which are used in political communication and which are very important for politicians, as they help them to influence the addressee(s). She isolates the genres of protest, support, rational-analytical and analytical-statistic, humorous and virtually oriented low genres as the most noteworthy (Купина 2002: 223).

In conclusion, consider Lassan's (1995) idea that it is necessary to analyse the elements of discourse as a complex communicative act; to investigate the content of the text, its rhetorical means, its social context, any data regarding the participants of the communication, and the process of text perception in order to investigate political language and the aims of political leaders. This dissertation makes use of the concept of domain. The term domain can be defined as a broad field of meaning, including all the participants, their actions and circumstances, whose verbalization has common semantic features. This can be expressed directly or implicated. Moreover, in this dissertation, domains are organized on the basis of the *WE-THEY* opposition. The term domain also includes narrower meaning fields, namely, specific concepts. Moreover, the domain is structured through conceptual metaphors. One of the prevailing means of assuring the effectiveness of political language is the selection and application of particular oppositions and their member nominations.

1. 5.1. USAGE OF NOMINATIONS

In conflict communication, the choice of nominations – the adjectives, nouns, verbs and phrases which are attributed by political leaders to their opponents – is determined by the aim to negatively affect the attitude of society towards them, their ideology and behaviour. Certain nominations are used in order to form stereotypes about political and personal opponents which

are beneficial to those in power, to win their fight for power and to achieve their personal aims. Nominations are also used to form a more positive image of the political leader and his/her colleagues.

According to Bolinger (1987), the choice of nominations is essential in order to create the intended picture of the world; thus, particular nominations are used for particular reasons in propaganda to manipulate the consciousness of the addressees. This scholar, in the 1980 book *Language – the Loaded Weapon: the Use and Abuse of Language Today*, illustrates the special role of nominations in creating the picture of the world intended by one side of a conflict: for example, a bombardment can become a “defensive reaction,” a precise bombardment is defined as a “surgical strike,” and the bombarded house automatically becomes a “military object” (Bolinger 1980: 36).

Lassan (1995) introduces the constituents of nominations in political texts suggested by Akimov, Baranov and Sergejev (1990). They are as follows:

1. the subject and its characteristics;
2. aims and values;
3. action conditions and their characteristics;
4. actions and their characteristics;
5. the results of actions (Lassan 1995: 63).

In the article “Ideological Discourse Analysis” (1995), Van Dijk presents a range of descriptions which are significant for creating nominations. This system includes: self-identity descriptions, activity descriptions, goal descriptions, norm and value descriptions, position and relation descriptions, and resource descriptions. According to this scholar, various groups (journalists, politicians, ethnic minorities, the poor, the rich, etc.) are also equated to political leaders, but they can exist only on the condition that they have access to common or specific resources. Therefore, the resources of journalists are called information sources, while those of scientists are called knowledge. It is important to emphasize that political leaders not only have access to all the resources, but they can also influence these resources in order to reach their personal aims.

One of the means of research used in this dissertation is nomination analysis, which will help to reveal how political identification, positive and negative images are formed.

Van Dijk does not use the term *nomination* in his investigations, but he draws a parallel between *we* and *they*. *We* could be regarded as political leaders and those in power; *they* as their opponents. In this investigation the term of nomination will be applied to Van Dijk's "*we–they*" model, which will also be called research into the nominations of political discourse.

The selection of nominations is closely related not only to political identification, but also to the identity of the person. Self-identity descriptions answer the questions, "who are We, where do We come from, what are Our properties, what is Our history, how are We different from Others, what are We proud of" and also provide boundary statements with respect to Others: "Who will be admitted, what are the criteria of admission, who may immigrate, etc." (Van Dijk 1995: 147). The author points out that usually these descriptions are positive.

Activity descriptions indicate tasks, general and ideological activities, and the social roles of the speakers. Goal descriptions introduce positive goals which are essential for political discourse. In this stage, political leaders may persuade the society that they have only positive goals and intentions which will be beneficial for the country. Norm and value descriptions depict the moral values and norms of the political leaders, their conception of good and bad, right and wrong. Position and relation descriptions indicate that "groups define their identity, activities and goals largely also in relation to other groups" (ibid: 148).

Van Dijk (1995) proposes that nominations are usually formed on the basis that *we* are positive and *they* are negative. Positive and negative features can be attributed to nominees according to the model suggested by this scholar, where ingroup is *we* and outgroup is *they*:

Table 3. Describing/attributing positive action (Van Dijk 1995: 144).

<i>Ingroup</i>	<i>Outgroup</i>
Emphasis	De-emphasis
Assertion	Denial
Hyperbole	Understatement
Topicalization	De-topicalization
-sentential (micro)	
-textual (macro)	
High, prominent position	Low, non-prominent position
Headlining, summarizing	Marginalization
Detailed description	Vague, overall description
Attribution to personality	Attribution to context
Explicit	Implicit
Direct	Indirect
Narrative illustration	No storytelling
Argumentative support	No argumentative support
Impression management	No impression management

According to Van Dijk (1995), the description of a negative action will be inverted. Those features which are associated with ingroup will depict outgroup and conversely.

In the article “Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis” (1995), this scholar presents the following domains at the microstructure level: semantics, syntax and rhetoric. Nominations are the microstructure analysis method which helps to reach the macrostructure level, defined as the key idea.

Furthermore, Van Dijk points out that “lexicalization is a major and well-known domain of ideological expression and persuasion” (Van Dijk 1995: 25). The lexicon depends on the genre of discourse, thus, the same person may be described differently in different genres. That also depends on “personal context (mood, opinion, perspective), social context (formality, familiarity, group membership, dominance relations) and sociocultural context (language variants, sociolect, norms and values)” (ibid: 25).

The domain of lexicalization is inseparable from semantics, which is divided into global (macrostructure) and local semantics of text and word (microstructure). The field of local semantics includes positive descriptions of

ingroups and negative presentations of outgroups. Van Dijk (1995) presents an example of Dutch employers refusing to take responsibility for the unemployment of ethnic minorities, instead blaming these minorities for their lack of motivation and poor language skills. This domain, insofar as it creates a positive description of ingroups and a negative presentation of outgroups, is vitally significant in conflict communication, for it helps to form the desired attitude of society towards the opponents, to blame them for inefficiency, selfishness, economic and political crises. On the other hand, political leaders may present themselves with the help of local semantics as (positive) revolutionaries, positive heroes and the only saviours of the society and the country.

Van Dijk (1995) narrows the term of global semantics to topics. “Topics or semantic macropropositions of discourse subjectively define the information in a discourse that speakers find the most relevant or important” (Van Dijk 1995: 27). This conveys the idea that political leaders may emphasize information that is relevant for them while avoiding those topics and facts that are not beneficial for them or even harmful. Consider Van Dijk’s example of a police raid which took place in 1985, in Brixton. A black woman was shot during that raid. The main topic presented in the British mass media was crime, aggression, and the drug abuse of black youth, while the police actions were relegated to the background, the result of a race riot.

According to O’Halloran (2003), deliberate or unintentional avoidance of information influences the correct perception of a speech or text and may cause misunderstandings. This scholar introduces the term “mystification” to describe and analyse such a lack of information.

In discussing the syntax domain, Van Dijk points out that “in English, responsible agency is associated with grammatical subject, and initial position” (Van Dijk 1995: 24). According to him, if the intention of a text is to emphasize the negative features of an opponent, this information will be presented in the initial position. If the intention is to describe *us* (in this study, the political leaders), the focus will be on positive facts and information;

furthermore, they will be presented in the initial position. Van Dijk proposes that even fixed syntactic structure may be violated in order to achieve desirable aims. In the English language the main character and the main information are presented at the beginning of the sentence. As a result, if it is necessary to emphasize *their* negative actions, the agents and any information regarding their behaviour will be placed into the initial position of the syntactic structure. The same steps are performed if the emphasis on *our* positive actions is desirable. This scholar also states that elite speakers use complex sentences in order to distance themselves from the rest of society. Clearly, politicians treat themselves as elite, making use of complex syntactic structures and political terminology which conveys the main idea and is only appreciated by a narrow circle of addressees, more specifically, by their political comrades. The syntactic structure of a text and the lexical peculiarities of the words that are used may be included into the analysis of those rhetorical means of conflict communication discourse that are intended to influence the consciousness of the addressee and to convey information to a particular circle of politicians. These syntactic and lexical peculiarities may, of course, be interpreted differently by the comrades of political leaders, their opponents and/or persons who do not take part in the conflict communication. Moreover, words which are familiar to everyone acquire totally different meanings and connotations in the process of such communication.

Furthermore, “overall meanings, i.e., topics or macrostructures, may be organized by conventional schemata (superstructures), such as those that define an argument, a conversation or a news report. As is the case for all formal structures, schematic structures are not directly controlled by ideological variation” (Van Dijk 1995: 28).

Van Dijk points out that “the social control of speech acts should operate through context models that represent the communicative situation and its participants, goals, and other relevant appropriateness conditions” (ibid: 30). The scholar illustrates this idea with the following example: if a speaker with a racist attitude and ideology talks about the inferiority of ethnic minorities on

the basis of such preconceptions, his/her negative opinion can control the formation of the speech act. Threats and orders may also be expressed in this way. The pragmatic domain deals with inferiorization and lack of politeness in the formation of opponent nominations.

In his description of dialogical interaction, Van Dijk states that:

“ideologies define relationships of power, which in turn also may control interaction, i.e., who has more or less access to the use of specific dialogical features, such as setting agendas for meetings, making appointments, opening and closing dialogues, turn management (e.g. interruption), the initiation, change and closure of topics, style selection and variation, and the more general properties of discourse” (Van Dijk 1995: 31).

The descriptions presented above are mainly used in the production of positive *we* nominations, but Van Dijk (1995) presents a system of discursive structures and strategies which are used to produce nominations of the opposition – of the *others*. These strategies include: negative lexicalization, hyperbole, compassion move, apparent altruism move, apparent honesty move, negative comparison, generalization, concretization, alliteration, warning, norm and value violation and presupposition.

Negative lexicalization, according to Van Dijk (1995), is the use of strongly negative words to address the opponent. The scholar presents examples regarding Muslims containing the following words describing *them/Others* (Muslims): destroy, terrorism, paralyzing fear, extremism, gangs, murky, etc.

Hyperbole is used as an exaggeration of the opponent’s actions and behaviour. It is very useful when political leaders want to emphasize that their political opponents are guilty of every negative phenomenon in the country.

The compassion move is used in order to show “empathy or sympathy for (weak) victims of the Other’s actions, so as to enhance the brutality of the Other” (Van Dijk 1995: 154). The apparent altruism move depicts political leaders (*we*) as positive when they reveal their moral values by showing interest in, compassion for and understanding of the opponents’ ideas and

actions. According to Van Dijk (1995), the apparent honesty move combines a positive self-presentation with negative presentations of the Other. The next discursive strategy, negative comparison, is used in order to emphasize the bad qualities of a political opponent in comparison with another negative politician or personality. Generalization is used when features of one political opponent are attributed to the whole party he/she represents. The strategy of concretization is beneficial when political leaders want to emphasize the negative actions of their opponents and present them in detail.

Alliteration is a rhetorical means used “to emphasize the importance or relevance of the words thus being marked” (Van Dijk 1995: 156), and is widely used in political communication.

Warning is invoked in order to show that political opponents, their ideology, values and actions are dangerous to the state and society. It is often used in order to slander opponents.

Norm and value violations are of particular importance: “the most fundamental way of establishing a distinction between THEM and US is not only to describe ourselves in benevolent terms and them in negative terms, but to emphasize that the Others violate the very norms and values we hold dear” (Van Dijk 1995: 156).

Presupposition is a semantic device which is very significant in the production of nominations as it helps to emphasize the positive features of those in power and the negative features of those in opposition.

The choice of nominations is very important in political discourse, especially in conflict communication, because they form the stereotypes which are intended to change the addressees’ point of view or to form desirable attitudes. According to Lassan (1995), speakers who use nominations activate the emotive and associative aspects of the word. This helps to form a negative attitude towards the opponent. She also points out that the nominations used by politicians depend on their political ideology.

1. 5. 2. CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS

The identification of the metaphorical expressions prevailing in political texts has become one of the main research trends in political discourse. The majority of metaphorical expressions forms a particular system, which can be explained through their relations to conceptual metaphors – cognitive structures, existing in the sub-conscious, that determine the interpretation of the world and unfold through linguistic metaphors.

The idea of conceptual metaphors was first introduced and investigated by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson in their work *Metaphors We Live By* (1980). These scholars point out that “the concepts that govern our thought are not just matters of the intellect. They also govern our everyday functioning, down to the most mundane details. Our concepts structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people” (Lakoff, Johnson 1980: 103). According to these scholars, our conceptual system is metaphoric and based on linguistic data. Moreover, our everyday language is full of common metaphors, reflecting the *mapping of domains*. “Metaphorical mappings, which are usually unconscious, are used for reasoning, reasoning about target domains that are ill understood, vague or controversial...source domains are intuitively understood and have holistic structure, so that if one part is accepted other parts follow” (Chilton, 2004, 52). Metaphor includes at least two domains. „The conceptual domain from which we draw metaphorical expressions to understand another conceptual domain is called the **source domain**, while the conceptual domain that is understood this way is the **target domain**” (Kövecses 2002: 4).

Musolff’s (2004) ideas complement the above presented theoretical background on domains, as he claims that cognitive metaphor theory involves conceptual, semantic, rhetorical, historical and ethical domains.

Lassan (1995) assumes that the generation of an ideological text has three levels: binary oppositions, conceptual metaphors and expanding these

oppositions as well as metaphors. In her opinion, conceptual metaphors exist in the basis of discourse ideology and provide the foundation for its development.

According to Chudinov (2001), every person conceptualizes himself/herself and the world. The basis for metaphors are concepts which have been formed in the consciousness. “These concepts include a person’s perception of the features of a person himself/herself and the characteristics of the surrounding world” (Чудинов 2001: 29). This scholar compares conceptual metaphors with a system of closely interrelated mirrors, where the first mirror reflects the mental world of a person and society, the second mirror reflects the perception of the source domain and its structure, and the third mirror is the reflection of a person’s understanding of the concept domain. Chudinov thinks that a person conceptualizes and structures this domain metaphorically and sees the most important elements of this domain.

Furthermore, he (2001) points out that metaphorical models are very significant in political discourse analysis because they reflect national, social, and personal consciousness, as well as the evaluation and conceptualization of various fragments of reality with the help of scenarios, frames and slots.

The identification of conceptual metaphors is beneficial in political discourse analysis because conceptual metaphors are short formulas expressing the world-view of a political text subject in brief, or presenting the world-view model that he/she wants to insert into the consciousness of the addressees. Different interpretations of the same event are determined by different conceptual metaphors which condition the whole world-view system (ideology) – the whole value system. Moreover, conceptual metaphors include personal experience and “define our linguistic and non-linguistic behaviour” (Lassan 1995: 45).

According to Chudinov (2001), the target domain is a polysemantic domain which includes the primary meanings of the words used in a particular model. The latter domain is defined as a field-donor; it is called the source of metaphorical expansion.

The source domain, which is also called the denotative zone, recipient field or direction of metaphorical expansion, includes the figurative meanings of the words used in a particular model.

Scenarios which are typical of that particular model express the most typical consequences of the target domain. Chudinov presents an example where the “war” scenario has the following subsequences: preparation, declaration, military actions followed by the usage of different armies, victory or defeat (ЧУДИНОВ 2001: 25). It is possible to state that the words used in the “war” scenario belong to the target domain and the addressee’s attitude towards the latter scenario is expressed through the source domain.

Chudinov (2001) also introduces some features of metaphorical models: productivity, frequency, domination and emotive nature. Productivity is defined as the possibility of the origin of new secondary meanings. Furthermore, the productivity may change over some period of time.

Frequency may be determined by counting the examples which exist in some particular collection of texts and which correspond to the particular model. Moreover, this number must be compared with the total number of metaphorical examples found in that collection. “The emotive nature of the model can be sharp and weak, it can practically denote the emotionality of all corresponding models of metaphors or just a significant part of these models” (ЧУДИНОВ 2001: 104).

Chudinov arrives at the conclusion that modern political language is metaphorical. Budajev (2006) points out that the metaphorical expression of political life is intensified during periods of social instability and crises. It becomes weaker during periods of stability.

In political texts, metaphors are usually used deliberately, in order to achieve a particular rhetorical effect. Metaphors are used as a method of indirect communication which helps politicians to achieve their aims, i.e., to influence the subconscious structures of the addressee through the view created by the metaphor. Chudinov (2001) illustrates the fact that the image of a person may be degraded with the help of metaphors with the following example: “The

suspension of Dorenko from the TV channel turned into a shock for the TV audience of the motherland. However, after losing their favourite ‘soap opera,’ the viewers got an odd propaganda show, instead, which is moderated by the similar dissembler” (Рязанцев, cited in Чудинов 2001: 108).

Political metaphors have many cognitive and non-cognitive functions. Chudinov (2001) presents nine non-cognitive functions in his book on political metaphors. This set includes the nominative, communicative, pragmatic, descriptive, instrumental, hypothetical, schematic, euphemistic and popularization functions.

The nominative function is “necessary for knowledge fixation, especially in these cases when there is no traditional or even short denomination which could satisfy the author of realia. In such cases, metaphor is used simultaneously in order to create the denomination for realia and to disclose the basic characteristics of that realia” (Чудинов 2001: 27).

The communicative function allows the sender to transfer information in a short and accessible way to the recipient/addressee. Chudinov (2001) here presents the metaphorical party name “Медведь” (Bear), which is the symbol of the party “United Russia,” rather than a full name or an abbreviation.

The pragmatic function is necessary in order to influence the recipient. It helps to form particular stereotypes and ideas in the consciousness of the addressee. This function is also responsible for the emotive influence. In this case, Chudinov further develops the “Медведь” (Bear) topic and explains that people attribute the positive features of a bear (in particular, its perception as the host of the taiga) to the “United Russia” party.

The descriptive function enables the sender to make his/her message “more figurative, emphatic, visual and aesthetic” (Чудинов 2001: 27). The instrumental function helps the recipient to form background knowledge and to contemplate the political situation and events. Chudinov (2001) illustrates this function with the help of the metaphor “occupation regime,” which expresses actions committed against the will of citizens. It also enables the society to form a corresponding power image.

The hypothetical function is responsible for the presentation of statements (hypotheses). It is helpful for making assumptions about the metaphorical nature of the object which is being investigated. The author assumes that Mikhail Gorbachev did not completely perceive the essence and results of his reforms when he started to use the metaphor “perestroika.”

The schematic function of metaphor “allows some particular world model to be created; it also helps to explain the interrelations which exist between its elements’ (Чудинов 2001: 28). In this case Gorbachev’s metaphor “common European home” is presented. With the help of this metaphor, the politician expressed the relations that he believed should be developed between neighbouring countries and should also be an antonym for the metaphor “iron curtain.”

The euphemistic function helps to transfer information which is not indicated by the author with the help of nominations. Here Chudinov presents an example taken from the speech of Yuriy Luzhkov: “if bees do not protect their honey from various bears (медведь), they will die” (Лужков, cited in Чудинов 2001: 28).

The last function presented in Chudinov’s (2001) model is popularization. It helps to convey difficult and complex ideas to the addressee in a form that is accessible and comprehensible to him/her. For example, consideration of the budget is explained by comparison with the situation of a poor student family.

The presented models and functions are irrelevant if the recipient/addressee is not acquainted with the context of the political situation. According to Chudinov (2001), metaphors live in a specific context, text and discourse.

The secret aims of politicians can be achieved by employing the eloquent nature of the metaphor. According to Chudinov (2001), this can be accomplished in two main ways:

1. Development of a metaphorical image through the use of new words taken from the target domain. For example, Blair’s (2005) words about the

Conservative government: “[...] and the periods of conservatism are the punctuation marks not the sentences in which our history is written.”

2. Metaphors, which coincide with phraseological expressions, can also be used. For example, Blair’s expression “the old monolithic systems of education” does not only indicate the system of education, but the Conservative Government, as well.

Metaphoric constructions present a framework for viewing how the political leaders define conflict communication. Furthermore, according to Goatly (2007), metaphors reflect hidden ideologies. Thus it is possible to state that they help to form the intended opinions and attitudes. In this dissertation, linguistic metaphors of political discourse which have features of conflict communication are being analysed in order to reveal:

1. how the speaker conceptualizes the world or how he/she wants to make listeners conceptualize some particular fragment of reality through the system of used metaphors;

2. the rhetorical effects of the metaphor and to show how its usage helps to create a particular, intended image.

1.6. REVIEW OF POLITICAL HISTORY AND THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN GREAT BRITAIN, 1998 – 2008

As it has already been mentioned, the term *discourse* includes the concept of social context. It is impossible to analyse linguistic means if the context of word usage is not understood. Without this context, it is impossible to determine what the speaker wants to say and what information is encoded in the text. In other words, it is impossible to answer the question *Why did the speaker say that and not the other thing*, or *Why did he/she say that in that particular way*.

Conflict communication arises out of a political situation and its features are related to the traditions of political culture. For these reasons, the political history and current situation of Great Britain and Lithuania will be presented in Chapters 1.6. and 1.7.

There are two names used to identify the country which is located in the British Isles. Sometimes people call it Great Britain, sometimes the United Kingdom. According to the Britannica Online Encyclopedia (www.britannica.com), in 1707 England and Scotland assented to the Act of Union, forming the kingdom of Great Britain. In 1801 Great Britain united with Ireland and created the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

Great Britain is a parliamentary monarchy. This means that there exist two political powers: the Queen, who plays formal and representative roles, and the Parliament, which has legislative and governing rights. According to Birch (1993), the United Kingdom is the only state that does not have a Constitution. There are a lot of statutes, determining powers of particular institutions, and Birch also presents the following examples: “Thus, the powers of the monarchy are limited by the Bill of Rights of 1689 and the Act of Settlement of 1701; the powers of the House of Lords are defined by the Parliament Acts of 1911 and 1949; and the modern electoral system is regulated by the Representation of the People Acts of 1948 and 1949” (Birch 1993: 23). This scholar (1993) explains that the Parliament holds the most power in the British governmental system. It directly controls legislation, and indirectly, the actions of the executive and the central administration. Moreover, all the ministers report to the Parliament on their actions and the actions of the departments under their leadership. Birch (1993) points out that the main function of the Parliament is to control the government. The official Internet site of the British Parliament (www.parliament.uk) provides the information that the Prime Minister is the head of the government, who is also the leader of the party which received the majority of votes during the election. After the election, the Queen invites this person to form the government. Furthermore, the Prime Minister is a Member of Parliament. His/her authority includes the appointment of judges and the head of the church of England. According to Birch (1993), the Prime Minister advises the Queen, distributes positions in the Cabinet, is the head of the Cabinet, solves the disputes that emerge there, leads the discussions on politics and tries to convince the

members of the Cabinet to support his/her own attitude towards political strategy.

Birch (1993) writes that two major parties have dominated in the British party system for more than a century. There are also some minor parties in the system, but the author of the book indicates that their role in politics is minimal: “until 1918 the two main parties were the Conservative and Liberal Parties, but the latter was displaced by the Labour Party shortly after that date” (Birch 1993: 64). This scholar states that in the period of 1924–1974 the Conservative and the Labour Parties dominated. After 1974 the role of minor parties increased. The Conservative and the Labour Parties were still competing for power with each other during the period of this research. Therefore, the conflict communication of the leaders of these two parties will be one of the parts of the research. As a result, it is necessary to introduce these parties.

Birch (1993) points out that the Conservative Party has existed since 1830. In the beginning, it was formed by a group of peers and Members of Parliament. This Party did not have local departments until 1867 when local Conservative associations were formed and the National Union of Conservative Associations was established.

It is important to mention that the Conservative Party has another name: the Tories. In the 17th century, monarchists in the House of Commons were given the “Tory” name. The Conservative Party is the oldest and the most successful party in the world (*The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics*, 2003). *Britannica Concise Encyclopedia* (2006) presents the main principles of this party as “promotion of private property and enterprise, maintenance of a strong military and foreign policy, and preservation of traditional cultural values and institutions.” It also states that the modern Conservative Party is a coalition of two groups and “must balance its traditionalist and communitarian wing against its libertarian and individualist wing” (*Britannica Concise Encyclopedia*, 2006). This party is against Britain’s relationship with the European Union. The electorate of the Conservatives has been mainly “the

landowning and middle classes, but its electoral base has extended at times to incorporate about one-third of the working class” (*Britannica Concise Encyclopedia*, 2006).

After having introduced the history and the main principles of the Conservative party, it is necessary to indicate the periods of its dominance and defeat. *A Dictionary of British History* (2004) indicates that “the Conservatives spent most of the period 1830-86 in opposition.” During that period, they won the elections of 1841 and 1874. The Great War (World War I) was beneficial for the latter party because it came back to power and became the dominant party in Great Britain.

“The Second World War undermined this position: it brought Labour into government and to the management of the ‘home front,’ and the 1945 general election was lost decisively by the Conservatives. The 1945–51 Labour government established a ‘post-war consensus’ around a mixed economy, the welfare state, and a commitment to full employment. Conservative governments from 1951 to 1964 were founded on acceptance of this legacy” (*A Dictionary of British History*, 2004).

Margaret Thatcher was prime minister from 1979 to 1990, “the longest uninterrupted government of the 20th century. Her government dismantled much of Britain’s postwar welfare state, and the party became identified with free-market economic policies” (*The Columbia Encyclopedia*, 2003). In 1990 John Major became the party leader and the Conservatives won the 1992 general election. The Conservatives ruled the country up to 1997, when they faced their first defeat in half a century. The following election defeats of 2001 and 2005 totally weakened the party’s political position.

The Labour Party has always been the Conservative Party’s opponent and competitor:

“The principal centre-left party in modern British politics. It was established as the Labour Representation Committee in 1900, becoming the Labour Party in 1906. Labour developed as a mass party, with its origins in late nineteenth-century working-class protest. Its strategy from its formation was electoral, eschewing direct action as a route to political power. Its structure formally placed a high

premium on internal party democracy...” (*The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics*, 2003).

According to the compilers of this dictionary, the Labour Party helped trade unions to represent themselves politically, so the trade unions have thus been this party’s funders. Therefore, the party bases its ideology on democratic socialism. “After 1918 the Party traditionally presented its policies as ‘socialist,’ emphasizing the importance of a large state-controlled sector of the economy, relatively high levels of taxation, and comprehensive state-organized welfare provision” (*The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics*, 2003).

In 1994 the leader of the Labour Party renamed it New Labour and started a new era of this party, which remained in power until 2010.

The official site of the Labour Party introduces it as the party which has revolutionised the lives of the British people. “The values Labour stands for today are those which have guided it throughout its existence:

- social justice;
- strong community and strong values;
- reward for hard work;
- decency;
- rights matched by responsibilities” (<http://www.labour.org.uk>).

These values and principles are especially attractive for the middle-class electorate which is the most numerous and, thus, most influential. British society has been especially favourable to the Labour Party in 1924, 1929–31, 1945–51, 1964–70, 1974–9, 1997–2010. These dates mark the Labour Party’s victories in elections and years of power.

The ideology, values and principles of New Labour coincide with those of the majority of British citizens. The leaders of the analyzed period and the members of the party focus on such important issues as asylum and immigration, crime and anti-social behaviour, defence, democracy and citizenship, economic stability and full employment, the environment, equality, education, health care, international development, elderly people, local

government, transport and support for families. New Labour adopts a positive point of view towards power and society, it declares change in all areas, thus combining and reflecting values of the old and young generations. This is the secret of the longest period of consecutive government in Labour Party history.

This research focuses on the period of 1998–2008, which presents the era of the Labour government’s prosperity and depicts two Prime Ministers, Tony Blair and Gordon Brown. The research data are the speeches and interviews of the mentioned political leaders, and reveal their point of view toward their opponents, the Conservatives. Different ideologies, values and attitudes cause conflict communication between the Prime Ministers, representing the leading party, and the members of the other, competing party.

1.7. REVIEW OF POLITICAL HISTORY AND THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN LITHUANIA, 1998–2008

According to the Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania (<http://www3.lrs.lt/>), the state of Lithuania is an independent democratic republic which is governed by a Parliament, a President, the Government and the Supreme Court.

The Constitution indicates that Parliament consists of 141 members who are elected for four-year terms. Only a member of Parliament can be appointed to the position of minister or Prime Minister. Although members of Parliament perform numerous functions ranging from legislation to national awards, the most important person in the political life of this republic is the President.

It is recorded in the 6th paragraph of the Constitution that “the President of the Republic is the head of the State. He represents the Republic of Lithuania and performs everything that is charged by the Constitution and legislation” (<http://www3.lrs.lt/>). The President’s term lasts 5 years. The same person can be elected President for no more than two consecutive terms.

The same paragraph of the Constitution describes the functions of the President, who:

- solves the most important questions of foreign policy and administers it together with the Government;
- signs international treaties;
- appoints and recalls diplomatic representatives;
- appoints and dismisses the Prime Minister and assigns him/her to form the Government;
- appoints and dismisses ministers and State officials;
- suggests the candidacies of the judges of the Constitutional Court;
- appoints and dismisses the head of the Army;
- grants the highest military degrees;
- makes annual speeches in the Parliament on the situation in Lithuania, local and foreign policy;
- grants citizenship of the Republic of Lithuania;
- grants pardons for convicts;
- signs statutes billed by the Parliament or returns them, etc.

Each of the abovementioned cases where the Presidential functions include dismissal have the potential to become conflicts which may take place between the President and the chairman of the Parliament or the Government.

The 7th paragraph introduces the Government of Lithuania and states that it consists of the Prime Minister and ministers. The Prime Minister, like all the ministers, is appointed and dismissed by the President. The Government is responsible for the security and peace of the State; it executes legislation, the resolutions of the Parliament and the decrees of the President; it coordinates the performance of the Department of ministries and other governmental institutions; it arranges State budget projects and executes them; and it prepares and presents legislation projects to the Parliament. It is also responsible for diplomatic relations with foreign countries.

Article No 102 of the 8th paragraph of the Constitution defines the functions of one more governing institution, the Constitutional Court. “The Constitutional Court determines if statutes and other Parliamentary acts do not

contradict the Constitution, whereas acts of the President of the Republic and Government do not contradict the Constitution or legislation. The status of the Constitutional Court and order of performance of its authority are defined by the statute of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Lithuania” (<http://www3.lrs.lt>).

Now that the political system of Lithuania has been presented, it is relevant to introduce the period which is being investigated in the dissertation.

The period of 1998–2008 in Lithuania was more politically intense than in Great Britain. Four presidential elections took place during that period. The President Valdas Adamkus was elected twice. Firstly, he succeeded in 1998 and governed the Republic of Lithuania till 2003. During the period of his first term, it was possible to observe an open conflict which took place between Adamkus and the Prime Minister Vagnorius, which was settled by dismissing Vagnorius from the Prime Minister’s position. In 2004 Lithuanian citizens elected Adamkus again. Later he was reelected for another 5 year term of office.

The short period which lasted from February 26, 2003 to July 12, 2004 was marked by two Presidents: Rolandas Paksas and Artūras Paulauskas. In February of 2003, the Lithuanians expressed their trust in the new candidate Paksas and elected him to the President’s post.

Paksas was replaced by the interim President Paulauskas on April 06, 2004, who governed the Republic until the new presidential election and relinquished this post to President Adamkus on July 12, 2004.

The next step is to describe each President in detail and to show their relationships with political parties, colleagues and opponents.

Adamkus was the longest governing President in the history of the republic. He was not a member of any political party; his ideology was based on his own moral values and principles, which may have been the secret of his popularity. Another important factor in his popularity among the citizens is that Adamkus came back to Lithuania from the USA, which is usually perceived by Lithuanians as a land of happiness and wealth. As a result, the electorate hoped

that this candidate would change Lithuania and transform it into a Western country. His personality was attractive, too, for “while living in the United States, Valdas Adamkus was an active organizer of protests against Lithuania’s occupation and the initiator of numerous petitions. Between 1961 and 1964, Adamkus was a member of the Board of the American-Lithuanian Community (LC), vice-chairman of the Centre Board, member of the American-Lithuanian Council (ALC)’ (<http://www.president.lt/family/biografija>). The country perceived such a President as a hero and a saviour of the country.

Paksas became the successor of Adamkus in 2003. A year earlier this person had established the Liberal Democratic Party and become its chairman; he therefore represented the ideology and values of this party in the elections and while governing the State. The official Internet site of this party (<http://www.ldp.lt/lt/programa>) presents the following values: order in the State; liberal social politics; safe, healthy and wealthy countryside; accommodation, education and healthcare for everyone; decentralization of the State; etc.

According to Žvaliauskas (2007), during the period of 2002–2004, the Liberal Democratic Party was among the most popular “new” parties of that time and had more seats in the Parliament than “traditional” parties. People were tired of the same members of Parliament, their backward-looking ideology and empty promises. The “new” party consisted of “new” people with fresh and attractive ideas. *New* is associated with changes, usually positive, thus, the citizens of the country were ready to enter a better era.

The term of Paksas was the shortest known in the history of Lithuania. The news agency ELTA (<http://www.mediabv.lt>), on April 05, 2004, presented three indictments to the President. All of them were related to breaches of the Constitution. Paksas was accused of illegal bestowal of citizenship on Jurijus Borisovas on the basis of his financial support to the President; of informing Borisovas that his telephone conversations were being listened to; and for influencing the executives and shareholders of JSC “Žemaitijos keliai” in order to personally benefit from its profits.

After Paksas' impeachment, Paulauskas, who was the Chairman of the Parliament at that time, became the interim President. On April 25, 1998, the New Union (social liberals) was established and Paulauskas was elected as the Chairman of this union. According to Žvaliauskas (2007), the New Union was the most influential political party in 2000, and one of the most successful parties in the 2004 elections to the Parliament.

This Union presents its ideology, ideas and values on its official site. "Our policy is based on the social liberal ideology, the principal values of which are personal freedom, social solidarity, welfare of people and justice" (<http://www.nsajunga.lt>). This party was also associated with positive changes, new and fresh ideas, wealth and prosperity as they presented the image of Lithuania as a society of opportunities.

Although his presidential term was very short and temporary, Paulauskas based his work on the values declared by his party. He did not have many opponents during that period, but perceived Paksas as his fiercest opponent and all of his conflict communication was directed towards the former President. The majority of the citizens of Lithuania supported the interim President on that point.

Having presented the theoretical background and methods, as well as a considerable amount of political information, the next step is to focus on the practical application of these methods and the analysis of the research material.

II. CONFLICT COMMUNICATION DISCOURSE OF THE POLITICAL LEADERS OF GREAT BRITAIN

The British political period of 1998–2008 is marked by two significant politicians – Tony Blair and Gordon Brown – who were the Prime Ministers of the United Kingdom.

Political communication often occurs within the context of a political conflict. It is marked by extra-linguistic and intra-linguistic factors which help a listener to understand that the speaker is involved in a conflict with his/her opponents. In this part of the dissertation, the political discourse of the British

Prime Ministers, aimed at both their opponents and at the British citizens, is analysed. The analysis model suggested by Fairclough (1995), which includes description (text analysis), interpretation (processing analysis) and explanation (social analysis), is very beneficial for this research.

Furthermore, another aspect is significant in this research – the fact that conflict may be expressed both directly and indirectly. In Great Britain conflict is related with ideology, therefore the opposition *WE–THEY* is present. For this reason it is important:

1. to describe how both sides involved in the conflict are characterized;

2. to interpret what was said; to disclose any indirectly expressed meanings; to show what concepts are used by the speaker to legitimize his position;

3. to explain why the speaker speaks in some particular way: what background knowledge, attitudes, and/or aims prompt him to choose particular rhetorical means (in the analysis of conceptual metaphors);

4. to show the applied rhetorical means.

2.1. OPPOSITIONS AND THEIR MEMBER NOMINATIONS IN THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF TONY BLAIR

It is possible to state that there are two main political subjects – the Labour Party and the Conservatives – in Blair’s political discourse. As mentioned above, all positive features are attributed to the Labour Party, whereas the Conservative Party, their political opponents, are defined as a negative power with an outdated, rigid ideology that performs detrimental actions. The only aim of such a usage of contrastive nominations could be the attraction of a larger part of the electorate than that of the Conservatives and the bid to stay in power for more than one term. The aim itself presents action conditions – the start of the Labour governing era after a long period of waiting in the opposition. This was a very important event not only for the representatives of the Labour Party and their supporters, but also for the

country. These action conditions could be compared with a victory in war, because politics and elections are often defined as fights and battles in which all actions are justifiable. Blair uses war nominations in this eternal battle for power. This political leader applies negative nominations to the image of his opponents in his speeches and contrasts them with positive nominations aimed himself and the party under his leadership. The results of such actions should be satisfactory because they help to form some particular stereotypes of the leading and the opponent parties, and to reach the intended aims.

The most frequently used domain in Blair's political discourse is *change*. This domain includes the following antonymic meaning fields: *change – against change*, *change – stuck in the middle/backwards*, *future – past*, etc. As discussed above, this political leader associates all positive changes with the Labour Party. The concept of changes is perfectly revealed and enumerated in his 1999 speech delivered in the Labour Party conference:

(1) *650,000 more jobs in the economy, long-term youth unemployment halved and - here's one for us to put back down a few Tory throats - fewer days lost in strikes than any of the 18 years of Tory Government. Who says Labour's not working now? All employees with the right to a paid holiday. Leave for parents to take time off work for a family crisis. [...]Maternity grant doubled. [...]And all around us the challenge of change. (1999)*

(2) *Global finance and Communications and Media. Electronic commerce. The Internet. The science of genetics. Every year a new revolution scattering in its wake, security, and ways of living for millions of people. These forces of change driving the future: Don't stop at national boundaries. Don't respect tradition. They wait for no-one and no nation. They are universal. We know what a 21st century nation needs.(1999)*

The first example contains a counterposition between the Labour Party and the Conservatives which is used in order to show implicated actions – the kindness, efficiency and expedience of the current government as opposed to the backwardness and conservatism of the previous one. This creates a negative *against change* nomination which is attributed to the Conservative Party. Such characteristics are created on the basis of contrast, where all the changes introduced by the Labour Government are contrasted with the actions

of the Conservatives. This helps to form a positive image of Labour, while the negative image of the opponents is intensified with the help of the following sentence: *here's one for us to put back down a few Tory throats*. Example (2) provides the target audience with information on all the alterations related to the Labour election to the government. The positivity and novelty of these changes is emphasized by this sentence: *These forces of change driving the future [...]*. It is also necessary to pay attention to the very vigorous repetition of *don't stop* and *don't respect*, which creates a particular rhetorical effect that enables the audience to perceive the expressions as imperatives which prompt them to act. Both examples contain inclusive pronouns: *WE* and *OUR*. Blair may be characterized as the action subject with the help of these pronouns, as he indicates particular actions already carried out by the Labour Party or actions that are still going to be taken. Labour Party attitudes and Blair's strong personal and party image are even more intensified by the following sentence: *We know what a 21st century nation needs*. This sentence also reflects the main *WE* characteristics and may have an implicated meaning that the *OTHERS* do not know.

The effect of the opposition *change – stuck in the middle/setback* is even more reinforced by the following examples, taken from the same speech by Blair delivered in the Labour Party conference. These statements introduce *their* (the Conservatives') governing results:

(3) *More than 1 million still unemployed. Schools and hospitals still needing investment. Pensioners still living in hardship. People still petrified by crime and drugs. 3 million children still in poverty. A century of decline, 20 years of Conservative Government still not put to rights. [...]The frustration, the impatience, the urgency, the anger at the waste of lives unfulfilled, hopes never achieved, dreams never realized. (1999)*

(4) *Look at Britain. Great strengths. Great history. English, the language of the new technology. The national creative genius of the British people. But wasted. The country run for far too long on the talents of the few, when the genius of the many lies uncared for, and ignored. (1999)*

Here, the actions of the eternal opponents of the Labour members are presented as negative and *stuck in the middle/backwards* on the basis of contrast; when defining the new and progressive changes initiated by the Labour Party, the Conservatives are granted a direct, serious accusation of defiance of talents. Negativity is intensified by the adverb *still* combined with such concepts as unemployment, crimes or the lack of opportunities, all of which express the Conservative heritage. In fact, the opponents are not directly indicated in examples (3) and (4), only their actions are presented; however, the opponent implication is obvious to anyone interested in global political events. It is clear that the past events, related to the preceding governments under the Conservative leadership, are being discussed. It is important to mention that *still* creates an effect of repetition, forming a certain rhythm and influencing the subconscious. Therefore, it is possible to state that repetition is characteristic of Labour rhetoric. The rhetorical effect is not only necessary to persuade the opponents but, even more so, to reach some particular effect influencing the subconscious of the electorate. Thus, it is possible to conclude that Blair's speech is primarily aimed at the electorate.

The key concept is the *change* brought into Great Britain by the members of the Labour Party. This concept consists of many sub-concepts: a new England, new values, a new state and even a new party which is now usually called the New Labour Party. The usage of the adjective *new* in the *change* domain is of special importance because it shows that the Labour Party and its ideology are totally different from the previous. It also enables the party to draw more support from the electorate that is the target audience of Blair's political discourse. This definite concept is very beneficial for the Labour Party and is widely exploited by its members in their struggle for power, because the idea of something stable and non-changing lies in the very definition of Conservatism itself. As a result, the ideology of the Conservative Party is based on traditional, steady, uniform values and government principles. In Blair's political discourse such characteristics are usually expressed by the opposite meaning fields:

(5) *Today at the frontier of the new Millennium I set out for you how, as a nation, we renew British strength and confidence for the 21st century; and how, as a Party reborn, we make it a century of progressive politics after one dominated by Conservatives.* (1999)

(6) *A New Britain where the extraordinary talent of the British people is liberated from the forces of conservatism that so long have held them back, to create a model 21st century nation, based not on privilege, class or background, but on the equal worth of all.* (1999)

(7) *And New Labour, confident at having modernised itself, now the new progressive force in British politics which can modernise the nation, sweep away those forces of conservatism to set the people free.* (1999)

(8) *They are what hold our nation back. Not just in the Conservative Party but within us, within our nation. The forces that do not understand that creating a new Britain of true equality is no more a betrayal of Britain's history than New Labour is of Labour's values.* (1999)

Blair and other members of the Labour Party perceive changes as progress which has a very positive influence on British society and which is expressed in 1999 speech with the help of such linguistic means as the already presented adjective *new*; the expressions *progressive politics*, *21st century nation*, *progressive force*; and the prefix *re-* emphasizing the idea of something different and positive – *renew*, *reborn*. In example (5), the identification of Blair with the nation is directly expressed through the pronoun *I* and *WE* – the whole Labour Party is presented as the action subject through the indication of the results of the already completed and future actions. The importance of the phrase *British strength*, which is attributed to the Labour actions, should be also emphasized; with its help the members of the Labour Party introduce themselves as true-born English people who correspond to the needs of the electoral majority. Example (6) contains a very significant word, *liberated*, which attributes to the Conservatives the characteristics of oppressors. In example (7), *WE* is presented as a progressive force which is able to *sweep away those forces of conservatism to set the people free*. In the last example, the negative nomination of the Conservative actions is expressed with the help

of the phrase *hold back*, which was already used in the other statement, taken from the same speech and which is again repeated.

The negative character of *THEIR* actions is presented through *WE* characteristics: *we make it a century of progressive politics after one dominated by Conservatives; the extraordinary talent of the British people is liberated from the forces of conservatism that so long have held them back; They are what hold our nation back; Not just in the Conservative Party but within us, within our nation.* It is obvious that *THEY* do not let the country move forward, that *THEY* ignore talents. Conservatives are contrasted with Labourists, and their distance from the nation is expressed through such pronouns as *those, they*.

The idea of novelty may be complemented by the examples taken from a speech delivered in 2003 in the Labour Party conference in Bournemouth, and from a speech delivered in 2005 in the Labour Party conference in Brighton. The following examples reveal the progressive nature of the *changes* initiated by the Labour Party and its leader Blair:

(9) *But progress in the 21st century demands more, much more. [...]And because the world changes we have to change. No longer "one size fits all". [...]That's the reason for change.* (2003)

(10) *Progressive parties, like the Labour Party, rarely fail because of their values.* (2005)

From the examples that have been discussed above, it is evident that 21st century characteristics are only attributed to the Labour Party in Blair's political discourse. Repetition of the noun *change* and the verb *to change* creates the repetition effect which is characteristic of Labour rhetoric and which forms a rhythm and influences the subconscious. In these examples, the party leader adds one more feature to the image: *progress*, which is implied in example (9) and expressed directly in example (10). Therefore, in his conflict communication Blair introduces another opposite meaning field, *progress–regress*. In the political discourse of this Prime Minister, the party under his

leadership is presented as a power which has helped the country to become strong, prosperous and modern.

(11) *Meeting the 18 weeks maximum for waiting in the NHS with an average of 9 weeks from the door of the GP to the door of the operating theatre. Booked appointments. The end of waiting in the NHS. Historic. Transforming secondary schools in the way we have done for primary schools. Schools with three quarters of children getting good results the norm. Historic.* (2000)

(12) [...] *If we fail, and without change we will, then believe me: change will still be done; but in a regressive way by a Conservative Party. I want change true to progressive values, done by a fourth term Labour Government.* (2006)

(13) [...] *Where progressive and conservative policy can differ is that progressives are stronger on the challenges of poverty, climate change and trade justice.* (2006)

In example (11), the *progress* concept is not directly expressed, though it is implied in the enumeration of all the progressive actions taken by the leading party: *the end of waiting in the NHS, transforming secondary schools*. The characteristics of *regress* that are applied to the Conservative image are presented with the help of a very felicitous and eloquent adjective – *historic*. It is important to consider the way that this adjective is used: an individual phrase is used with the intention to sound very assured. Examples (12) and (13), with the help of the antonymous adjectives *progressive* and *regressive*, and with the help of contrast, clearly define and complement the opposite *WE–THEY* model, reveal the action subjects and their performance consequences.

In his last annual report of September 27, 2006, Tony Blair uses the personal pronoun *I*, which helps to present himself as a progressive person, a leader, while he blames the Conservatives for their regressive ideology and characterizes them as a regressive power:

(14) *I'm a progressive.* (2006)

(15) *I remember when I introduced the DNA database. [...]. We were told it was a monstrous breach of liberty.* (2006)

(16) *David Cameron's Tories? My advice: get after them. His foreign policy. Pander to anti-Americanism by stepping back from America . Pander to the Eurosceptics through isolation in Europe. Sacrificing British influence for Party expediency is not a policy worthy of a Prime Minister. His immigration policy. Says he'll sort out illegal immigration, but opposes Identity Cards, the one thing essential to do it. His energy policy. Nuclear power "only as a last resort". It's not a multiple choice quiz question, Mr Cameron. We need to decide now otherwise in ten years time we will be importing expensive fossil fuels and Britain's economy will suffer. He wants tax cuts and more spending, with the same money. He wants a Bill of Rights for Britain drafted by a Committee of Lawyers [...].(2006)*

It is evident that in these examples Blair identifies himself with the whole Labour Party through the presentation of its accomplished tasks and values. He uses the inclusive pronoun in order to emphasize his leader image. This method should confirm the electorate's trust in the new political leader. Moreover, Blair contrasts his own personality with that of a representative of the other party, applying the rhetorical effect of asking questions whose answers would negatively characterize various aspects of Cameron's performance. Blair's indication of a definite Conservative political leader and enumeration of such action areas as *foreign policy, immigration policy, energy policy*, etc., and their analysis, give the basis for the application of the *regress* meaning field. In these examples, it is possible to notice an *I- HE* opposition, where the result of the presented contrastive actions enables the audience to treat *I* (Blair) as a positive action subject and *HE* (Cameron) as a negative one.

As mentioned before, *change* is associated with the concept of something *new*; thus, the very important meaning field *new-old* is widely used in Labour Party conflict communication with the Conservatives:

(17) *So when I speak of the need for a new moral purpose [...]. (1999)*

(18) *A new Britain is emerging with a revitalised conception of citizenship [...]. (2000)*

(19) *The new school, its new attitude was summed up by one young student who told me she had been badgering her mum all week to buy an alarm-clock,*

as she was scared of sleeping in case she missed a single lesson. What better symbol of the opportunities we are giving our children. (2003)

(20) Years ago, before coming to Government, I said that we would make the arts and culture part of our "core script". In other words, it was no longer to be on the periphery, an add-on, a valued bit of fun when the serious work of Government was done; but rather it was to be central, an essential part of the narrative about the character of a new, different, changed Britain. (2007)

versus:

(21) [...] the Tories [...]. A narrow base. Obsessed about the wrong things. Old fashioned. In retreat. (2003)

(22) [...]the Party of no change – the Conservatives [...]. (2000)

It is obvious that this opposition, existing in the examples taken from Blair's speech on identity, published in March 2000 in *The Guardian*, and the 2007 speech published on the official website, should convince British society that it is right to trust the Labour Party and to help them stay in that position for more than one or two terms of office. This opposition manifests in the following expressions: *new moral purpose, new Britain, revitalised conception, new school, new attitude, new different, changed Britain*. The constant repetition of the dominant adjective *new* in Blair's political discourse reinforces all the meaning fields included in the *change* domain and substantiates the formation of *new* characteristics. This meaning field is attributed not only to the Labour Party, but to all aspects of social and political life and even to the values related to this party and its members.

The meaning field *old* is attributed to the political opponents, the Conservative Party. It is expressed through a direct meaning relation with the help of the adjective *old fashioned*, emphasizing the negative attitude of the Labour leader towards its opponents, or through such connoted meaning relations as *the Party of no change, in retreat*. Such opponent characteristics are very beneficial for Blair because it enables him to create a strongly negative image of *THEM* and to achieve his intended aim, i.e., to stay in power as long as possible.

Therefore, the action subjects of the *new* meaning field are implied through such expressions as *new Britain*, *new moral purpose* or through the presentation of completed actions, but they are not indicated directly. In *THEIR* (the Conservatives') *old* meaning field, not only are the negative actions, old-fashioned ideology and value of the opponents introduced, but the action subjects are also indicated directly, thus making the the target audience clearly aware of the source of their problems and encouraging them to actively identify with the *WE* side in the *WE–THEY* model.

This also helps Blair to present the Conservatives as hopeless, outdated and non-modern, and to form the *future–past* meaning field, which complements the previous fields and is included into the core concept of *change*. As the Prime Minister claims in his speeches, the bright and glorious future is in the hands of the Labour Party, while the Conservatives are associated with the dark and gloomy past. This characteristic enables the party in power to enhance its positive image and to attenuate its competitors' potential, or even to depict them as a threat to the country. In the already mentioned 2003 Bournemouth and 2006 Brighton speeches, and also in the resignation speech in 2007, Blair states that:

(23) *But now, is where we show whether we have the mettle not just to be a longer or even a better Labour Government than those that went before us, but whether we usher in a political era where progressive politics is to the 21st century what conservative politics was to the 20th.* (2003)

(24) *You're the future now.* (2006)

(25) *I came into office with high hopes for Britain's future. I leave it with even higher hopes for Britain's future.* (2007)

The constant repetition of the noun *future* and its relation to Labour's arrival in the Government enables the Prime Minister to assign the attribution of the *future* meaning field to himself and the party under his leadership. The phrase *21st century*, discussed above, implicates the Labour Party and is also related to the *future*. Furthermore, as is evident in example (24), the Labour Party is perceived as the party that the *future* depends on. This means that the

members of the party are sure that they will keep governing the country, as they know what is essential in the 21st century. Blair does not miss opportunities to create negative images of the opposition, therefore, he contrasts the *Labour future* with the *Conservative past: we usher in a political era where progressive politics is to the 21st century what conservative politics was to the 20th*.

In the Labour Party conference delivered in 2005 in Brighton, the leader of the party introduced 10 principles which should help to improve the future of British families:

(26) *So here are ten things a future Labour third term can do for Britain's hard-working families.* (2005)

For the members of the Labour Party, the *future* is associated with health, security, educational systems and their reforms. These reforms lie in the basis of other opposite meaning fields which will be analysed later. It is necessary to point out that direct conflict is not expressed in these words, though it is always implicated through promises. Promises are an inseparable part of political election discourse because they legitimate the party's rights to power.

The characteristic of the *past* is also present in the same speech from 2005:

(27) *And when was the last time you heard of a winter crisis in the health service or the scandal of outside toilets in primary schools, now that this country, Britain, is the only one anywhere in the developed world increasing public spending on health and education every year, year on year, as a proportion of our national income?* (2005)

(28) *When did you last hear of pensioners freezing to death in the cold because they couldn't afford the heating?* (2005)

Although the Conservatives are not directly addressed in these statements, the implication is that all those enumerated negative things happened in the past under the leadership of this Party. These linguistic expressions help to draw a clear line between the negative *past* and the positive

future. They are beneficial for the Labour Party in order to enhance their own good image and to debase their competitors in the eyes of society.

It has already been mentioned that Blair and the members of the Labour Party associate change with reforms. He presents reforms which have been introduced and carried out by the Labour Government while describing the Conservatives as the party which opposes those apparently positive and necessary changes. This can be observed in the following examples of one more meaning field, *reformers–anti-reformers*:

(29) *We gave the Bank of England independence. We cut the borrowing. We cut unemployment. We are at long last reforming welfare, making work pay more than benefit for hard-working families through the Working Families Tax Credit.*

They would scrap each and every one of these reforms. (1999)

(30) *To 2 million people given a pay rise through the minimum wage. Tory pledge 1: we'll cut it. To 1.5 million families helped by the working families tax credit. Tory pledge 2: we'll scrap it. To 250,000 young people getting through the New Deal, Tory pledge 3: you'll go back on the dole.* (1999)

(31) *Now after a century of antagonism, economic efficiency and social justice are finally working in partnership together.* (1999)

(32) *Let us take on the forces of conservatism in education, too, the greatest liberator of human potential there is. [...]We owe it to every child to unleash their potential. They are of equal worth. They deserve an equal chance. A failed education is a life sentence on a child.* (1999)

(33) *Only now can this happen because there is a Labour Government that cares about educating the many and a Labour Party with the courage to reform the system to do it.* (1999)

After such a presentation, only one favourite emerges: the members of the Labour Party with its leader in the forward ranks. All these examples contain contrasts: *we gave, we cut, we are reforming* appear in counterposition to *They would scrap each and every one of these reforms*. In these statements the *reformers – anti-reformers* characteristic is intensified by verbs which emphasize the contrastive results of the Labourist and the Conservative actions. Moreover, example (30) contains an interpretation of the opponents' words and actions that helps to form a negative image of the Conservatives

which should evoke public disapproval of Tory politics. After the formation of this negative Conservative image, Blair depicts the party under his leadership as the saviour of the state, and presents the result of the Labour reforms with the help of the following sentence: *There is a Labour Government that cares about educating the many and a Labour Party with the courage to reform the system to do it.*

The concept of *change* in Great Britain is closely related to the change of its position in Europe and the world. Earlier this country was perceived as an isolated country, having a conservative image. Blair and the Labourists convey the idea that globalization has come to their country during the process of change. This concept is intensified by the introduction of the meaning field of *pro-globalists–non-globalists*. In his speech on globalization at Blenheim Palace (2007), Blair expresses the following attitude:

(34) *In Britain, the modern Labour Party has undoubtedly gone for the open position. Interestingly, it is the Conservative party that appears to be more closed but not to be fair on the economic issue.* (2007)

(35) *I said open versus closed is often more important today than the traditional right versus left, but how openness is managed, how its opportunities are garnered and its risks withstood, this is emphatically a live issue between the conservative and progressive ends of the political spectrum.* (2007)

It is important to consider the *open–closed* opposition that is related to the issue of globalization. Globalization is not an undeniable value, it is an object of disputes; therefore, the British may oppose this idea. For this reason, the speaker uses the already mentioned *open–closed* opposition, where the first member has a positive connotation associated with communication. This positive characteristic is attributed to the actions of the Labour Party because its members support the process of globalization and the Conservatives object to it. Furthermore, resistance to anything new, traditionalism and stability form the essence of the Conservative ideology, thus the second member of the opposition, with its negative connotation, is attributed to the opponents of the Labour Party.

Another widely illustrated set of meaning fields in Blair's conflict communication is *democracy–anti-democracy*. It includes attitudes towards equal rights, liberty, racism, discrimination, justice and the class system. According to this political leader, New Labour focuses on *democracy* while Conservatives are represented with an *anti-democracy* ideology. In this case, the *anti-democracy* characteristic is based on the adjective *old*, which is intensified by other adjectives, such as *bad*, *left-wing*, *hereditary*, and verbs such as *destroy*, *keep out*, *hold back*, *keep down*, and *stunt*, all bearing negative connotations in the context:

(36) *The old prejudices, where foreign means bad. Where multi-culturalism is not something to celebrate, but a left-wing conspiracy to destroy their way of life. Where women shouldn't work and those who do are responsible for the breakdown of the family. The old elites, establishments that have run our professions and our country too long. Who have kept women and black and Asian talent out of our top jobs and senior parts of Government and the Services. Who keep our bright inner city kids from our best universities. And who still think the House of Lords should be run by hereditary peers in the interests of the Tory Party. The old order, those forces of conservatism, for all their language about promoting the individual, and freedom and liberty, they held people back. They kept people down. They stunted people's potential. Year after year. Decade after decade. (1999)*

(37) *To us today, it almost defies belief that people had to die to win the fight for the vote for women. But they did. That battle was a massive, heroic struggle. But why did it need such a fight? Because Tory MPs stood up in the House of Commons and said: "voting is a man's business". And that is why we can be so proud that it is this Labour Party that has more women MPs and more women Ministers than any Government before us until our record is bettered by a future Labour Government. (1999)*

The idea that *foreign means bad* (see example (36)), in regard to the attitude of the Conservatives, reveals the fact that Blair transforms the opponents' words in a way meant to disclose their real sense. In the speeches of the Labour leader, the attitude of the Conservative Party towards working women is presented from an angle that should set women against the Conservatives. It is important to point out that in these statements, the Tories are related to their historical performance; this can be treated as a means of

black rhetoric, because the Prime Minister wants to historically overshadow the current political battle. The Conservatives' old-fashioned, non-liberal methods and principles seem much worse in the light of the Labour Party's positive and democratic attitude:

(38) *And it is us, the new radicals, the Labour Party modernised, that must undertake this historic mission. To liberate Britain from the old class divisions, old structures, old prejudices, old ways of working and of doing things, that will not do in this world of change.* (1999)

These words do not directly link those old structures to the Conservatives, but from the analyses performed above it is clear that the concept *old* stands for the latter party. Example (38) introduces the idea that under Conservative leadership the state was non-democratic, restricted by prejudices and divided into classes. Such a portentous picture of the previous power helps the Labourists to secure the support of the electorate for a long time. Moreover, the verb *to liberate*, used frequently in Blair's speeches, helps to present the party under his leadership as saviours. This effect is reinforced by other nominations related to the domain of *democracy–anti-democracy*.

Another pair of meaning fields in that domain is *equality–inequality*. It is evident that the first speeches delivered by Blair were much more mordant. The Labour methods here are represented as increasing equality versus the Conservative ones, which promote unequal rights for their citizens and the old-fashioned class system which was very beneficial for this party in the past:

(39) *But true equality: equal worth, an equal chance of fulfilment, equal access to knowledge and opportunity. Equal rights. Equal responsibilities. The class war is over.* (1999)

(40) *To be the progressive force that defeats the forces of conservatism. [...]The forces that do not understand that creating a new Britain of true equality is no more a betrayal of Britain's history than New Labour is of Labour's values.* (1999)

(41) *Not a society where all succeed equally - that is utopia; but an opportunity society where all have an equal chance to succeed; that could and should be 21st century Britain under a Labour Government.* (2005)

In order to form and emphasize the *equality* image, Blair repeats it in the form of a noun in every possible case and applies this concept in the form of an adjective to every possible subject related to the Labour Party and its performance: *equal worth, an equal chance of fulfilment, equal access to knowledge and opportunity, equal rights, equal responsibilities*. The opposite meaning fields *equality–inequality* form the basis for further characteristics, evoking the negative connotations applied by Blair to the Conservative image. He accuses this party of discrimination and, therefore, the meaning fields *non-discriminators–discriminators* appear:

(42) *And remember when to be in favour of gay rights was to be a loony leftie, race relations was political correctness, and Red Ken frightened people even as brave as your own leadership?*

Now the parties compete for the gay vote, unite against the BNP and Ken has led and won the debate on congestion charging and community policing. (2005)

(43) *In 1997, we faced daunting challenges. [...]Parliament, supposedly the forum of the people, with only 1 in 10 women MPs. Gay people denied equal rights.* (2006)

Blair's statements and accusations presented in the already mentioned speeches of 2005 and 2006 convey the idea that the Conservatives discriminated against a great variety of people in the majority of areas. The oppositions which are used in Blair's speeches are very useful in conflict communication, as they help to form the desired attitudes among the electorate and to imply who is "good" and who is "bad", what is "white" and what is "black." The beneficial effect is further reinforced with the help of the verbs *frighten* and *compete*, which emphasize the importance of these meaning fields.

The concept of discrimination is even more narrowed and leads to the next set of meaning fields, *non-racist–racist*, which were consistently presented in the speeches of 1999–2006. Here, once again, positive features are

attributed to the members of the Labour Party and negative to the Conservatives. The prevailing method used here is that of contrast:

(44) *The forces of conservatism allied to racism are why one of the heroes of the 20th Century, Martin Luther King, is dead. And though the fact that Mandela is alive, free and became President, is a sign of the progress we have made [...].* (1999)

(45) [...] *Britain under a Labour Government. Where nothing in your background, whether you're black or white, a man or a woman, able-bodied or disabled, stands in the way of what your merit and hard work can achieve.* (2005)

(46) *In 1997, we faced daunting challenges. [...] No black Ministers and never a black Cabinet Minister.* (2006)

(47) *We have black Ministers and the first woman and then the first black woman Leader of the Lords.* (2006)

Example (44) directly discloses the reasons for the *racist* characteristic attribution, which is contrasted with the *non-racist*, positive Labour attribute. This characteristic of the Conservatives is meant to help the Labour Party to get votes from the black electorate. Examples (45–47) present the implicit *racist* characteristic and contrast it with the totally different performance of the Labour Government's. The density of these meaning fields is expressed by the noun *challenges*, the adjective *daunting* and the phrases *black Ministers*, *the first woman*, *the first black woman*, which sustain Labour as a *non-racist* party. Example (45) includes all the points of the equality model which is used in Labour's governmental strategy. The issue of democracy, including equality and freedom, is very important for the British; as a nation, they want to be modern and to eliminate all boundaries existing among people. This elimination means change, which stands for the Labour Party and its ideology in Blair's speeches. The positive characteristics of the Labour leader and the party under his leadership are intensified by the repetition of the pronoun *we*; this expresses conflict where, as already mentioned, *WE* are positive and *THEY* are negative. Moreover, this presentation of the party's performance presents the Prime Minister of Great Britain as a strong, active action subject. The

statements presented in Blair's political discourse are effective because, according to this political leader, positive characteristics correspond to the modern political and social values of democracy, equality, multiculturalism, women's rights and the welfare of the nation. Furthermore, such action expression through the *WE-THEY* model violates the stereotype of Britain as a state of gentlemen and sophisticated politeness.

In Blair's political discourse, it is possible to define numerous oppositions related to the *positive-negative* features. They are represented by the following pairs of lexemes: *strength-weakness*, *strong state-weak state*, *responsibility-detriment*, *new beneficial politics-political shortsightedness*.

From the beginning of his term, Blair constantly compares and contrasts two parties, the Labour Party and the Conservatives (*WE-THEY*). This *positive-negative* opposition helps the Labour Party to consolidate its position in the government, to become the one and only governing party for a long period of time. This also helps to present the reforms that have been started or merely planned in a way which helps to win society's agreement and admiration. It is done intentionally in order to marginalize the competing party, to blame it for all maladies and to disparage its ideology. This can be clearly observed in the following examples:

(48) *Let us now finish it and with it finish the Tory Party's chances of doing as much damage in the next century as they've done in this one.* (1999)

(49) *Those who are addicted to violence. Those who confuse any progress with selling out. (Those- the Conservatives – remark, made by Linkevičiūtė).* (1999)

Blair was an especially strident critic of his opponents when comparing their performance with Labour's achievements:

(50) *Arrayed against us: the forces of conservatism, the cynics, the elites, the establishment. Those who will live with decline. Those who yearn for yesteryear. Those who just can't be bothered. Those who prefer to criticise rather than do.* (1999)

(51) *On our side, the forces of modernity and justice. Those who believe in a Britain for all the people. Those who fight social injustice, because they know it harms our nation.* (1999)

(52) *It is between the Conservatives who believe freedom requires only that government stand back while the fittest and most privileged prosper.* (2005)

(53) *Tories are advocating an inheritance tax cut which gives £2 billion to the richest five per cent of estates, Labour's priority will be tax relief for the millions of hard-working families, not tax cuts for the wealthy few.* (2005)

In example (50), direct conflict is revealed in the phrase *arrayed against us*, and the agents belonging to *THEM* are indicated. This and the next examples also contain direct counterpositions: *the poor–the rich, ordinary people–the elite/privileged*. The strength and positivity attributed to *WE* are emphasized by the phrases *on our side* and *the forces of modernity and justice*. The negative characteristics attributed to the Conservatives are formed on the basis of the following eloquent nouns: *the cynics, the elites, the establishment, decline, yesteryear*. These nouns evoke negative connotations in the target audience. The positive characteristics attributed by Blair to himself and the Labour Party are contrasted with the negative connotations and are related to *the forces of modernity and justice*. This meaning field is intensified and complemented by the following nouns: *equality, opportunity, responsibility, change* and *future*. Blair blames the Conservatives for their self-interest and advocacy of the needs of the rich, and he also contrasts these actions with the plans and reforms introduced by the Labour Party.

Later, in 2003, the leader of the governing party adds new colours and features to the positive Labour picture in order to enhance its image and effectiveness. In this case the positive meaning field may be analysed by enumerating all the positive actions taken by the Labour Government. These actions should be perceived by the society as extremely effective and beneficial:

(54) *No complaints from them. Just astonishment and admiration [...].* (2003)

(55) *The money isn't wasted. It's not disappearing down some black hole.*
(2003)

(56) *That's the difference we are making in this country.* (2003)

(57) *So, after a time, after we have righted the most obvious wrongs of the Conservatives, we fold up. We return to our comfort zone.* (2003)

(58) [...] *what's round the corner is the old Tory days. It's not that long ago that we've all forgotten, is it? The 3m unemployed. The two recessions. The negative equity. The double figure inflation. The 15% interest rates. The cuts in schools and hospitals. The privatising of the railways.* (2003)

Blair is very confident when he praises the Labour Party in his resignation speech. This confidence and his enumeration of all the positive things that have been done influence the target audience and augment the party's popularity. This result is achieved with the help of the very straightforward phrase *only one Government*, which is intended to define the Labour Government:

(59) *There is only one Government since 1945 that can say all of the following: more jobs, fewer unemployed, better health and education results, lower crime, and economic growth in every quarter – this one.* (2007)

As discussed above, the *positive–negative* characteristics include several narrower opposite meaning fields. The *strength–weakness* meaning fields also belong to that domain. They are advantageous for Blair's political discourse because they create an image of the Labour Party as a strong power while painting the Conservative party as a group of cowards who lack the resolve to take the necessary actions.

(60) *Today we stand here, more confident than at any time during our 100 years, more confident because we are winning the battle of ideas; we are putting our values into practice; we are the only political force capable of liberating the potential of our people.* (1999)

The linguistic means used in the latter statement suggest the idea of *strength*. The repetition of the adjective *confident*, such verbs as *stand*, *win*, *put*

into practice, and *liberate* and the expression *political force* leave no space for doubt that the Labour Party is a strong power. The attribution of the *strength* characteristic to the Labour Government is further reinforced by the following sentence: *We are the only political force capable of liberating the potential of our people*, where the adjective *only* is highlighted. This statement also contains a rare war metaphor, *we are winning the battle*, which eventually forms Labour's *strength* characteristic in the electorate's consciousness and emphasizes its importance in the life of society and the country.

A clear division between two parties on the basis of *strength* is presented in the following statement of Blair's:

(61) *Government's tough. Fulfilling but tough. Opposition was easy.* (2003)

The *strength* meaning field is vividly escalated in the same speech as well as in later ones:

(62) *In the first phase of our transformation, we took the millstones off our neck. We became a Party of economic competence, strong on defence, concerned on law and order. And we won power. And then in our first term we recovered the credibility to govern. We laid foundations.* (2003)

(63) *But on the issues we have just discussed - the normal run of politics, you feel, the country feels reasonably confident.* (2005)

(64) *But nor should we minimise the strength that unites this Labour Government and this Labour Party as we seek to win a third mandate for change.* (2003)

(65) *A governing Party has confidence, self-belief. It sees the tough decision and thinks it should be taking it.* (2006)

Evidently, this action characteristic is formed on the basis of the following parts of speech: the adjective *strong*, the noun *strength* and the adjectives *tough* and *confident*, which could be perceived as synonyms of *strength* in this context. Moreover, in these statements the Labour leader and the party under his leadership may be perceived as an active action subject.

The members of the Labour Party also seek to show their *strength* through counterposition with violations of the law. Blair is set against immigration if it leads to criminality. As a result, he presents very negative characteristics of the Conservatives: *child abductors, thieves and bomb hoaxers*:

(66) They tried to stop us fining lorry drivers caught smuggling illegal immigrants into the country – by voting against our £2,000 civil penalties for hauliers in 1999. They voted to restore benefits to asylum seekers in 1999, and argued against our proposals to remove support from families whose claimed were rejected and who had exhausted the appeals system but still refused to go home. They even voted to allow child abductors, thieves and bomb hoaxers to remain as refugees when the Government wanted to exclude anyone sentenced to prison for two or more years from lodging an asylum claim in 2002. (2005)

The strong always defeat the weak and the cowardly. This opposition is very beneficial in the fight for power; for this reason, the Labourist leader repeatedly presents this characteristic throughout his term of office. In 2005, when talking about the Conservative party, he uses the adjective *afraid* and such adjectives as *embarrassed* and *unable*, which clearly reveal his attitude towards his opponents:

(67) The Tory party have gone from being a One Nation party to being a one-issue party. Afraid to talk about the economy, embarrassed by the sheer ineptitude of their economic plan, unable to defend their unfair and elitist NHS and schools policies, unable to explain how they would finance the extra police they are promising, they are left with this one-issue campaign, on asylum and immigration. (2005)

In 2006 Blair even expresses open doubts about the potential of the competing party:

(68) That will be their real test of leadership. There is no evidence from this week that they can pass it. (2006)

It has already been mentioned that pronouns *they* and *them* stand for the Conservatives and express not only Blair's doubts about the opponents' competence but also his wish to distance the Labour Party from the

Conservative Party. All these effects serve to show the contrast between these two parties and to form a positive Labour and negative Conservative image in the consciousness of the target audience.

The meaning fields *strength–weakness* may be detailed into a *strong state–weak state* characteristic. Because the Labour Party is granted the *strength* feature, and the Conservatives are defined as representing *weakness*, it is possible to conclude that the Labour state is strong while a Conservative state is weak:

(69) *See Britain as it is seen from abroad today. An economy gaining in strength. A society seeking to combine enterprise with investment in public services that bind the nation together. A politics that from relations within the UK, to pursuing peace in Northern Ireland, to engaging with Europe, is prepared to change to overcome the problems of the past and rise to the challenges of a changing world.* (2000)

In this case, the *strong state* meaning field is related to such important issues and areas as economics, society, politics and peace while the Conservative *weak state* is associated with *the problems of the past*.

In the following example, taken from the same speech, Blair implicitly states that under Conservative leadership, Great Britain was a *weak state*; his usage of the expression *rediscovery of strength* implies this opinion:

(70) *We can have confidence in our future. Britain is no longer in decline. We are rediscovering our strength and values. We are uniting those values to a common purpose: modernising the nation for the 21st Century. If we succeed, Britain will be stronger and fairer, on the road to providing opportunity and security for all.* (2000)

The Labour *strength* characteristic is emphasized even more by the introduction of another feature which is used by Tony Blair in his political discourse to address his fellow Labourists. He perceives himself and the Labour Party as *leaders*. Moreover, this politician frequently uses the phrase *the 21st Century* in his speeches, due to its relation to the proposition *WE are the party of the future*. The presented statement does not contain any personal pronouns, indicating that either the Prime Minister or the Labour Party (or

both) are *leaders*. However, it contains the agent *Britain*, which is nominated as a *leader*. It has already been mentioned that Blair perceives and identifies himself and the Labour Party with Great Britain, thus, it is possible to state that he grants himself the features of a *leader*:

(71) *Think about the culture of Britain in 2007. [...]Britain is not a follower, it is a leader. (2007)*

Only the strongest power can be in the leading position; as a result, all the others, which are weaker, stay in opposition and criticise the leader. The parties which are analysed in this research are not an exception. The Conservatives, which had grown used to being in power during the 20th century, wanted to regain this position; they therefore criticised the Labour Party in order to show the electorate that those in power were not the best choice. The Labour leader discloses these goals:

(72) *[...]The Tories haven't thought it through. They think it's all about image. It's true we changed our image. We created a professional organisation. (2006)*

(73) *They say I hate the Party, and its traditions. I don't. I love this Party. There's only one tradition I hated: losing. (2006)*

It is obvious in the examples presented above that the Prime Minister is involved in a conflict dialogue with the Conservatives. This politician denies the accusations leveled at him and includes the *OTHERS'/THEIR* words in his own speeches.

In the following 2006 speech Blair turns his conflict communication into a more mordant form and presents the competitors as unprincipled and unfaithful to their own creeds. This characteristic is very useful in creating the *weak* and *cowardly* Conservative image being formed by the Labour Party:

(74) *It was amusing to hear the Conservatives asking for an extension of the right to request flexible working – another part of the New Labour family programme. When we introduced it just four years ago, they and their leader voted against it. (2006)*

Labour's *strength* and loyalty to the party's values and ideology as presented by their leader adds more negativity to the already gloomy Conservative image. It is important to emphasize the usage of the pronoun *they*, as it is indicated to marginalize the communication partner by depriving him/her of his/her name and individuality, which is eliminated by the latter pronoun. Moreover, the party in power is depicted as irreplaceable. This result is achieved through the constant repetition of the pronoun *we* in reference to the Labour Party. The following quotation illustrates this opinion:

(75) *We won not because we surrendered our values but because we finally had the courage to be true to them.* (2006)

Blair's political discourse reveals one more large domain of *benefit*, which is present in his and his party's conflict communication. This domain once again implies the idea that the British made the right choice by electing the Labour Party, because everything the members of this party do is beneficial to society and the country, while everything performed by the Conservatives does more harm than good.

The most widely used opposite meaning fields in this domain are *rescuers–wreckers*. The members of the Labour Party are depicted as the *rescuers* of culture, while their competitors are its *wreckers*. The following examples depict the current government as the *rescuers* of art and culture and attribute all the detrimental results of the *funding regime and the policies that we inherited* to the previous Conservative Government, in support of its characteristic as *wreckers*:

(76) [...] *I thought we, as a Government, were of great importance to you, the arts, but rather because you, the arts, were going to be of fundamental importance to the country.* (2007)

(77) *Imagine what the world would have been like if we had continued with the funding regime and the policies that we inherited. Many of the country's finest regional theatres would have closed or would exist as shadows of themselves, on a diet of light drama. Many orchestras would have gone to the wall. There would be no new programmes for art education. Museums, far from being full, would have gradually diminished in importance as charging reduced the*

audience to the middle class. I'm not sure there would be a British film industry, or at least not one nearly so healthy, or the same huge success at the National Theatre.

Instead Government funding has doubled since 1997 and is now done on a more stable 3-year basis. Free admission has meant that there are 42 million visits each year to museums and galleries.

London has become the creative capital of the world. (2007)

The same (2007) speech of Blair's is full of antonymous characteristics, indicating that *WE* (the Labourists) have done a lot for culture, *WE* have rescued it from *THEIR* (the Conservatives') harmful regime. This can be clearly observed in the following opposition:

(78) [...] during the 1980s, some art forms became unaffordable for all but the rich. Community arts projects were scaled back. The critical balance - box office and subsidy - was upset. The funding squeeze persisted through the early 1990s and cemented the spurious distinction between excellence on the one hand and broad access on the other.

The great virtue of what we have managed to achieve in this country is that we have clearly got the best of both. We have deepened our culture, extended its reach, with at the same time no compromise on quality, indeed rather the opposite. (2007)

These examples do not directly name the Conservatives, but the periods of the 1980s and the early 1990s correspond to the Conservatives' being in power and imply their responsibility for the harmful attitude towards arts and culture.

Because culture has been and continues to be one of the most fundamental areas of British society, the arts and culture are very important issues which can help to form a particular attitude towards a competing party. According to the official UNESCO website, the UK is a leader in developing public policy to promote the growth of cultural industries (<http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en>). Furthermore, culture is one of the key factors which helps to form a positive image of the country, and society is intolerant of those who do harm to it.

Another area in which the Labour leader casts his party as *rescuers* is economics. Naturally, the competitors, the Conservatives, are perceived as the *wreckers* of the British economy:

(79) *If we had run a Tory economic policy Britain would be in recession by now which is no doubt why they predicted it.* (1999)

(80) *It's not that long ago that we've all forgotten, is it? The 3m unemployed. The two recessions. The negative equity. The double figure inflation. The 15% interest rates. The cuts in schools and hospitals. The privatising of the railways.* (2003)

(81) *Look at our economy – at ease with globalisation, London the world's financial centre. Visit our great cities and compare them with 10 years ago. No country attracts overseas investment like we do.* (2003)

(82) *The Tory party have gone from being a One Nation party to being a one-issue party. Afraid to talk about the economy, embarrassed by the sheer ineptitude of their economic plan, unable to defend their unfair and elitist NHS and schools policies, unable to explain how they would finance the extra police they are promising [...].*(2005)

(83) *Labour is working. Britain is working. The longest period of economic growth since records began, an economy now bigger than that of Italy and France. The lowest unemployment and highest employment rate of any of our competitors for the first time since the 1950s. Living standards up, for everyone, and for the poorest up most. The biggest reductions in child poverty and biggest increases in investment for decades. This isn't a country in decline. The British people aren't a people on the way down. We are winning. They are winning.* (2005)

The idea of *rescuers–wreckers* is presented through the enumeration of contrasting actions performed by the two opposing parties during their respective periods of government. It is possible to state that Blair constantly uses comparison as a rhetorical device. It is evident in the following example: *Look at our economy – at ease with globalisation, London the world's financial centre. Visit our great cities and compare them with 10 years ago. No country attracts overseas investment like we do.* These opposing meaning fields are complemented by the phrase *Labour is working* which is contrasted with the words taken from another statement: *The Tory party [...]. Afraid to talk about*

the economy, embarrassed by the sheer ineptitude of their economic plan, unable to defend their unfair and elitist NHS and schools policies, unable to explain how they would finance the extra police they are promising [...]. In order to give greater prominence to Labour's economic politics and become more attractive to the electorate, Blair identifies himself and the members of his party with Britain and the ordinary British people. This helps to emphasize the idea that Labour knows what is beneficial for the state and the society. The successful and positive image of the *rescuers* concludes with the words *We are winning*.

Blair advances the same goal in 2006 when he expresses mordant criticism of Conservative principles and compares Tory politics to a multiple choice quiz:

(84) *David Cameron's Tories? [...]His energy policy. Nuclear power "only as a last resort". It's not a multiple choice question, Mr Cameron. We need to decide now otherwise in ten years time we will be importing expensive fossil fuels and Britain's economy will suffer.* (2006)

As detrimental Conservatism, which has acquired many negative features in Blair's political discourse. Indeed, this use of the pronoun becomes one of the most powerful weapons in Blair's conflict communication with his competitors. According to him, *THEY* are distant from the common citizens, *THEY* are not useful. Everything related to this form of address is negative and contrasted with the positive *WE*. Furthermore, the statement contains a question-answer format which gives the impression that the speaker is thinking together with his target audience.

The employment of the abovementioned pronouns helps to form other meaning fields in the *benefit* domain. These meaning fields depict harsh Labour criticism of their competitors. These fields may be defined as *nation's unifiers–nation's splitters*:

(85) *The Conservative Party, in the Tory policy document on five guarantees for Britain, proposes "English votes for English laws". While rejecting a proposal to set up a wholly separate English parliament and now today re-*

affirming that they support devolution, they propose to exclude the Scots, Welsh and Irish from any discussion of laws defined as "English". (2000)

(86) Where through solidarity we build a society in which collective strength compensates for individual weakness. (2003)

(87) It is New Labour that now wears the one nation mantle. (2005)

These quotations illustrate Blair's conviction that the Conservatives want to disunite the nation and thereby weaken the country. The contrastive *WE–THEY* characteristic is formed on the basis of the following phrases: *Where through solidarity we build a society; It is New Labour that now wears the one nation mantle*, which are contrasted with *The Conservative Party [...]* *they support devolution, they propose to exclude the Scots, Welsh and Irish from any discussion of laws defined as "English."* This adds one more detrimental point to the Conservative domain and, with the help of contrast, supports the beneficial Labour image.

Such images are further enhanced by the introduction of the following meaning fields: *new beneficial politics–political shortsightedness*. The leader of the Labour Party points out that Labour's new politics are aimed at people for their benefit; he defines them by enumerating all their positive results and intensifies this with the help of the eloquent phrase *political wisdom*:

(88) We have changed the terms of political debate. This Labour Government has been unique. First time ever two full terms; now three. Why? How? We faced out to the people, not in on ourselves. We put the Party at the service of the country. Their reality became our reality. Their worries, our worries. We abandoned the ridiculous, self-imposed dilemma between principle and power. We went back to first principles, to our values, our real values, those that are timeless, and separated them from doctrine and dogma that had been ravaged by time.

In doing so, we freed Britain at long last from the reactionary choice that dominated British politics for so long: between individual prosperity and a caring society. (2006)

In this example Blair enables the target audience to perceive the fact that the members of the Labour Party are the guardians of traditions, unlike the Conservatives. According to this politician, the Labour Party has taken over

the role of the Conservatives in politics, therefore, the Conservatives are no longer necessary for Great Britain.

The beneficial nature of the Labour ideology is emphasized by the introduction of the meaning fields *choice/opportunities–no choice/no opportunities*, which are actualized through the opposition *now* (i.e., the period of Labour government)–*then* (i.e., the period of Conservative government). Blair states that the party under his leadership is on the side of the ordinary citizen and that it provides all possible options and choices to help society to develop:

(89) At birth: a year's maternity leave, paid paternity leave for the first time and now a new trust fund for every child; their own stake in the future. For toddlers, childcare places, nursery places, child tax credits, and Sure Start giving mothers the confidence and support they need. At primary school the basics, so now our children are in the top three in the world for reading. At secondary school, personalised learning for every child in new specialist schools and City Academies. For teenagers, grants to stay on at school, modern apprenticeships, not a thing of the past but a part of the future. And then throughout adult life, new opportunities through Learn Direct to learn more – a language, new skills – every individual the chance to fulfil their potential. (2003)

Such words as *future, opportunities, learning, and chance* help to give the impression that the Labour Party has done things which have never been done before in Great Britain, and, moreover, that these things are necessary for the future. This is contrasted with the totally different picture of the Conservatives which is drawn in the last lines through the implication that for them the concept of opportunity was attributed only to the privileged. This is supported by the following words:

(90) Sometimes I hear people describe "choice" as a Tory word. It reminds me of when I first used to knock on doors as a canvasser and was told if they owned their own home they were Tories. Choice a Tory word? [...]Choice is not a Tory word. Choice dependent on wealth; those are the Tory words. (2005)

In Blair's political discourse, the good image of Labour is created not only with the help of opposite meaning fields; but meaning fields intended to depict only the Labour Party are also employed. All these characteristics are related to the *benefit* domain. They include *children safety, hope, optimism* and *success*.

Children are important for every society, as the country and society's future itself is dependent on them. As a result, every party that comes to power tries to gain the electorate's support by introducing new policies aimed at children:

(91) *If we are in politics for one thing – it is to make sure that all children are given the best chance in life. [...] That every child can grow up with high hopes, certainty, love, security and the attention of their parents. Strong families cherished by a strong community. That is our national moral purpose.* (1999)

The Labour leader describes his party as a party of *hope*:

(92) *May 1997 was a unique moment. An abundance of expectation surrounded our arrival. A sense of hope beyond ordinary imagining. The people felt it. We felt it. Instead of reining in the expectation, we gave it free rein.* (2003)

(93) *Let us be absolutely clear about where we are today and why. Everything we have done has led up to this moment. To bring new hope and opportunity to the lives of all our citizens [...].* (2003)

Although the *hope* characteristic is not directly expressed in example (92), it is implied by the repetition of the noun *expectation*. This noun is related to the Labour Party and reinforced by the statement *An abundance of expectation surrounded our arrival*. Moreover, *hope* in this example is related to and expressed through one of the key words, *free*, introduced by the Labour Prime Minister Blair. Example (93) contains the direct noun *hope*, which together with *opportunity* may be treated as the basis for the characteristic.

The *hope* meaning field is supplemented with the *optimism* characteristic:

(94) *Our vision is of a Britain that thrives on optimism, on shaping its own destiny not cowering before the might of the global economy.* (2000)

This statement reflects those Labour activities related to *shaping its own destiny*. As a result, it evokes positive connotations in the target audience's consciousness.

The strongest and/or the winning side is always associated with *success*, thus, the Labour leader Blair grants his party this characteristic, which is supported by the following phrases: *It's a happy ending* and *with some pride in what we have done*. These words and the indicated completed actions enable the target audience to perceive Blair as an active action subject:

(95) *It's a happy ending because rarely has a political party been able to deliver so much of what it promised.* (2005)

(96) *And then into the hands of everyone of us as we knock on doors, visit the factories, tour the shops, get out and campaign with some fire in our bellies, with some pride in what we have done.* (2005)

One more factor of exceptional importance in Labour political discourse and, especially, in the *benefit* domain is that they treat themselves as common British people, they identify themselves with the society and the country. According to Blair, that is the reason why this party can do so many useful things – it knows the real demands of the British people. This identification helps to form a very positive and attractive image of the Labour Party. The following examples illustrate this hypothesis:

(97) *We are citizens proud to say there is such a thing as society and proud to be part of it.* (1999)

(98) *These are my values and yours.* (2003)

(99) *The British people aren't a people on the way down. We are winning. They are winning.* (2005)

As a contrast Blair applies a label of absolute *detriment* to the Conservative Party:

(100) *Like, after years in which people thought the Labour Party was unfit to govern, now they think the Tories are.* (2005)

(101) *So Mr Howard's policies aren't going anywhere. They aren't practical. And they aren't costed. And if the Tory plans won't work and aren't funded, what will happen? Confusion at best; chaos at worst [...].* (2005)

Having carried out the comprehensive analysis, it is possible to draw the following conclusions:

1. In Blair's conflict communication discourse, two main political subjects exist. They are the members of the Labour Party and the Conservatives.

2. The Labour leader, with the help of the *WE–THEY* model, draws a clear line between the Labour and the Conservative Parties. In his political discourse, all positive features are always attributed to the *WE* side, and all negative features to the *THEY* side. Blair's statements encourage his target audience to believe that all positive phenomena, changes and ideas are thanks to the Labour Party, while all the negative phenomena are the fault of the competitors, the Conservatives. This is a traditional counterposition, indicating that the Conservative ideology is unacceptable for Blair.

3. The major domains analysed in this politician's discourse are the following: *change* and *benefit*. In these domains it is possible to distinguish positive *WE* and negative *THEY* meaning fields. The concept of *WE* is presented as strong, open, democratic and fair; *WE* are also introduced as protectors of children and culture, defenders of equality and truth, non-racists who implement positive, progressive changes and reforms. *THEY* are introduced as closed, weak, cowardly, non-democratic, selfish, politically myopic racists who advocate hierarchy and resist change. In Blair's discourse an indirect, connoted characteristic of *WE* as rescuers and *THEY* as oppressors may be also noticed.

4. It is possible to conclude that Blair carries out open, direct conflict communication with his opponents, the Conservatives, and may be treated as an active action subject in this communication. Moreover, ideological conflict is clearly present here. The conflict communication existing in the political life of Great Britain is ideological in nature.

2.2. CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS IN BLAIR'S DISCOURSE

In Blair's conflict communication with the Conservative Party, it is possible to observe and analyse not only oppositions and nominations characterized through the *WE-THEY* model, but it is also possible to identify conceptual metaphors which determine corresponding linguistic metaphors.

Cibulskienė points out that “both- the members of the Labour Party and the Conservatives develop *fight* concept. The Conservatives use much broader *fight* context while the Labourists indicate only the things that they fight for. The Conservatives mostly direct their fight towards the Labour Party and the Leibor Party – towards maladies in the country” (Cibulskiene 2005: 84).

Clearly, in Blair's political discourse there is a dominant POLITICS IS WAR conceptual metaphor. It may be analysed in a *war* frame. It is obvious that this metaphor is generally expressed through the opposition *WE-THEY*, where *WE*, the Labour Party, fight against *THEM*, the Conservatives, and *WE* always win this fight:

(102) *To be the progressive force that defeats the forces of conservatism.*

For the 21st century will not be about the battle between capitalism and socialism but between the forces of progress and the forces of conservatism. (1999)

(103) *Let us take on the forces of conservatism in education [...]. (1999)*

(104) *[...] and now having defeated the force of conservatism in granting devolution, let us continue to defeat the separatism which is just the forces of conservatism by another name. (1999)*

The *force* characteristic expresses negative connotations related to war and battles. As a result, the Conservatives are introduced as negative forces which have to be defeated. Such an idea is implied in statement (102). Blair also calls the party under his leadership “forces,” but he eliminates all the negative connotations associated with this word by adding the notion of *progressive force*. The opposition between the progressive forces and the forces of conservatism, between *WE* and *THEY*, is very beneficial for the

Labour Party as it depicts the party as one which has saved the British state through its fight against the Conservative forces which are introduced as enemies.

War is always associated with battles, so the conceptual metaphor POLITICS IS WAR, analysed on the basis of Blair's political discourse, includes the *battle* concept, where the winning side is the Labour Party and the losing, or rather, defeated side is the Conservative Party:

(105) *Today we stand here, more confident than at any time during our 100 years, more confident because we are winning the battle of ideas; we are putting our values into practice [...].* (1999)

Blair reinforces the *battle* idea by employing the verb *fight* and the collocation *forces of modernity and justice*, which complement the already positive image of the Labour Party and its leader. Furthermore, it makes this image even more attractive to the electorate, strengthening its support for the party:

(106) *On our side, the forces of modernity and justice. Those who believe in a Britain for all the people. Those who fight social injustice, because they know it harms our nation.* (1999)

Even the political scene and the period of Labour leadership are associated with *war*:

(107) *The battleground, the new Millennium.* (1999).

In this case the country of Great Britain is identified as a *battleground*, wherein the two parties compete against each other. The members of the Labour Party introduce themselves as fighting for changes, for *the new Millennium* which will be beneficial to society. The Conservatives are perceived as fighting for their own welfare.

When characterizing *THEM*, the Conservatives, Blair presents particular actions which he and his party will take in the fight against their opponents. Therefore, in the latter context, this politician may be perceived as an active action subject.

The *fight* concept is not only employed in order to show that the Conservatives are enemies, but it is also used to emphasize all the positive and beneficial changes that have been initiated by the Labour Party:

(108) *There they are: ten pointers to what a third term Labour Government would do for Britain's hard-working families. Don't tell me that's not worth fighting for.* (2005)

(109) *And now we stand, in a position no Labour Party ever dared to dream of standing before, with a third term Labour Government beckoning. With the values for today and the ideas for tomorrow, and a policy programme that will change the country for better and for good. [...]With the courage of our convictions, we can win the third term, deliver the lasting change. It is worth the fight.* (2005)

In examples (108) and (109), the Prime Minister emphasizes the significance and complexity of the already introduced war with the help of two very similar phrases: *Don't tell me that's not worth fighting for* and *it is worth the fight*. Clearly, in this context *fight* acquires positive connotations.

War in Blair's speeches is related not only to the *fight* against the Conservatives, not only to a political attack, but also to the liberation of the nation and its citizens:

(110) *A new Britain where the extraordinary talent of the British people is liberated from the forces of conservatism that so long have held them back [...].* (1999)

(111) *To liberate Britain from the old class divisions, old structures, old prejudices, old ways of working and of doing things, that will not do in this world of change.* (1999)

(112) *And this will be a progressive future as long as we remember that the reason for our struggle against injustice has always been to liberate the individual.* (2005)

In the examples presented above, the Labour Party is introduced as rescuers of the nation *from the forces of conservatism*, as liberators from *the old class divisions* and all obsolete things which do not correspond to the new state being created on the basis of the Labour changes. The liberation idea is

based on the verb *to liberate*, which attributes all positive features to the party–rescuer and evokes positive connotations. Therefore, it also expresses negative connotations of the party–opponent and reveals the open conflict between the concepts of *WE* and *THEY*. The conflict idea is also expressed by the noun *struggle* (see example (112)) which reflects the characteristics of a tough war requiring tremendous power and thus, with the help of the possessive pronoun *our*, grants the Labour Party more merits.

In a speech delivered in 2000, Blair attributes the *saviour* characteristic to the Conservatives. However, in the speech context it acquires only negative connotations because it is related to the opponents’ self-interest:

(113) [...] *how could a healthy body politic defend the political privileges of hereditary peers [...].* (2000)

Although example (113) does not directly indicate who defends the privileges of peers, every British citizen, or any person interested in the British political situation, can be sure that this abstract presentation of the politician advocating such privileges is meant to implicate the Conservative Party.

Another conceptual metaphor that prevails in Blair’s political discourse is POLITICS IS A JOURNEY. According to Cibulskienė (2005), the two major parties in the UK (Labour and the Conservatives) conceptualize social life and politics with the help of *journey* lexis. Systematic metaphorical expressions presuppose the usage of the POLITICS IS A JOURNEY metaphor in the political and social life of Great Britain.

The linguistic metaphors determined by the conceptual metaphor reveal the idea that the path of Labour leads forward, towards changes and progress, while the Conservatives either put obstacles in the path or, worse, attempting to change its direction, to turn it back.

The conceptual metaphor POLITICS IS A JOURNEY and its forward direction are evident in the following statements:

(114) *I can go one way. I’ve not got a reverse gear.*(2003)

(115) *This is our challenge. To stride forward where we have always previously stumble.* (2003)

(116) *The British people aren't a people on the way down.* (2005)

Example (114) illustrates that Blair talks only about himself, introduces himself as an active action subject and characterizes himself as a strong-minded person. In this case it is possible to observe a meaning relation with the *strength* concept, because a strong-minded person does not renounce his attitude and cannot be stopped by any difficulties. The next example, with the help of the pronoun *we*, attributes the metaphor of moving forward to all the members of the Labour Party. The complexity of this motion is introduced through the noun *challenge*, which is also related to the already mentioned pronoun, revealing the fact that the situation requires tremendous effort. However, the members of the Labour Party are able to tackle the *challenge*. In the last statement the direction of movement is changed – instead of a way forward, the implication of a way up is evident. This expresses and complements the positive nature of such a *journey*.

The way forward or up is inseparable from the way leading to various Labour achievements, and presents the representatives of the latter party as the first people to have chosen such a way:

(117) *Standing up for Britain means [...] moving Europe closer to the USA [...].* (2000)

(118) *We've never been here before. We've never come this far.* (2003)

The positive nature of the Labour actions is presented through an indication of the distance of the way: *We've never come this far*. This expresses the first Labour term through one hundred years and predicts a second term of office. These words express the positive connotation of the *journey*, revealing the idea that the way chosen by the Labour Party seems proper and attractive to the electorate. Moreover, these words, which indicate that particular actions have been completed, enable the target audience to

perceive Blair as an active action subject. Example (117) introduces one of the aims of this forward *journey*: to move Europe closer to the USA, which in the broad context of politics is perceived as the leader of the world. This once again supports the positive connotation of the way forward metaphor.

In the context of conflict communication with the Conservatives, the conceptual metaphor POLITICS IS A JOURNEY determines linguistic metaphors which enable Blair to treat his opponents as obstacles in the path of progress:

(119) [...] *where the closed doors of snobbery and prejudice, ignorance and poverty, fear and injustice no longer bar our way to fulfillment.*(1999)

(120) *Britain has the potential to be the bridge between Europe and America and for the 21st century the narrow- minded isolationism of right- wing Tories should not block our path to fulfilling it.* (1999)

(121) *At every age, at every stage, education is the surest guarantee of a fair future. At every age and every stage we are breaking down the barriers that hold people back.* (2003)

(122) *So Mr Howard's policies aren't going anywhere.* (2005)

Only in examples (120) and (122) are the exact opponents *right-wing Tories* and their representative Mr. Howard indicated, where they are treated as obstacles in the way that leads to the future. In the other examples the opponents are implicated with the help of the following phrases: *the closed doors of snobbery and prejudice, ignorance, etc.; the barriers that hold people back*. The negative connotations of the *journey* are evoked by the verbs attributed to the opponents: *bar, block, hold, aren't going* and the noun *barriers*. On the other hand, the positive direction of Labour's *way to fulfillment* is contrasted with the negative actions of the Conservatives. In this context, *fulfillment* is related to positive Labour changes and reforms. Therefore, the oppositions expressed through linguistic metaphors create a positive image of the governing party and, conversely, a negative image of the opposition party.

Looking back on Blair's political discourse, it is evident that he perceives his country as a building; it is thus possible to analyse one more

conceptual metaphor, THE STATE IS A BUILDING. All construction of any kind of building starts from laying foundations. As a result, the Prime Minister associates his politics regarding the state with strong foundations:

(123) *I do say the foundations of a New Britain are being laid.* (1999)

(124) *We laid foundations.* (2003)

Example (123) contains the implication that the Labour Party is laying the foundations of a New Britain, because the concept of New Britain belongs to the political Labour discourse and it is related to their actions and governing. As 1997 is the start of the Labour governing period, the Present Continuous tense is used in the phrase *foundations are being laid*. The year 2003 marks the result complemented by the pronoun *we*: *We laid foundations*. These words should only evoke positive connotations because they implicate the idea that the state was weak until the Labourists came to power, because it did not have any foundations. As a result the foundation of the country is a merit of the Labour Party. This implication is supported by the following words, which directly express the idea and reveal the open conflict situation between the two competing parties:

(125) *David Cameron's Tories? [...] They haven't even laid the foundation stone.* (2006)

Linguistic expressions of conceptual metaphors formed on the basis of Blair's political discourse are used not only to compete with the Conservatives and to form a negative image of them, but they also add extra positive features to the image of the Labour Party.

The conceptual metaphor analysis of Blair's conflict communication allows the following conclusions to be drawn:

1. The conceptual metaphors POLITICS IS WAR, POLITICS IS A JOURNEY and THE STATE IS A BUILDING prevail in Blair's political discourse.

2. In the speeches delivered by this politician, the conceptual metaphors generally typical of political discourse are realized. It is possible to observe that a conceptual metaphor has an evaluative potential – the evaluations expressed through linguistic metaphors and belonging to the same conceptual metaphor may differ and acquire both positive and negative connotations.

3. In Blair's political discourse, the opposition *WE–THEY* is actualized through metaphors. Through the metaphor *POLITICS IS WAR* Blair presents himself and the Labour Party as the protectors and liberators of the state and its citizens, while the opponents are presented as enemies. Through the metaphor *THE STATE IS A BUILDING*, the idea that the members of the Labour Party have laid and strengthened the foundations of the state while the Conservatives did nothing is expressed. The conceptual metaphor *POLITICS IS A JOURNEY* allows Blair to use linguistic metaphors with positive and negative evaluations. Therefore, the Labour way forward is evaluated positively and the opponents are treated as obstacles slowing progress along the way.

4. Conceptual metaphors, which are the basis for text creation, allow Blair to attribute the features of a good leader to his own personality through linguistic metaphors. His opponents are saddled with bad, stuck-in-the-middle and even dangerous characteristics.

2.3.OPPOSITIONS AND THEIR MEMBER NOMINATIONS IN THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF GORDON BROWN

In 2007, Gordon Brown replaced Tony Blair as the Prime Minister of Great Britain. Therefore, it is very important to analyse his political discourse and the methods he used in his conflict communication.

This politician continued the implementation of his predecessor's ideas, which were based on a social democratic ideology. Similarly, the Conservative Party remained as his political opponents. This part of the dissertation poses the question of whether Brown uses the same means in his conflict communication as Blair did; whether they are conditioned by his

ideology; and how, on the whole, they characterize Labour rhetoric in comparison with the linguistic expressions of Conservative discourse.

At the beginning of his career as Prime Minister, Gordon Brown mainly focused on the issue of change which had already been widely escalated by the previous political leader, Blair. As a result, the first domain to be analysed is *change*.

The widest and the most important opposite meaning fields are *new-old*. Brown does not break the tradition introduced by his predecessor of associating everything that is new with the Labour Party and its ideology and, correspondingly, everything that is old or stuck in the middle with its rival the Conservative Party. According to Brown, the Labour Party was formed and it presented and applied its new type of politics with the help of new and progressive methods of governing. The counterposition of such adjectives as *new-old* in a political context is always beneficial for that party which identifies itself as new, modern and different, because it promises to change the major fields of social and political life. *New politics* are generally more attractive than the *old*, as even the term itself means something better than the previous. In his political discourse, this Prime Minister uses this concept to contrast the images of Labour and the Conservatives and to emphasize the gap between their ideologies in the eyes of society:

(126) *It is because I believe that the big challenges we face as a country - security, global competition, climate change, rising aspirations, the desire for stronger, safer, more sustainable communities - can no longer be solved by the old politics.* (2007)

(127) *And it is where the new progressive consensus will be built so that we can meet the challenges of change for the long term national interest of the country. Quite simply it rejects the old politics of dividing people, not uniting them; of quick fixes not long term solutions.* (2007)

From the examples presented above, it becomes evident that Brown in his discourse directly characterizes his opponents as representatives of the *old* meaning field: *the old politics, the old politics of dividing people*. Although the

opponents are not directly indicated, the opponent implication becomes evident with the help of the latter meaning field.

According to Brown, the Labour Party is the founder of a new Britain:

(128) *Indeed as I travel around the country outside Whitehall and Westminster I see in social enterprise, in local environmental action, in new forms of neighbourhood engagement and in non-governmental organisations such as make poverty history, a new Britain that is being born. A Britain that we must recognise and celebrate.* (2007)

In this example it is possible to observe that in the phrase *make poverty history*, *poverty* is identified with *old politics*. It is important to emphasize that Labour rhetoric has been characterized as socialist; this was also reflected in Blair's ideas, where human rights were treated as the main value and the common people were opposed to the privileged. In the latter example it is evident that Brown exchanges direct socialist rhetorical oppositions for euphemisms.

Brown's application of the *old* meaning field to the Conservative Party helps him to continue the formation of the negative image of the opposition which had been created by Blair throughout the decade. This may be illustrated by the following statements:

(129) *And I believe I am not alone in thinking normal politics, this old tired sloganising politics of the past, should not resume in the old ways this autumn.* (2007)

(130) *But I believe that the evidence shows that the depths of our new concerns cannot be met by the shallowness of an old-style politics. And the breadth of the new challenges cannot be met by the narrowness of the old tired political discourse.* (2007)

Versus:

(131) *So I believe that we need new ways of reaching out. New ways of listening to people. New ways of consulting on new ideas. New ways of engaging in a dialogue and deliberation. And thus new ways of building our democracy for the future.* (2007)

Analysis of the examples presented above gives the impression that Brown not only continues the political performance of his predecessor, but also employs the same methods, such as counterposition of the Labour and the Conservative Parties *WE–THEY* in his conflict communication. That is a natural result of the ideological contraposition. The Labour Party is effectively shown to be open to new, modern methods of governing which will help to improve the life of the state, while at the same time it is emphasized that the opponents are tired. These words of Brown lead to the conclusion that the Conservatives are not so bad that they could not govern the state. Brown's predecessor Blair did not characterize the Conservatives in this way. However, from the analysis of these meaning fields it becomes evident that Brown differs from his predecessor even while employing the same methods of conflict communication. In this research, Blair was disclosed as an active action subject. Brown in his discourse does not indicate particular actions; instead, the verb *believe* prevails. This verb enables the target audience to perceive this politician as a mental subject.

It is important to point out that Brown does not directly indicate who or what stands behind the epithets *new* and *old politics*, but this implication can be easily perceived; it is obvious from the examples already analysed that the Prime Minister associates everything *new* with the Labour Party and everything *old* with the Conservative Party. This politician's conflict communication with his competitors presents his politics as consensus politics where there is no division into privileged and ordinary people. Moreover, the counterposition between Brown, his predecessor and the Conservatives may be noticed in the following words:

(132) A politics built on consensus, not division. A politics built on engaging with people, not excluding them. A politics that draws on the widest range of talents and expertise, not the narrow circles of power. This is the politics of the mainstream centre ground in Britain. It is a politics that takes a hard look at the tough questions, not the easy path of short-term slogans. It is the politics of the common ground and draws upon the common sense of the British people. And it is where the new progressive consensus will be built so that we can meet the challenges of change for the long term national

interest of the country. Quite simply it rejects the old politics of dividing people, not uniting them; of quick fixes not long term solutions. It means debating issues, like housing, crime, the NHS and schools, that affect local communities directly, not just in the corridors of power, but in the country. (2007)

In this extract, the *WE–THEY* reference is changed because Brown talks about the whole nation. In this case almost every sentence contains direct *WE–THEY* counterpositions in which the agents (*WE*) are only implied, while *THEY* are obvious. The actions are expressed openly: *WE* invoke *consensus*, *THEY* invoke *division*, *WE* engage people, *THEY* exclude, *WE* are for equality, *THEY* are for representation of *the narrow circles of power*, *WE* act, *THEY* use *short-term slogans*.

The next statement, which brings up the idea of uniting people, again reveals the contrast between Brown's rhetoric and Blair's sharp rhetoric:

(133) So we must be open to new ideas and be ready to take them on, from wherever they come. Change happens when we involve people who are rarely involved beyond the opportunity to cast a vote at elections. Change happens when we enhance rather than constrain democracy at the local grassroots level. So I believe that we need new ways of reaching out. New ways of listening to people. New ways of consulting on new ideas. New ways of engaging in a dialogue and deliberation. And thus new ways of building our democracy for the future. I want to propose ways of reaching out today. Reaching out so that voices outside my party are heard. And that means voices outside normal political processes, for politics cannot resume in new ways without recognising the need to engage people of no party as well. (2007)

These statements prove the conclusion that has already been advanced, namely, that Brown is more discreet and reserved in his conflict communication with the competitors. Furthermore, his advisory tone enables the target audience to perceive him as a mental rather than an action (or very energetic) subject. Brown does not specify the old and unhelpful methods of the Conservatives, instead leaving space for the target audience to draw its own conclusions. On the other hand, these conclusions can only be homologous as all *new* methods are presented as having been introduced by the Labour Party.

Another set of meaning fields that can be analysed in the *change* domain is *progress–stuck-in-the-middle*. The latter political leader nominates his party as *progressive* and the opponent party as *stuck-in-the-middle*. This is one more way to attract the electorate's attention, to prove that the citizens were correct in their support of the Labour Party and, at the same time, to diminish the competitors on the basis of their conservatism and unwillingness to change.

The meaning field of *progressive changes* may be observed in the following examples:

(134) [...] *our agenda for change, our ambition for this new age.* (2008)

(135) *Our purpose has always been to be the party of progressive change. [...] As the world changes so we must change too.* (2007).

(136) *So this is the next chapter in our progress* (2007)

(137) *In that classroom our mission for change was as clear and strong [...].* (2007)

(138) *And just as our policies must change to meet new challenges, so too our party must change.* (2007)

(139) *Because when I take office on Wednesday I will heed and lead the call of change.* (2007)

The concept of *progress* presented in the statements above is expressed through the noun *progress*, the adjective *progressive* and the noun *change* (which is itself closely related to *progress*). The fact that *progress* and *change* are exclusively Labour merits is revealed by the pronoun *our*, which appears more frequently in all these statements than the pronoun *we*. Moreover, in these cases Brown is again perceived as a mental subject: the phrases *we must change*, *our policies must change* do not describe particular actions, but simply suggest their necessity.

The *change* domain includes meaning fields which could be perceived as a result of a new type of politics. *Changes* are perceived as reforms;

therefore, the new opposition *reformers–anti-reformers*, including such concepts as reforms in various fields of social life, the future and innovations, appears in the latter domain.

Brown continues the work started by the previous Prime Minister Blair and focuses on the reforms in two major fields – education and the health service. Like his predecessor, he emphasizes the 21st century and associates these reforms with the bright future of British society:

(140) [...] *we will move ahead with radical reforms to create a 21st century NHS personal to people's needs.* (2008)

(141) *And as we expand specialist, trust and academy schools it's also time to make the biggest change in education in decades, a ten year children's plan to make our schools, colleges and universities world class.*

Instead of education from 5 to 16, we will be offering free universal education to every child – from nursery school at 3 to advanced studies or training right up to 18. In just one decade we are doing what no government has ever done: moving the right to education from 11 years free education to 15 years. (2007)

(142) *So for every apprentice, a certificate of completion. For every college or school student, A-levels and diplomas and for all a clear pathway into skilled work. [...] So when the big new changes we are now making are fully in place, 300,000 students will receive full grants. 600,000 – that's two thirds of students - will have grants. That's the change: more students with grants than at any time in the history of university education.* (2007)

(143) *So let me set out how we take the NHS into a new era.* (2007)

The presented examples show that the members of the Labour Party identify themselves as *reformers* who are turning the state into a perfect place to live. This effect is reinforced by constant use of the pronoun *we*. The employment of such phrases as *we are doing what no government has ever done, more students with grants than at any time in the history of university education, and we take the NHS into a new era* implies that the previous government did very little or even nothing for their citizens, and helps to create a contrast between the two ideologies. Moreover, it helps to imply that a party comparable to *WE* has not yet existed.

In 2008, Brown starts to use stronger words, such as the modal verb *must*, while focusing on reforms in his political discourse:

(144) [...] *we must create:*

- *a new economic policy [...]*
- *a new social and welfare policy of rights and responsibilities [...]*
- *a programme of new education reforms [...]*
- *a new politics [...]*
- *and new personalised public services [...]* (2008).

The Prime Minister characterizes the reforms that have been introduced by his party as *pioneer* and actualizes this idea through the adjective *new* related to social and economic politics.

Sometimes the *pioneer* meaning field is replaced by the adjective *first*, which has essentially the same meaning:

(145) *And next week for the first time on top of holiday entitlement 4 days paid public holidays guaranteed.* (2007)

(146) *And for the first time in nearly half a century we will show the imagination to build new towns - eco-towns with low and zero carbon homes.* (2007)

(147) *And I am proud that Britain will now become the first country in the world to write into law binding limits on carbon emissions.* (2007)

In Brown's political discourse, the meaning field of being *first* bears positive connotations because it is related to beneficial and positive changes. Moreover, the phrase *for the first time* implies a *WE–THEY* opposition because it contrasts *OUR* merits with *THEIR* disability or disinclination for activity.

Reforms are frequently associated with a revolution which marks some change and the start of something new. Brown's political discourse is no exception – the *revolution* characteristic is widely used when talking about reforms. Moreover, it supports the *pioneer* idea:

(148) *To lead and succeed in this new world, we in Britain must achieve for our era our own revolution - a revolution of rising opportunity and aspiration.* (2007)

(149) *All this is part of the revolution in services for parents and the under fives: now 7,000 extended schools, moving from zero to 3,500 sure start children's centres, the doubling of nursery education – two-thirds of a million more child care places. (2007)*

(150) *Now we have to move to the next stage of the Opportunity Revolution and provide lifelong educational opportunity, and not just for some but for all. (2007)*

(151) *So now we must move to the next stage of the Opportunity Revolution and start to ensure that not just the few but the many can have access if they need it to the benefits of personal tuition.(2007)*

(152) *But now facing the global skills challenge we must move to the next stage of the Opportunity Revolution: ensure that everyone looking for work has not only the information they need but direct personal support and continuous retraining in the skills they need for the jobs of the future, and as a result decent well-paid jobs. (2007)*

The examples presented above enable the target audience to observe that the Prime Minister specially emphasizes one type of *revolution* in his political discourse – *the Opportunity Revolution*. The members of the Labour Party are socialists, therefore they treat *revolution* as a value, but British society is traditionally conservative and this value may not be acceptable for it. The fact that Brown was not re-elected for a second term and that his leadership marked the end of Labour government suggests that *revolution* did not turn out to be acceptable for the British.

The Opportunity Revolution provides a basis for the meaning fields *opportunity–self-interest*, which can also be found in Brown's conflict communication. Naturally, the members of the Labour Party perceive themselves as a party of *opportunity* and introduce their competitors as a party of *self-interest*.

(153) *And only progressive forces in our country - only New Labour - can open up the opportunities, remove the barriers created by privilege, and equip all our people to make the most of their abilities. (2007)*

(154) *And today I want to confirm my profound confidence about what Britain can achieve in the future, to say that these changes, whilst bringing insecurities, also herald the greatest of opportunities.* (2008)

(155) *And opportunity for all that must start at birth: by giving all young children the best springboard from which to soar.* (2008)

(156) *So let me explain why only the Labour Party has the seriousness of purpose, the hunger for change, the passion for spreading opportunity, the mission of justice for all that can meet the rising ambitions of this new age.* (2008)

Brown understands the situation in the country and society's attitude towards change; therefore, he emphasizes the *opportunity* characteristic attributed to the Labour Party by adding the very strong and important adjective *only*, which may have a rhetorical effect in conflict communication as it enables the speaker to give the Labour Party prominence, to depict it as the best. On the other hand, this adjective is very beneficial in degrading the opponents by showing that there is *only* one Party which cares about the opportunities of British citizens. This contrast between the two parties taking part in the conflict communication is illustrated by the following examples, taken from Brown's speech in the Spring Conference (2008) in Birmingham:

(157) *And this is the difference between the two parties, at the very time when to meet the challenge of change we need more opportunity not less: [...].* (2008)

(158) *In truth it's photo opportunities for themselves the Conservatives seek; it's opportunities for the people of Britain that we seek.* (2008)

The *self-interest* characteristic applied to the Conservatives is based on a contrast drawn between the two parties as in example (157). There is no direct indication of the competing party, but the pronoun *we*, which stands for the Labour Party in Brown's political discourse, is present. It is thus immediately clear which party he has in mind when drawing this contrast. Another example, which apparently illustrates the *self-interest* meaning field, contains a direct accusation leveled at the Conservatives for being interested only in their own welfare.

In order to emphasize the significance of the *opportunity–self-interest* meaning fields, the Prime Minister draws a contrast between two centuries. *This century* stands for the government of the Labour Party and is associated with *opportunities*, while *the last century* is perceived as the century of the Conservatives, their *self-interest* and the corresponding lack of opportunities. Thus, the opposition *new/future–old/past* is again connoted:

(159) *In Britain today too many still cannot rise as far as their talents can take them.*

Yet this is the century where our country cannot afford to waste the talents of anyone.

Up against the competition of two billion people in China and India, we need to unlock all the talent we have. In the last century the question was can we afford to do this? In the face of economic challenge, I say: in this century we cannot afford not to.

And the country that brings out the best in all its people will be the great success story of the global age. (2007)

(160) *And we all know how the absence of opportunity, denying as the Tories cruelly did to millions the basic right to work, can damage and destroy lives. (2007)*

In example (159), the sentence *In the last century the question was can we afford to do this?* indirectly expresses a conflict because *the last century* in the Labour rhetoric is associated with the Conservative government. Moreover, in this context the verb *to unlock* connotes the concept of a prison and makes the Labourists seem to be liberators. It is a continuation of Blair's rhetoric, only it reimagines the Conservatives as jailers rather than oppressors. The next example, (160), directly expresses the ideological conflict between the Labour Party and the Conservatives by indicating the negative actions of the latter party.

The *change* domain contains other meaning fields which are also closely related to the *revolution* and *opportunity* meaning fields and could be defined as *future* (or *bright future*)–*past*. In this opposition *future* stands for the Labour Party and *past* for the Conservative Party:

(161) *In the last century there were five Speakers Conferences. Each looked at different aspects of the electoral process – reform of the franchise, the distribution of parliamentary seats, registration of electors, and other such matters.*

Today I am proposing to the Speaker that he calls a conference to consider, against the backdrop of a decline in turnout, a number of important issues, such as electoral registration, weekend voting, and the representation of women and ethnic minorities in the House of Commons. (2007)

In this example, conflict is expressed through opposition where one member, the Labour Party has a positive evaluation whereas the other, the Conservatives, a negative evaluation. All expressions revealing this opposition may be considered as part of the conflict.

Future–past meaning fields are also successfully expressed by the employment of contrast. They reveal the conflict situation existing between the competing parties. This conflict is expressed through the counterposition of the different periods *past century–today*. Brown contrasts the demerits of the previous party in the past with the positive changes that are going to be introduced in the future by the Labour Party:

(162) *I believe Britain has been held back too long by three great failings in our political system:*

- *that political parties have not reached out enough to the people, so we have to rise to the challenge of forging a better party politics;*
- *that the political system too often ignores or neglects the new ideas that flow from outside Westminster and often in the past has failed to listen and learn, so we have to rise to the challenge of opening up our political system to new ideas;*
- *and that our participatory democracy is too weak at a local level, so we have to rise to the new challenge of engagement. (2007)*

All implied demerits of the Conservatives and *THEIR* system are contrasted with the actions that are to be taken by the Labour Party, *US*. In this way a clear line is drawn between the two parties once again. This line should help the target audience to form the corresponding opinion as to which of the sides involved in the conflict is positive and which is negative. Moreover, in these statements the advice *we have to rise to the challenge* appears to reveal

the indecision of the latter politician. However, these ideas were expressed early in his career, and it is natural that Brown simply indicates what should be done. Furthermore, such words may also proclaim a conflict with Blair, because it is possible to understand that Brown's predecessor did not take the necessary actions.

The *bright future* meaning field is expressed through the promises given by this political leader to families using the key *family* concept words *families, children, parents*. The decision is not a random one; family is one of the main values in every society, and the focus on family issues makes the Labour Party more attractive to the electorate and can provide more support and votes during elections:

(163) [...] *for individual families to escape the daily injustices of poverty – I propose new Contracts out of Poverty. Matching new opportunities to support their children with new responsibilities to take up work, to acquire new skills, to make the most of their lives.*

Support for parents who undergo a skills audit and take up training to improve their job prospects. Ensuring that work pays and is a route out of poverty for couples and lone parents. Individual contracts between families and government showing in this generation the power of opportunity to change lives for good. (2007)

The verb *propose*, used in example (163), once again allows us to presume that the Prime Minister is indecisive, not active, and that he shirks responsibility for his own actions.

The *equality–inequality* meaning fields can be also analysed in the *change* domain of Brown's conflict communication. The Prime Minister supposes that under the Conservative government, people were treated with inequality, while the Labour Party has totally changed the situation, abrogated inequality and laid the foundations for an equal and hierarchy-free society. These opposite meaning fields once again provide a basis for the formation of a positive Labour and a negative Conservative image. This can easily be observed in the following examples:

(164) *I stand for a Britain where every young person who has it in them to study at college or university should not be prevented by money from doing so.* (2007)

(165) *A Government on the side of all the people, and not just some, is no longer only a matter of fairness and equality; it is the most powerful practical imperative because it is fundamental to our future prosperity.* (2007)

(166) *Unlocking not just some, but all of Britain's talent. Just think of the losses and injustices of past centuries. Yes, there was the creative genius of a few, but consider the tragedy of talents unrealised by the many: the books not written, the music not created, the art never seen, the science never advanced, the potential left buried. Yet think what we can achieve in our century if - instead of unlocking only some of the talent of some of the people - we are able for the first time to unlock all the talent of all our people.* (2007)

(167) *For we in New Labour are and have always been the party whose basic mission is to deliver opportunity not just for some but for all.* (2007)

(168) *I want our children and their children to say that in the first decades of the 21st century there lived a generation that built a Britain, where the talent you had mattered more than the title you held.* (2008)

(169) *In the old Britain, there was a view that only a minority needed the best education and the best skills, because there was only so much room at the top. But today with so many skilled jobs which are ours for the taking, those old assumptions can be buried forever.* (2008)

Statements such as these enable the target audience to see that the Labour leader associates *equality* with education, talent and human potential. He characterizes the Labour Party as one which stands for equal opportunities for every member of British society. According to surveys, such ideas are supported by 57–68% of the British. These surveys revealed the fact that thousands of unemployed people feel anger towards the rich. The *equality* characteristic is emphasized by the usage of such quantifiers as *every* and *all*. The Conservatives are indirectly characterized as the party responsible for *inequality*, because the latter party is implied by such expressions as *the old Britain, old assumptions, the title, a Government on the side of [...] just some*. This attitude is given even more prominence with the help of the imputation of inequality and hierarchy, and is perfectly reflected in the following speeches of

2007, delivered in a Labour conference, in National Council for Voluntary Organisations (NCVO) and in a speech published in *the Independent*:

(170) *But as a teenager I saw close friends of mine who might have gone to college or an apprenticeship or to university who never did. I know some could not to afford to stay on at school. For others, their potential had never been nurtured. When they heard about further education, they thought, or their parents thought, it was not for people like them.* (2007)

(171) *Half a century ago, housing became a national priority and there was a promise of a property-owning democracy, but then unfortunately it was just for a few.* (2007)

(172) *I do not agree with the old belief of half a century ago that we can issue commands from Whitehall and expect the world to change.* (2007)

The people responsible for hierarchy and *inequality* are not directly named, but they are implied with the help of the following phrases: *as a teenager, half a century ago, the old belief of half a century ago*, for these words point to the period of Conservative government. Open conflict between the Labour Party and the Conservatives is expressed with the words *I do not agree*. It is important to point out that in the first speech (see example (170)) delivered in the Labour conference, Brown approaches the common people through his use of the first person narrative and story of how he communicated with teenagers from poor families and remains close to them.

Although this research investigates only domestic politics, it cannot avoid covering other meaning fields related to the *change* domain. As Great Britain is changing and taking part in the speedy processes of globalization, its citizens have begun to perceive their country not as an isolated island but as a part of the European Union (EU). As a result, the meaning fields *pro-EU–anti-EU* can be analysed in Brown's political discourse:

(173) *And let me say: we in Britain cannot be good stewards of the environment unless we are good internationalists and that means being good Europeans too.* (2007)

(174) *We should not be throwing into question our future membership of the EU.* (2008)

The last example implies the Conservative position on the EU, as they are willing to organize a referendum on that issue. That is why their *anti-EU* characteristic is expressed through the noun *question*. On the other hand, the vision of a stable, inflexible and isolated state is imprinted in the Conservative ideology itself.

The Labour leader, Brown, declares that the changes taking place under his leadership by the Labour Party are very beneficial for the state and the society, so the *change* domain provides the basis for the formation of another large domain of *benefit*. This domain includes such issues as power, stable economic and social politics, security, fairness, order, reliability, etc.

The first meaning fields to be analysed in this domain are *rescuers–damagers*. As this is conflict communication aimed at creating a positive Labour and a negative Conservative image, *rescuers* are associated with the leading Party and *damagers* with the opposition.

(175) *But we in the Labour Party believe not just in the power of opportunity to change lives, but something more, we believe in the power of compassion to save lives.* (2007)

(176) *We have lifted 600,000 children out of poverty. We are doubling child benefits. We have trebled maternity allowances. And 6 million families now benefit from the Child Tax Credit. None of this happened before a Labour Government.* (2007)

The last sentence of the latter example contains the implication that the Conservative Party did not perform any actions beneficial to British society. This statement is also an indirect accusation that Labour's opponents actually damaged the state by taking no action to transform the stiff political and social situation. Brown likes to enumerate all the beneficial actions of the Labour government coinciding with the actions initiated by his predecessor Blair in his political discourse:

(177) *And the Pre Budget Report will set out our next steps because our goal for this generation is to abolish child poverty and let me reaffirm that goal today. (2007)*

(178) *So yes we will strengthen the police. Yes we will strengthen our laws. [...] Bullying is unacceptable – and unacceptable too is disrupting a classroom. So to punish: we will give teachers the support they need to exclude. To prevent: parents held accountable – fined if they fail to supervise. And so that these young people are not left to hang around street corners, councils and authorities obligated to maintain their education and supervision. Binge drinking and underage drinking that disrupt neighbourhoods are unacceptable.*

To punish: let me tell the shops that repeatedly sell alcohol to those who are under age – we will take your licences away.

To prevent: councils should use new powers to ban alcohol in trouble spots and I call on the industry to do more to advertise the dangers of teenage drinking.

[...] As we take action against anti-social behaviour, so too we must take action that could transform our communities, by providing the kind of facilities young people want and need.

So we will use unclaimed assets in dormant bank accounts to build new youth centres, and we will invest over £670 million pounds so that in every community there are places for young people to go. (2007)

(179) *So this is my pledge to the British people:*

I will not let you down.

I will stand up for our schools and our hospitals.

I will stand up for British values.

I will stand up for a strong Britain. (2007)

The *rescuers* meaning field, attributed to the Labour Party and personally to its leader and his actions, is actualized through the key words *I will stand up* and *strong Britain*. In order to emphasize the beneficial nature of Labour actions, Brown invites action (see example (178)), which adds extra stringency and tone to his words. Moreover, for the first time this politician transforms himself from a passive mental subject into an active action subject, as he does not only prompt for others to perform, but he also indicates particular actions that he is going to take.

In contrast with the *benefit* domain and the *rescuers* meaning field, the Prime Minister forms a *damage* characteristic by enumerating all the negative and non-beneficial actions performed by the Conservative government:

(180) *And in Britain where once there were three million unemployed, there are today more men and women in jobs than ever in our history - for the first time over 29 million people in work.* (2007)

(181) *But don't just listen to what they say, or what i say, look at what they do. I don't need to tell anybody here that round the country, Tory councillors are cutting the very services upon which we all depend.* (2008)

(182) *We will deliver educational maintenance allowances for one quarter of a million teenagers can stay on at school, the Conservatives will cut them. We will double apprenticeships even when the Conservatives oppose this. We will provide free education to 18 even when the Conservatives don't support it. And we want half of young people to have the chance of university, while the Conservatives believe more means worse.* (2008)

Direct accusation and an especially negative attitude towards the Conservative Party are expressed in example (182). The negative image is heightened with the help of contrast. Here *WE* (the Labour Party) are presented as a power concerned with benefitting all citizens, while the *damage* caused by the opponents is expressed in words with negative connotations: *will cut*, *oppose*, *believe more means worse*. Example (181) contains an *I/WE-THEY* model which was especially popular in Blair's political discourse. As discussed above, this model helps to create distance between two opponents and to indicate that *THEY* are strangers who do not belong to society; thus, *THEIR* decisions cannot be beneficial. The *rescuers-damagers* characteristic in example (180) is formed with the help of the *change* domain, as it indicates change in the social area. Here the damaging role of the Conservatives is expressed with the help of the Past Simple tense, as the members of the Labour Party characterize them as *the past*. The Labourists are associated with *today* and are presented as the *rescuers* of society from unemployment by emphasizing their *pioneer* feature once again with the help of their favourite phrase, *for the first time*.

The *benefit* domain includes these meaning fields: *new beneficial social and economic politics–economic shortsightedness*. It has already been concluded that in Labour’s political discourse, the *new* characteristic is attributed exclusively to Labour itself; therefore, it is very easy to understand which parties these characteristics are associated with.

(183) *Ten years ago before a Labour government we were 7th in the G7 for income per head. Now we are second only to the USA - above Germany, above France, above Italy, above Japan, above Canada - with the longest uninterrupted period of economic growth in the history of our country.* (2007)

(184) *Creating and sustaining a strong economy will always be our starting point so that everyone can plan safely for the future. Let us all be proud that this month, in the eleventh year of a New Labour government, Alistair Darling has been able to announce that Britain has more men and women in work than at any time in the history of our country. The Conservatives said a minimum wage would cost 2 million jobs, but we have created and then every year raised the minimum wage and at the same time created 3 million jobs.* (2008)

(185) *And whilst New Labour will always get the right balance between public service investment, affordable tax cuts, and economic stability, the country has learnt only this week, the truth from the Conservative front bench, that their billions of pounds of tax cuts, will be paid for by billions of pounds of spending cuts, in our vital public services.* (2008)

These examples show how conflict communication is enabled with the help of contrasting and drawing parallels between the Labour and the Conservative Parties. Here Brown employs his favourite cliché, in which he initially introduces all the beneficial points and transformations introduced by the party under his leadership, only to contrast them with a totally different Conservative picture. Statement (183) contains the PM’s favourite implication, in which the words *Ten years ago before a Labour government* stand for the eternal opponents of the Labour Party and their detrimental performance.

Finally, the meaning fields *new beneficial social and economic politics–economic shortsightedness* are intensified by the usage of the adjective *strong* and the noun *strength*, applied by Brown when talking about the Labour economic politics:

(186) *And everything we build – we build on a strong foundation of economic stability.* (2007)

(187) *And it is because of the strength of the British economy that we are able to steer a path of low inflation, low interest rates and stable growth.* (2007)

Another pair of meaning fields, *reliable–unreliable*, can be traced in the *benefit* domain that exists in Brown's conflict communication. These meaning fields are closely related to *new–old / future–past* and they show that in the past the electorate did not trust the government, as it does now. This statement creates tension between the two competing parties by depicting one of them as superior to the other. *Reliability* in Brown's political discourse is closely related to the *democracy* meaning field, which is also associated with the Labour Party:

(188) *Citizens juries are not a substitute for representative democracy but an enrichment of it. And the challenge of reviving local democracy can only be met if we build new forms of citizen involvement in our local services and new ways of holding them to account.*

So as we expand opportunities for deliberation, we must extend democratic participation in our localities.

I want to see a vibrant, reinvigorated local democracy [...]. (2007)

(189) *Party politics remains at the heart of our representative democracy because it reflects inevitable differences of values and principles and because it is fundamental to citizens to have a clear choice of programmes and policies.* (2007)

In order to meet the electorate's hopes and trust or even to gain more support from it, the Labour leader presents the party's ideology as being democratic, beneficial for the citizens and, as a result, trustworthy. Brown's phrase (see example (188)) *reviving local democracy* is very significant as it implies the idea that in Great Britain, which is the homeland of democracy, democracy was lost during the Conservative governing. Therefore, the Labour Party had to revive it. This positive image is opposed by introducing a *narrowness of democratic word* meaning field, attributed to the Conservative Party within *democracy* context:

(190) *And the breadth of the new challenges cannot be met by the narrowness of the old tired political discourse.* (2007)

In this case of conflict communication Brown employs a negative Conservative image with the help of implication. Here *narrowness of the old tired political discourse* stands for the Conservative ideology and drops the target audience the hint that the latter party is too tired to do anything for the benefit and welfare of its state.

The *narrowness of democratic word* meaning field leads to other oppositions in the *benefit* domain: *openness/identity with the society–distance*. The Labour leader identifies himself with all the citizens of Great Britain and points out that he is also a member of society, that he is an equal of every citizen of the state:

(191) *And these are the principles which I believe can guide us as we, the British people, meet all the new challenges ahead [...].* (2007)

(192) *And because your concerns are my passions and personal priorities, I will work tirelessly to deliver for you.* (2008)

In the presented examples, Brown relates society's needs and values to his own. He talks about political performance as if it were love by using the word *passion*, and creates an attractive *MY–YOUR, I–WE* model which is in contrast to the *WE–THEY* model. This issue is further emphasized by the introduction of two similar sentences, in which one statement implies the *distant* nature of the Conservative government and depicts the Labour Party as a representative of the ideology of *openness*:

(193) *In the old days when politicians went round the country the principal method of communication was party political speeches from a platform. More recently as political meetings withered, politicians went round the country offering to do question and answer sessions.* (2007)

This contrast between closed communication with citizens, including political speeches and question-and-answer sessions, and open communication, including the open discussion of problems, is intended to signal a large gap

between the two parties involved in the conflict communication. It is aimed at creating corresponding images of these parties, because it introduces the Labour Party as a party of every citizen, while the Conservative Party is presented as distant from society, from its life and problems.

This stereotype is reinforced by another opposition, *support–destruction*:

(194) *And let me thank our Welsh Assembly members, our Welsh MPs, our Welsh MEPs – Glenys and Eluned, and our Welsh councillors. Because of this partnership over 100,000 compensation payments have been made to former miners and their families as part of the Miners' Compensation Schemes as we honour the dignity of our former miners who were so cruelly denied any compensation under the Tories.* (2007)

(195) *And it is where the new progressive consensus will be built so that we can meet the challenges of change for the long term national interest of the country. Quite simply it rejects the old politics of dividing people, not uniting them; of quick fixes not long term solutions.* (2007)

The examples presented above disclose one more feature of the Conservatives as perceived by the Labour leader. Brown characterizes them as a *destructive power* in his political discourse. The usage of such phrases as *so cruelly denied* and *old politics of dividing people* is felicitous in the conflict communication, for it enables the Prime Minister to form the intended negative image of the opponents, to add more positive features to the Party under his leadership and to gain more support from society.

The *benefit* domain also contains a non-opposite *fairness/justice* meaning field attributed by the Prime Minister to the Labour Party. Fair government and a fair society are two of the cornerstones of a strong state, and Brown associates his government with *fairness/justice*:

(196) *For half a century Labour governments have pursued policies that combine economic prosperity and social justice.* (2007)

(197) *And we must be far clearer in speaking up for the common ground upon which we stand - the shared British values of liberty, civic duty and fairness to all.* (2007)

(198) *So let me explain why only the Labour Party has the seriousness of purpose, the hunger for change, the passion for spreading opportunity, the mission of justice for all that can meet the rising ambitions of this new age.* (2008)

In example (198), Brown uses the phrase *so let me*, which addresses society directly and requests its permission to act. This once again emphasizes the Prime Minister's indecision and enables the target audience to perceive him as a less active subject who does not have imperative intonations. The phrase *we must be far clearer in speaking* employed in another statement performs the same function.

The *power* domain may also be observed in Brown's political discourse. This domain reflects and emphasizes the strength of the Labour Party and the weakness of the Conservatives, and it is thus possible to determine *strength–weakness* meaning fields. There are various *strength* expressions in Brown's political discourse, both implied and direct. The implicit characteristic is related to the status of the English language as a world language, so proving the *strength* of Great Britain and, by association, the Labour government:

(199) *Because in Britain, with our international reach, our flexibility, our openness, our scientific creativity, our stability, our language - now the language of the world [...].*(2008)

The direct expression of this characteristic is conveyed by numerous repetitions of the noun *leader*:

(200) *As we set out on the next stage of our journey this is our vision: Britain leading the global economy – by our skills and creativity, by our enterprise and flexibility, by our investment in transport and infrastructure – a world leader in science; a world leader in financial and business services; a world leader in energy and the environment from nuclear to renewables; a world leader in the creative industries; and yes – modern manufacturing too – drawing on the talents of all to create British jobs for British workers.* (2007)

Brown's frequent repetition of the noun *leader* may be meant to strengthen the British society's confidence in both the current government and

in society itself, in the consciousness of the addressee. It should help citizens to perceive themselves as the leaders of the world, realizing that this success is the result of the Labour government and was impossible during the reign of the Conservative Party. This idea is reinforced by the following implication:

(201) *And there is no weakness in Britain today that cannot be overcome by the strengths of the British people.* (2007)

The adverb *today* is of special importance in the latter context, as it is very closely related to the performance of the Labour Party and conveys the idea that Great Britain is stronger today than it was in the past. In other words, Britain is *strong* because the Labour Party is in power, and it was *weak* during the period of Conservative government period. Once again the proposition makes one party superior to the other.

It has been observed through the analysis of oppositions and their member nominations in Brown's speeches that:

1. Brown's conflict communication discourse, similarly to Blair's discourse, touches on two main political subjects – the Labour Party and the Conservatives. The denominations of these subjects are ideological in nature.

2. The Prime Minister, on the base of the *WE–THEY/OTHERS* model, attributes only positive features to the Labour Party and only negative ones to the Conservatives.

3. Domains of *change*, *benefit* and *power* are present in Brown's political discourse. They include meaning fields related to the welfare of society and its citizens, as in his predecessor's discourse. The positive meaning fields *progress*, *reforms*, *opportunities*, *future*, *equality*, *democracy*, *openness*, *support*, *justice*, *strength*, etc, are associated with the Labour Party. These meaning fields are contrasted with the negative ones related to the Conservatives: *stuck-in-the-middle*, *self-interest*, *past*, *inequality*, *unreliability*, *distance*, *damage*, *weakness*, etc.

4. It is possible to assert that in his speeches Brown introduces himself less vigorously and decisively than did his predecessor Blair. The Prime

Minister introduces himself as a mental subject, and he may therefore be seen as a more passive political subject than Blair. Brown's characteristic, published in *the Times* (<http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1619139-2,00.html>) before the start of his Prime Minister's career, reveals facts and opinions about his passion for long speeches, absent-mindedness and complex character. This article also presents the doubts of Brown's colleagues and enemies about his suitability for such an important position.

5. Brown's rhetoric is not as mordant as Blair's. He avoids direct accusations and in his conflict communication prefers to characterize his opponents with the help of implication. The analysis of Brown's speeches suggests the conclusion that the opponents, the Conservatives, do not have the abilities necessary to govern the country. Moreover, in his discourse, particular actions are not indicated and the mental verb *believe* prevails. This enables the target audience to perceive this politician as a rather unenergetic politician, more a mental than an action subject. Finally, the research supports the hypothesis that the conflict communication that exists in the political life of Great Britain is ideological in nature.

2.4.CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS IN BROWN'S DISCOURSE

In Brown's political discourse, the frequency of usage of the traditional WAR, JOURNEY and BUILDING metaphors determines his implementation of the corresponding conceptual metaphors into the addressees' consciousness, thereby determining their political thinking.

The prevailing conceptual metaphor in the Prime Minister's political discourse is POLITICS IS WAR. Brown's concept of war is totally different from the same concept used by his predecessor. Blair perceived it as *war against the Conservative Party*, while Brown perceives it as *war for the state's benefit*, which, as is evident from the implications contained in the following statements, was absent during the period of Conservative government:

(202) *Sometimes people say I am too serious and I fight too hard and maybe that's true. But these experiences taught me what families all across Britain*

know: that things don't always come easy and there are things worth fighting for. (2007)

(203) And I can also announce that Douglas Alexander will be the general election co-ordinator so that we are ready not just to fight but to win a general election. (2007)

(204) So I am only standing here today because a previous generation fought for education for all, demanded an NHS for all, dared to stand up for a common purpose, opportunity for all, and in their generation, unleashed the power of opportunity to change lives. (2008)

The examples above are taken from the first speech delivered by Brown as the Prime Minister in the Labour conference (2007), from an article published in *the Independent* (2007) and the 2008 speech delivered in the Labour spring conference in Birmingham. Here the POLITICS IS WAR metaphor is formed with the help of the verb *to fight*, which is frequently intensified by the preposition *for* and is aimed at showing the correct and positive direction of the actions taken by the Labour government and indicating the advantageous nature of such actions. Conflict communication with the opponents is not directly expressed in these cases, but as is the analysis in the previous chapter has already made clear, the *fight for* welfare means the *fight against* the Conservative governing principles and their politics. Moreover, the phrase *I fight too hard* (see example (202)), expressed in the first person with the help of the key word, does not only disclose the personal characteristics of the Prime Minister, but also implies his personal actions and dedication to the *fight for* the welfare of the state.

Labour's successful presentation of itself as the only party that fights for the rights and welfare of its society is emphasized by the introduction of the nouns *force*, *struggle* and *battle*, which are especially stringent in the conflict communication:

(205) Once our struggle was to secure minimum standards, then to extend opportunity. (2007)

(206) *Our foreign policy will reflect the truth that to isolate and defeat terrorist extremism now involves more than military force - it is also a struggle of ideas and ideals.* (2007)

(207) *These forces - properly harnessed by a purposeful and progressive government – can mean that Britain will not only survive but thrive in the years ahead.* (2008)

Examples (205–207) imply that there was a strong necessity to fight for the enumerated issues due to the opposition's objections or even resistance to them. As the Conservatives are the opponents of the Labour Party, the conclusion can be drawn that they object to or even fight against any positive changes. Implications such as these raise tension between the two competing parties and form the intended stereotypes, which are very relevant in the conflict communication.

Another conceptual metaphor whose linguistic expression may be analysed in Brown's political discourse is POLITICS IS A JOURNEY. This metaphor performs the same function as POLITICS IS WAR, namely, it points the way towards all the changes and reforms introduced by the Labour Party which are going to transform Great Britain into a wealthier and more prosperous state and bring much benefit to its citizens. This politician prefers to express the JOURNEY metaphor through the key noun *journey*:

(208) *The next stage of our country's long journey to build the strong and fair society.* (2007)

(210) *As we set out on the next stage of our journey this is our vision: Britain leading the global economy [...].* (2007)

In order to draw a contrast between the Conservative and the Labour Parties, Brown employs the binary *WE–THEY* model and emphasizes the work performed by the party under his leadership with the help of the pronoun *our*, attached to the *journey* linguistic metaphor. A *journey* has a beginning and an end, it is a voluntary action, but it can also connote the concept of surprise. A *journey* may also have a heroic nature or be dangerous. The Prime Minister

complements *journey* with the adjective *long* in order to indicate and emphasize the complexity and significance of his work.

The POLITICS IS A JOURNEY metaphor and its evaluative potential may be analysed in Brown's political discourse not only on the basis of the direct *journey* expressions, but also with the help of verbs that indicate movement along a chosen path:

(211) *And we will move forward with our new Australian-style points-based approach to immigration.* (2007)

(212) *We have already taken the unprecedented step of publishing the legislative programme in draft and inviting comments and views.* (2007)

The examples presented above disclose a totally different picture of Brown than did the analysis of nominations in his political discourse. His enumeration of a series of specific actions – *we will move, we have already taken [...] the step* – enables the target audience to perceive this politician as an active action subject, rather than a passive mental subject.

The positive connotations of the *journey* metaphor are expressed in Brown's political discourse, reinforcing the idea that his chosen way leads to reforms and detailing their positive results for the state and society:

(213) *Step by step we will raise investment in the state school pupils [...].* (2007)

(214) *[...] and moving this country further towards our goal of full employment.* (2007)

(215) *Now we have to move to the next stage of the Opportunity Revolution [...]. Now we must move to the next stage of the Opportunity Revolution [...].* (2007)

(216) *[...] we will move ahead with radical reforms to create 21st century NHS personal to people's needs.* (2008)

In examples (214–216), POLITICS IS A JOURNEY is expressed using the verb *move*, and this journey's direction is indicated by the adverbs *ahead* and *further* and the phrase *to the next stage*. The destination of this journey is also

indicated: *NHS personal to people's needs, full employment and opportunities*. It is possible to state that the way that leads to reforms implicitly expresses conflict between the members of the Labour Party and the Conservatives, because the way chosen by the latter party did not lead to beneficial changes. The significance of this movement towards change is introduced by the modal verbs *have* and *must*, related to *move* in example (215). It again enables the target audience to perceive Brown as an active action subject. In example (213), the *journey* metaphor is expressed through the phrase *step by step* and through the indication of the reform that these steps lead to.

This Prime Minister, like his predecessor, conceptualizes the state as a building. This is reflected in his political discourse, where the conceptual metaphor THE STATE IS A BUILDING firstly determines a linguistic metaphor that indicates the foundations of the building, which are the merit of the Labour government:

(217) *And everything we build – we build on a strong foundation of economic stability.* (2007)

(218) *Because in Britain, with our international reach, our flexibility, our openness, our scientific creativity, our stability, our language- now the language of the world- our successful membership of the European Union and our long term investments in energy and infrastructure we have the foundations for our future success.* (2008)

Clearly, Brown associates the *foundations* of the state with the success and economic stability in the country. Example (217) once again indicates that these *foundations* are strong. The fact that the *foundations* of the state were laid by the Labour Party is disclosed by the usage of pronoun *we* and its relation with *foundations*. The positive nature of this construction is expressed through the phrase *the foundations for our future success* and the proposition introducing the idea that everything built by the Labour Party is built *on a strong foundation of economic stability*. Such propositions and the usage of the latter linguistic metaphor form a positive image of the Labour Party and its leader in the eyes of the electorate. Moreover, they enable the target audience

to perceive Labour's opponents as a contrast, evoking negative connotations. The negative connotations are even more obvious in the following statements, where the BUILDING metaphor is also envisaged:

(219) *I believe that Britain needs a new type of politics [...]. A politics built on consensus, not division. A politics built on engaging with people, not excluding them. (2007)*

(220) *I want our children and their children to say that in the first decades of the 21st century there lived a generation that built a Britain, where the talent you had mattered more than the title you held. (2008)*

In example (220), the Labour government is implicated through the phrase *in the first decades of the 21st century*, and its merits for the state are marked by *a generation that built a Britain*. It should be emphasized that both of the Prime Ministers who have represented the Labour Party prefer to indicate and emphasize the 21st century in their speeches. Considering that Great Britain was governed by the Conservatives for most of the 20th century, it is possible to conclude that this preoccupation with the new century has a special significance: to remind the audience that times change. Conflict with the opponents who are negatively evaluated is implied through the characteristic of a newly built state, where talent is more important than one's title. The title in this context directly refers to the Conservatives. In another example, (219), the place of the state in THE STATE IS A BUILDING metaphor is replaced by the concept of politics. The phrase *new type of politics* stands for the members of the Labour Party, who identify themselves with novelties. The conflict between two opposing parties is expressed through a direct counterposition: *a politics built on engaging with people, not excluding them, a politics built on consensus, not division*. THE STATE IS A BUILDING perception is supported by the fact that in the English language, as in many other languages, politics and the state are understood as buildings.

The analysis of conceptual metaphors in Brown's political discourse leads to the following conclusions:

1. The conceptual metaphors POLITICS IS WAR, POLITICS IS A JOURNEY and THE STATE IS A BUILDING prevail in Brown's political discourse.

2. The speeches delivered by this politician contain conceptual metaphors that are broadly typical of political discourse. It is possible to observe that a conceptual metaphor has an evaluative potential – the evaluations expressed through linguistic metaphors and belonging to the same conceptual metaphor may differ and acquire both positive and negative connotations.

3. In Brown's political discourse, the implied *WE–THEY* opposition is actualized through metaphors. Through the metaphor POLITICS IS WAR, Brown presents himself and the Labour Party as fighters for the wealth of the state and its citizens, while the opponents are implicitly presented as doing nothing for the improvement of the situation (though not as enemies). Through THE STATE IS A BUILDING metaphor, the idea is expressed that only the Labourists have laid the foundations of the state, given it strength and a basis for a bright future. Moreover, this implies that the Conservatives did not contribute to the building of the foundation. The conceptual metaphor POLITICS IS A JOURNEY helps Brown to use linguistic metaphors having both positive and negative evaluations. Therefore, the Labour way forward, leading to reforms, is evaluated positively while the opponents are implicitly blamed for not choosing such a way.

4. Conceptual metaphors, which are the basis for text creation through linguistic metaphors, allow the features of a good leader to be attributed to Brown's personality. His opponents are implicitly granted bad characteristics.

In summary of the rhetoric of the two Labour Prime Ministers, it is necessary to emphasize that conflict is expressed as a discrepancy of ideologies – real sharp ideological conflict between the Labour Party and the Conservatives. The speeches that providing the basis for such conflict communication discourse, wherein the members of the Labour Party demonstrate their disagreement with the Conservatives and in which open

conflict is expressed, were mostly delivered in the Labour Party conferences, later presented on official websites and published in newspapers.

III. CONFLICT COMMUNICATION DISCOURSE OF THE POLITICAL LEADERS OF LITHUANIA

The Lithuanian political period of 1998–2008 was marked by three significant personalities – Valdas Adamkus, Rolandas Paksas and Artūras Paulauskas (the interim President) who were the Presidents of the Republic of Lithuania. As discussed in the theoretical part of this dissertation, the political systems differ in Great Britain and Lithuania, therefore, the posts of the political leaders are also different – the Prime Minister of Great Britain is equivalent to the President of Lithuania. Another fundamental difference between these two states is reflected by the fact that ideological conflict is impossible in Lithuania because the President officially does not belong to any party. The Parliament may have a different political attitude than the President had before his election to that position. The investigated period begins and ends under the government of the same political leader, Valdas Adamkus. His conflict communication will therefore be analysed last. This part of the dissertation is intended for an analysis of the conflict communication discourse of three Presidents of the Republic of Lithuania together with the linguistic means used in this kind of communication.

As already mentioned, political communication takes part in a situation of political conflict. It is marked by extra-linguistic and intra-linguistic factors, which help to understand that the speaker is involved in conflict with his/her opponents. This dissertation analyzes the speeches of high-ranking politicians, aimed at their opponents and at the citizens who must accept or deny the propositions presented therein. The analysis model of Fairclough (1995) – description (text analysis), interpretation (processing analysis) and explanation (social analysis) – is very beneficial for this study.

Moreover, one more aspect is significant in this research – conflict may be expressed both directly and indirectly. The main reasons for political conflict in Lithuania are based on the fact that the President protects his right to power and expresses his dissatisfaction with the performance of the Government and the Parliament. Although this conflict is not ideological, the opposition *I-THEY* is present. For this reason it is important:

1. to describe how both of the sides involved in the conflict are characterized;

2. to interpret what was said; to disclose those meanings which were expressed indirectly; to show the concepts used by the speaker to legitimate his position;

3. to explain why the speaker speaks as he does: which knowledge, attitudes, aims prompt him to choose particular rhetorical means (in the analysis of conceptual metaphors);

4. to show applied rhetorical means.

3.1.OPPOSITIONS AND THEIR MEMBER NOMINATIONS IN THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF ROLANDAS PAKSAS

Rolandas Paksas remained in the President's position for slightly more than one year, during which time the Constitutional Court initiated three indictments related to his breaches of the Constitution. The Parliament supported the indictments and carried out the impeachment process. In this situation it is possible to treat the Constitutional Court and the Parliament as the President's opponents, while Paksas is a defendant protecting himself from accusations. The following Aristotelian methods are often used by defendants in such situations: stating that the blame is absent, therefore, the damage is also absent; indicating the reason for the condemnatory action; accusing the prosecutor himself.

In his conflict communication during the impeachment, Paksas employed two strategies – the integration of the addressee (i.e., himself) and the segregation of the opponents. These strategies are represented through the

already presented dichotomy *I–THEY*. This model discloses an antithesis, *I*, which is identified with the citizens of Lithuania and claims to be the defender of national interests, and *THEY*, who are fictitious supporters of national interests and democracy.

Due to the brevity of his term, only the major domain *benefit* was analysed in Paksas's discourse. According to the political leader, this domain includes all the beneficial things that he has done for the state and the citizens during his short period of governing. On the other hand, that *benefit* is contrasted with the actions of all of his opponents.

Firstly, Paksas puts emphasis on the state; therefore, the meaning fields *welfare–detriment* may be investigated. Naturally, this political leader associates *welfare* with his performance (*I*) while a large number of his opponents (*THEY*) are blamed for all the negative issues and decisions. This is emphasized by the President's identification with the state which is revealed with the help of the inclusive pronouns *mūsų, mes* (*our, we*):

(221) *Visa tai stiprina mano tikėjimą, kad mes, Lietuvos žmonės, išlaikysime mums tekusį išbandymą.* (2004)

(222) *Mūsų šalis siekė ir sieks, kad Europos Sąjunga būtų demokratiška ir efektyvi organizacija, kurioje girdimas kiekvienos šalies balsas.* (2004)

(223) *Be to, pabrėžiau, kad šiuo metu Lietuvoje sukelta politinė sumaištis neturi sulėtinti mūsų žingsnių.* (2004)

These statements, delivered to the foreign ambassadors living in Lithuania, are complemented by inclusive pronouns and the following words: *mes, Lietuvos žmonės, mums* (*we are the Lithuanian people, for us*) (see example (221)) and *mūsų* (*our*) (see examples (222) and (223)). These examples express the idea of solidarity and disclose Paksas as a mental subject – the President believes and thinks, but he does not indicate any real actions. On the one hand, this politician appears to be a victim, but on the other hand, he looks like an inactive President who wants to do something.

As a result of his identification with the state, Paksas perceives all the indictments as applied not only to his personality but to Lithuania, as well:

(224) *Apkaltos procesas yra ne tik mano asmeninė drama ar tragedija, bet ir labai rimtas išbandymas valstybei, jos institucijoms ir visai Lietuvos teisės sistemai.* (2004)

This example enables the target audience to envisage an EXAM metaphor which is characteristic not only of Lithuanian political discourse, but also of political discourse in general. This example enables the target audience to perceive Paksas as a subject of feelings. This makes the communication intimate and, as a result of his openness, may evoke society's sympathy with the latter politician as being attacked by the opponents.

The latter example is instantly followed by another which implies a *detriment* characteristic employed to describe his opponents:

(225) *Tai, be abejo, ir kai kurių politikų bei pareigūnų padorumo, sąžiningumo, moralumo egzaminas, kurį įvertinti teks istorijai.* (2004)

In this case, an important *THEIR* (some politicians) nomination is present. It excludes some politicians from the total number of Lithuanians and also reveals the fact that such people are not numerous. This *THEIR* nomination has a pejorative meaning: if a politician is not named, it means that he is not important. The phrase *egzaminas, kurį įvertinti teks istorijai* (*The exam that will have to be evaluated by history*) stands as an appeal to history. Obviously, the speaker is sure that history is on his side, therefore, he is right.

In order to protect himself from the opponents' accusations and to get the support of society, the President expresses a direct *I–SOME OF THEM* counterposition, based on features of *benefit* and *detriment*:

(226) *Augantis Lietuvos žmonių palankumas ir pritarimas mano veiksams išgaudino kai kurias politines jėgas.* (2003)

This *I–SOME OF THEM* dichotomy discloses the idea that *I* am together with every citizen of the Republic of Lithuania. Paksas may be

promoting this idea as a strategy to integrate into society. Because of society's approbation of his actions, as seen in in example (226), the actions of the Parliament can be seen as directed against all of Lithuania.

The *I* nomination, expressed through the presentation of *benefit* characteristics, may be analysed on the basis of the President's interests and values, which are presented as beneficial for the state and society. In the context of the conflict communication taking place during the process of impeachment, this nomination may be treated as purposeful, aimed at presenting Paksas as guiltless, his actions as performed only for the welfare of the Republic of Lithuania. It is also possible to state that the nomination is meant to evoke the compassion of the electorate and to make it change its opinion and decision:

(227) *Dabar Jūs priimsite sprendimą. Kad ir koks jis būtų, priimsiu jį garbingai, kaip žmogus, kuriam rūpi ir visada rūpės valstybės, Tautos, demokratijos, teisingumo ateitis.* (2004)

This statement also helps Paksas to achieve the intended aim of defending himself from his opponents; it introduces him as an honourable, law abiding person, a supporter of democracy. The intended aim is reinforced by an attack and attribution of the *detriment* characteristic to all his opponents. *THEY* are introduced as active, physically *detrimental* subjects because *THEIR* particular actions are characterized as detrimental:

(228) *Mielieji Lietuvos žmonės, Kviečiu nepasiduoti nesantaikos kurstymui ir visuomenės skaldymui.* (2003)

(229) *Norėčiau pridurti, kad galvojant valstybės požiūriu, privačios bendrovės akcininkų turtiniai santykiai labai menkas tyrimo objektas palyginti, pavyzdžiui, su milžinišką žalą Lietuvos žmonėms atnešusiu "Mažeikių naftos" ar kitų bendrovių privatizavimu.* (2004)

(230) *Ar ne Lietuvos žmonių nusikurdinimas, vis didėjantis turtinis atotrūkis, grobstomos Europos Sąjungos lėšos, tamsūs privatizavimo sandėriai, korupcija, iš Tėvynės išvažiuojantys žmonės, narkomanija ir organizuotas nusikalstamumas - argi ne visa tai yra tikrosios grėsmės valstybės nacionaliniam saugumui?* (2004)

(231) *Pirminiai, dabar jau neminimi kaltinimai ilgus mėnesius ne tik nuolat drumstė Jūsų mintis, skleidė nepasitikėjimą ir skaldė visuomenę, bet ir padarė didžiulę žalą Lietuvai pasaulio akyse* (2004).

(232) *Nors dirbtinai sukeltas skandalas padarė milžiniškos žalos Lietuvai [...].*
(2004)

The statements presented above were used by Paksas in his political discourse as important armaments in his conflict communication with his numerous opponents; moreover, the President employs tactics of blame and accusation. Accusation tactics, as defined by Aristotle, are evident in example (230). Here, indirectly, without indicating any agents in particular, *THEIR* actions are presented as dangerous to the state. Other statements emphasize the negative results of the opposition's performance to society. In example (228), the encouragement *kviečiu nepasiduoti* (*I invite you to resist*) is a word subject, while the other statements express action subjects, which may be treated as disclosing the passive role of Paksas in political life.

The *detriment* meaning field is closely related to the *self-interest* meaning field applied by the President to his opponents:

(233) *Visi įstatymai, tarp jų ir tie, kurie reguliuoja slaptumą, turi tarnauti ne politinių jėgų interesams, o teisingumui. Jeigu įstatymais slepiama tiesa, jeigu slaptumo žyma uždedama tam, kad būtų galima nuslėpti nusikaltimus, tuomet tokie teisės aktai savo esme yra antidemokratiniai. Tuo dar kartą įsitikinau, susipažinęs su bendrovės "Alita" privatizavimo byla. Kai Valstybės saugumo departamentas teigia, jog jokių pažeidimų šioje byloje nėra, man yra visiškai aišku, kad ir specialiosios tarnybos mūsų šalyje yra įtrauktos į politinius procesus. Ši faktą aiškiai patvirtina ir Seimo Laikinosios tyrimo komisijos darbo metodai. Ši komisija, kurios funkcija Prezidento apkaltos procedūroje net nėra numatyta, nuo pat pradžių siekė politinio, o ne teisinio vertinimo.* (2003)

(234) *Žinau, kad Jus žeidžia neslepiamas įtakingųjų cinizmas: jūs, atseit, nemokėjote, nesugebėjote atsilaužti savo kėsnio nuo valstybės kepalų, o mes mokame ir sugebame.* (2004)

In example (233), Paksas directly defines his opponents and the subject who performs impermissible actions, and accuses them of *self-interest*.

The State Security Department and the Provisional Investigation Commission of the Parliament are two major institutions which, according to Paksas, should be perceived by the citizens as concerned only with their own interests; they are presented as the negative competing side in the conflict communication. The President's words, with the help of the negation *ne* and contrast, express the segregation of the already indicated opponents (*THEIR*) and an indictment of *THEM*: *turi tarnauti ne politinių jėgų interesams, o teisingumui; nuo pat pradžių siekė politinio, o ne teisinio vertinimo ([..] have to serve not the interests of political forces, but justice; [...] from the very beginning aimed at political but not legal assessment)* are expressed. In the second example, (234), the President dissociates himself from the Government and the Parliament, defines *THEM* as influential (*įtakingųjų*) and blames *THEM* for having and serving their own *self interest* and *benefit*. In this case, the negative prefix in the verb *nesugebėjote* (*did not manage*) presents a totally different connotation than in example (233). It is meant to emphasize the innocence and positivity of Paksas, who, he claims, did not have self-interest- *nesugebėjote atsilaužti savo kąsnio nuo valstybės kepalo* (*You did not manage to bite out of the state loaf*).

Self-interest provides a basis for another meaning field applied to the opponents in the *benefit* domain, *indiscretion*. Some politicians are presented as being over-concerned with their own benefit and even putting an equals sign between their welfare and the welfare of the state or even the European Union:

(235) *Kalbant apie Vilniaus mero rinkimus, susidaro įspūdis, kad kai kurie politikai labai susireikšmina, pralaimėjimą rinkimuose vertina kaip valstybės nelaimę ir tai sieja net su Europos Sąjungos reikalais. Neatrodo, kad tai labai kuklu.* (2003)

In this pejorative statement, the *THEY* (some politicians) aspect is once again emphasized, because no particular individuals are named.

Another opposition which can be observed in the *benefit* domain is *equality–inequality*. These meaning fields are formed on the basis of the key words *vienodai* (*equally*) and *lygus* (*equal*). Paksas introduces the period of his

governing as one of *equality* while treating other political ideologies as being responsible for *inequality*:

(236) *Neturiu mylimų ir nemylimų pareigūnų. Vertinu žmones pagal darbą.* (2003)

(237) *Valstybė, kurioje kiekvienas – nuo paprasto piliečio iki šalies vadovo – turi būti vienodai lygus prieš įstatymą ir kiekvienam žmogui turi galioti dar Pirmojo Lietuvos Statuto postulatuose formuluoti principai kaip nekaltumo prezumpcija bei vien teismo teisė nustatyti kaltę ir skirti bausmę.* (2004)

(238) *Manau, kad ir dabar, ir ateityje vienodai sugebėsiu skirti dėmesio visoms partijoms ir visuomeninėms organizacijoms bei institucijoms. Tokia yra Prezidento priedermė.* (2004)

(239) *Tikiu, kad ir Lietuva pamažu pripildys demokratijos sampratą tikrojo turinio, išvalys ją nuo dvigubų standartų, organizuoto užsakomojo teisingumo, politinių sprendimų viršenybės prieš teisę.* (2004)

In examples (236), (238), and (239), the President introduces himself as a mental subject and expresses his *I* integration with the help of the following verbs: *vertinu, manau, tikiu* (*assess, think, believe*). The last example contains the implication that under the government of other political parties and powers there existed *inequality*. The latter concept is expressed with the help of such expressions as *dvigubi standartai, organizuotas užsakomasis teisingumas, politinių sprendimų viršenybė* (*double standards, organized justice on order, the superiority of political decisions*), which suggest the idea that society is divided into two parts, one having better conditions than the other. These expressions are very beneficial in Paksas's conflict communication as they help to depict this political leader as being more positive than those in the opposition. Moreover, they are also employed to justify the President and to propose that the opponents are much worse and indifferent to the citizens.

The *inequality* characteristic is closely related to the violation of Paksas's human rights, as presented by himself in the speech of April 06, 2004:

(240) *Praktika, kai vieniems - slapta, kitiems - neslapta, vyravo viso proceso metu. Tokia nuostata akivaizdžiai varžė mano teisę į gynybą, tačiau net ne tai yra svarbiausia.* (2004)

As a result, the opponents are granted one more characteristic with a negative connotation. They are seen as *violators of human rights*.

The justification process and formation of Paksas's positive image are reinforced by a dichotomous presentation of moral values: *honesty/justice–dishonesty/injustice*. It is obvious that this political leader associates himself with *honesty* and *justice*. Considering the statements below, all the opponents are introduced as dishonest and unfair. This contrast of moral values is one of the most significant, beneficial and successful weapons employed in the conflict communication.

Paksas does not avoid direct *I–THEY* (opponents) counterposition of actions:

(241) *Vakar paskelbtos Seimo laikinosios tyrimo komisijos išvados. Šis dokumentas iš tikrųjų neatskleidė nieko naujo, nes visą lapkritį Jums nuosekliai, emociškai ir be faktų buvo brukama mintis, neva Prezidentą yra supančiojusios nusikalstamos struktūros.* (2003)

(242) *Argi neakivaizdu, kad daugelis Komisijos teiginių tėra konkrečiais įrodymais nepagrįstos prielaidos.* (2003)

(243) *Kitas dalykas, kad pagal Konstituciją Prezidentas sustabdo narystę partijose, ir tai yra padaryta. Trečias dalykas, kad kiekvienas patarėjas iš liberaldemokratų ar kitų komandų irgi yra sustabdę narystę partinėse organizacijose. Tai nėra privaloma, tačiau tai yra padaryta.* (2003)

(244) *Norėčiau paklausti, kaip valstybės paslaptis sergėjantys pareigūnai šį man inkriminuojamą prasižengimą palygintų su faktu, kad nuo 1994 metų iki mano kadencijos pradžios iš valstybės vadovo institucijos dingo 175 dokumentai su slaptumo žymomis?* (2004)

(245) *Atsakingai pareiškiu, kad akcininkų sprendimams nesu daręs jokios įtakos, juo labiau, kaip nurodoma kaltinime, siekdamas įgyvendinti man artimų asmenų privačius interesus. Taip, man buvo skambinama, bet aš gerai suvokiau, kad neturiu teisės kištis į privačios bendrovės turtinius santykius ir neketinau to daryti. Neatsitiktinai nė vienas iš liudytojų nepatvirtino man primetamo kaltinimo neva dariau įtaką šiems procesams.* (2004)

(246) - *Pastebėjau kai kurių politikų susijaudinimą ir mano klausimas labai paprastas: jei viskas tvarkoje tuose dokumentuose, ko jaudintis. Kodėl toks susierzinimas. Gal Valstybės saugumo departamento atstovams reikėtų atvažiuoti pas valstybės vadovą ir padėti išsiaiškinti. Parodyti, kas čia buvo. Galbūt pridėti telefoninių pokalbių išklotines, kad patvirtintų savo teisumą, - spaudos konferencijoje R. Paksas komentavo kai kurių politikų reakciją į "Alitos" privatizavimo dokumentų paėmimą. (2004)*

The latter examples present rather unenergetic accusations, aimed at *THEM*, and also express a direct attack against the opponents, indicating the invalidity of their actions. Furthermore, these statements emphasize that *THEY* treat and assess their own performance differently, more indulgently than his own actions of the same or similar kind. In this case Paksas is disclosed as a victim, and the counterposition *I-THEY* is expressed. This opposition is evident in this politician's discourse. *THEY* in most cases have some particular referent – the Parliament and, especially, the State Security Department and the Provisional Investigation Commission of the Parliament. There are a lot of negative *ne* prefixes in the investigated statements which are of special importance in Paksas's conflict communication. They create the impression that this person is honest, fair and innocent. Several rhetorical questions serve to set a stern mood, as they disclose and indicate the *dishonesty/injustice* of the opponents. Example (243) further emphasizes the feature of political ethics that the President applies to himself, for it implies that Paksas and his colleagues are so honest that they even perform actions which are not obligatory but which are very significant in showing the citizens, the Parliament and the Government that the President is not guilty.

The *dishonesty/injustice* meaning field attributed to the opponents is reinforced even more by a number of other negative characteristics, such as *transgressors, malpractice, negligence* and *bias* which are also included in the *benefit* domain. In order to consolidate his position in the conflict communication, Paksas suggests that the indictment process is taking place despite numerous breaches of statutes and regulations. Naturally, the guilty *transgressor* side is the opponents:

(247) *Gerai suvokiu, kad Prezidento nušalinimo procesą lydėjusių teisės normų pažeidimų vardijimas neturėtų įtakos apkaltos vykdymo tempui. Pažeidimų priežastys ir jų esmė liks istorikams ir Lietuvos teisės raidą studijuosiantiems specialistams.* (2004)

The presented example does not contain any direct accusation aimed at a particular person or institution. Such are only implied, but the example does contain a direct expression that the President's suspension process was not fair, full of violations of the law. The words *gerai suvokiu* (*I soundly understand*) once again present Paksas as a passive, mental subject. Moreover, the President again appeals to history. This enables the target audience to evaluate his actions as fair and to evoke society's approval. This idea is emphasized by another feature, *bias*, indicated to define *THEM*, Paksas's two main opponents: the State Security Department and the Provisional Investigation Commission of the Parliament:

(248) *Nors Valstybės saugumo departamento pažymoje, kurios pagrindu pradėtas tyrimas dėl galimų grėsmių Lietuvos nacionaliniam saugumui, Prezidentas apskritai neminimas, vienpusiškas Komisijos tyrimas buvo nukreiptas tik į Prezidentą ir jo instituciją. Tyrimo tendencingumą patvirtina ir tai, kad Komisija neapklausė Valstybės saugumo departamento pažymoje minimų asmenų, kurie Prezidento aplinkos žmonėms neva darė neigiamą poveikį. Tai dar vienas įrodymas, kad Komisija matė tik tai, kas galėtų būti naudinga, siekiant nušalinti Prezidentą.* (2003)

These statements are purposely used by the President in his political discourse to indicate the actual opponents who act counter to Paksas and the actions he has performed for the welfare of the state. The presented propositions, focused on *THEIR* (two institutions) *bias* are beneficial in this conflict communication, as they show that the others, *THEY* are guilty because *THEY* violated laws and human rights.

From the statements that have been analysed above it becomes evident that Paksas treats and presents himself as a victim. The following examples illustrate this idea:

(249) *Prezidentai Algirdas Brazauskas ir Valdas Adamkus išimties tvarka suteikė pilietybę 847 asmenims, tarp jų dviem šimtams žmonių, kurie neturėjo*

jokių nuopelnų Lietuvai. Kai kurių pilietybę gavusių asmenų nuopelnai Lietuvai, švelniai tariant, labai kuklūs, pavyzdžiui, “Kaimynai apie jį atsiliepia palankiai.”Arba kitas pavyzdys. Cituoju: “Nors išimtys paprastai daromos žymiems, Lietuvai nusipelnusiems žmonėms, tačiau, žinodamas Jūsų humaniškumą, drįstu tikėtis, kad priimsite palankų sprendimą.”Citavau Seimo nario, tuometinio Seimo Pirmininko pavaduotojo Aloyzo Sakalo kreipimąsi dėl pilietybės suteikimo piliečiui ar pilietei Sokolko.Lietuvos pilietybę yra gavę ir daugelis asmenų, kurie apskritai neturėjo jokių sąsajų su mūsų šalimi. (2003)

(250) Paradoksalu, kad teisiniais įrodymais nepagrįstos Komisijos išvados tapo pagrindu visam tolesniam teisiniam procesui. (2003)

(251) Neabejoju, kad teisininkai, įsigilinę į Seimo laikinosios komisijos išvadas, pripažins jų nepagrįstumą, nes ir ne teisininko akimi matyti, kad Komisija, turėjusi tirti grėsmes nacionaliniam saugumui ir atlikti situacijos teisinį įvertinimą, iš tikrųjų tyrė Prezidento politinio pasitikėjimo klausimą. (2003)

(252) Kalbama, gal kažkas ne taip apiforminta, gal į ne tokį voką buvo įdėta medžiaga, bet nekalbama, kad Valstybės saugumo departamento pažyma su grifu slapta buvo pagarsinta žmonėms, kurie neturėjo teisės dirbti su slapta medžiaga. (2004)

Example (249) introduces particular individuals, *THEM*, who are granted the *bias* characteristic. They include two former Presidents of the Republic of Lithuania and a former chairperson of the Parliament. This enumeration is performed on purpose, in order to compare the incumbent President with his predecessors and to reveal the fact that they did the same things (granted Lithuanian citizenship) without being indicted. Therefore, the conclusion is drawn that there are certain actions which are legal for some people but illegal for others. Moreover, these words serve as a reference to the breaches of law that have been done by the predecessors of Paksas. These statements, together with the word subject *citavau (quoted)*, once again suggest the idea that Paksas is not guilty, that he is merely a victim of circumstances and political opponents. Examples (250–252) help to form or even to reinforce the negative image of two major opponents of Paksas – the State Security Department and the Provisional Investigation Commission of the Parliament. All the statements and ideas concerning those institutions that are used in the President’s political discourse are intended to form a particular negative

stereotype in the minds of society, to weaken or even destroy the trust in the latter Department and Commission and to raise doubts as to the justice and necessity of their actions. This effect is reinforced by the attribution of the *negligence* meaning field to *THEM*. This is expressed with the help of Paksas's preferred contrast between the actions of the President and his opponents, and emphasized by an accusing question:

(253) *Norėčiau paklausti, kaip valstybės paslaptis sergėjantys pareigūnai ši man inkriminuojamą prasižengimą palygintų su faktu, kad nuo 1994 metų iki mano kadencijos pradžios iš valstybės vadovo institucijos dingo 175 dokumentai su slaptumo žymomis?* (2003)

There are two non-opposite meaning fields in the President's conflict communication: *unity*, with the help of which Paksas reveals his efforts to unite the country, and *disrespect*, attributed to his opponents. The benefit of *unity* is conveyed by such significant words as *vienyti* (*unite*) and *konsoliduoti* (*consolidate*):

(254) *Stengiuosi vienyti valdančiąją daugumą - ir viešais pareiškimais, ir darbu, kurį atlieku.* (2003)

(255) *Atėjau konsoliduoti, o ne skirstyti.* (2003)

These statements, with the help of the verbs *stengiuosi*, *atėjau* (*strive*, *came*), imply the intentions of the President but not his actions. From the context of the investigated political situation, it becomes obvious that *THEY*, the opponents, have restricted Paksas's actions. Therefore, this politician discloses his intentions in order to defend himself and to win society's support.

The negative *disrespect* characteristic reveals the attitude of the opponents towards the President. As already mentioned, Paksas identifies himself with the state, making the *disrespect* expressed towards his personality and his actions equal to *disrespect* towards the state. The following statement contains such a characteristic, expressed through a direct *I-THEY* model:

(256) *Komisija pasipriešino mano valiai atsakyti į visus ją dominančius klausimus tokia forma, kuri būtų pagarbi Seimui ir nežeistų Prezidento institucijos.* (2003)

The latter statement includes not only the institution of the President but the institution of the Parliament, as well, in order to draw attention and to gain more support from the electorate. This is aimed at that part of the society which does not support Paksas, but yet may have favourites in the Parliament, which is also treated with *disrespect*. As a result, the *disrespect* characteristic may raise doubts and dissatisfaction with the actions of the President's opponents; this suggests the intended aim that Paksas is innocent and that his actions are not harmful, but beneficial to the state and its citizens. This is a very popular defence strategy: the revelation of action reasons, described by Aristotle (1994). Furthermore, this phrase contains the antithesis *pagerbti–pažeisti* (*honour–violate*), expressed through a negative structure, which implicates the idea that the honour of the President was offended.

The analysed period includes the President's impeachment. During that process, the very important meaning field *innocence* was introduced into Paksas's political discourse. This political leader presents himself and his actions as innocent and beneficial to the state. The *I–THEY* nomination, expressed through this characteristic, should help to contrast the President with the accusing side, while showing that he is positive and the other side is negative and guilty:

(257) *Kartu norėčiau priminti Lietuvos Respublikos Konstitucijos 85-ajame straipsnyje įtvirtintą nuostatą, kad atsakomybė už dekretą, kuriuo suteikiama pilietybė, tenka jį kontrasignavusiam ministrui.* (2004)

(258) *Pabrėžčiau, kad nė vienas Teismo nusikalstamais pripažintų mano veiksmų nepadarė žalos valstybei* (2004).

(259) *Dar kartą pabrėžiu: nė vienu pasirašytu dekretu, nė vienu savo veiksmu nepažeidžiau Lietuvos Respublikos Konstitucijos, įstatymų ir Seime duotos priesaikos.*

Sukeltą skandalą ir nesiliaujančius reikalavimus atsistatydinti vertinu tik kaip prieš mano asmenį ir mano pradėtas iniciatyvas nukreiptą politinį veiksmą. (2004)

Example (257) does not directly indicate the *innocence* of the President, but as the target audience is already acquainted with the broader context of the situation and knows that one of the indictments is related to his illegal granting of citizenship, it should perceive the implied idea that the President must be *innocent* because there is a particular Minister responsible for the citizenship granting process.

The *innocence* characteristic may also be analysed on the basis of the human factor, by admitting the mistakes which have been made during the period of governing and instantly explaining their reasons. This should suggest the idea that the President is not guilty because he is a human being, one of the common people with the same right to make mistakes:

(260) *Per vienerius – pirmuosius – darbo valstybės vadovo poste metus aš padariau didesnių ir mažesnių klaidų. Kai kurios iš jų virto praėjusių savaitę paskelbtais kaltinimais, apie kuriuos jau kalbėjau. Veikiamas penkis mėnesius neatslūgstančios psichologinės įtampos, balansuodamas tarp žmogiškųjų jausmų ir pareigos, prieš porą savaičių, pakvietęs visuomeniniu patarėju Jurijų Borisovą, padariau klaidą, kurios privalėjau išvengti. Suprantu, kad Prezidentas, net ir pikčiausiai pjudomas ir juodinamas, neturi teisės daryti klaidų. Ištaisiau ją, atsiribojau nuo Jurijaus Borisovo, atsiprašau Jūsų, gerbiamieji Seimo nariai, ir dar kartą - visų Lietuvos žmonių. (2004)*

(261) *Dabar, kai pateiktos Konstitucinio Teismo išvados, kiekvienas iš Jūsų galite įvertinti mano, kaip Respublikos Prezidento, prasižengimus. Nusikaltau ar padariau klaidų? Neneigiu klaidų. Padariau jų ir mažesnių, ir didesnių. Neseniai apmaudžiai suklydau, bandydamas remtis vien žmogiškaisiais jausmais. Šią klaidą ištaisiau. Atsiribojau nuo buvusio savo rėmėjo. Dar kartą nuoširdžiai atsiprašau Jūsų, jei Jus užgavo kai kurie mano sprendimai ar poelgiai. Pripažindamas klaidas, kurių neišvengiau, vis dėlto noriu pasakyti: jos nebuvo tokios, kad padarytų žalos Lietuvai. Jokiu savo sprendimu ar veiksmu nepadariau žalos Lietuvai ir nepakenčiau mūsų šalies žmonių interesams. (2004)*

In example (260) it is possible to observe the professional confession of his (Paksas's) fault. He seems to be attempting to establish common ground for all further actions, essentially offering a hand to the opponents. Both examples reveal the fact that President Paksas, as every person in such a

situation would, tries to justify his actions and win society's support and sympathy.

Despite the open conflict which has already been analysed, conflict communication without public conflict is also present in Paksas's political discourse. It is possible to observe a conflict with his predecessors, with previous governments in the inaugural speech of the President. The negative characteristic of *selfish values* is attributed to the previous government:

(262) *Žinau, kad neįmanoma sugrąžinti šių vertybių neištrynus atgrasaus valdžios atotrūkio nuo žmonių.* (2003)

This example contains a covert counterposition in which the previous government is blamed for being distant from society. This statement is also taken from the inaugural speech, and it is therefore possible to assume that open conflict is not yet present, yet the new President presents his intentions as a contrast to the performance of the previous government. This is a foreshadowing of the forthcoming conflict, which is not expressed in the extralinguistic context. However, the procedure of elections may be treated as a conflict of programme and promises. If this conflict is carried over into the inaugural, resistance is inevitable.

Covert conflict related to *opportunities* may also be seen in Paksas's inaugural speech:

(263) *Negailėdamas pastangų sieksiu, kad išsilavinusiems, pasitikintiems savimi piliečiams būtų suteiktos galimybės atskleisti savo galias.* (2003)

The phrase *būtų suteiktos* (*would be granted*) implies the idea that, until now, the citizens of the Republic of Lithuania have not had any opportunities to express their talents and potential. Naturally, this serves as a basis for the *limited opportunities* characteristic and its application to the opponents.

It is possible to conclude that conflict communication takes place in two situations:

1. In an open public conflict situation involving major agents – the President, the Parliament and the State Security Department. In this case, direct linguistic features of conflict may be observed in Paksas's discourse. They are defined by the President's defence during the process of impeachment. It was shown that this politician uses all the defence methods discussed by Aristotle. He accuses his prosecutor, indicates reasons for his actions and presents his performance as non-criminal. Each of these methods has a particular expression:

a) In the accusation case, the opposition *I-THEY* is actualized. *I* is characterized as the supporter of democracy and justice, the initiator of progress and the promoter of moral values, having the support of the Lithuanian citizens and identifying himself with every Lithuanian. Solidarity tactics are actualized in this way. Moreover, Paksas introduces himself as a subject of thoughts, emotions and intentions, but he does not talk about particular actions. This suggests that he did not manage to perform the intended actions, due either to resistance or a lack of opportunities. Usage of negative structures discloses actions that were not performed.

THEY are granted the nomination of *some politicians*, who are excluded from society; this is a segregation strategy. *THEY* are violators of laws and human rights, *THEIR* actions have brought harm to Lithuania. In most cases Paksas directly indicates that *THEY* stand for the State Security Department, the Parliament and the Provisional Investigation Commission of the Parliament. *THEY* act as physical agents: they *violate*, *smother*, etc. *I* is presented as a subject of thought and intention, and it is therefore possible to conclude that *THEY* are introduced as active subjects, while Paksas takes a more passive role. The result of such a counterposition is the creation of his image as a victim. This politician also appeals to history, turns it into his associate and evokes implicit conclusions regarding his innocence.

b) Paksas implies his innocence by indicating the reasons for the actions that led to his impeachment. In this case, the President appeals to his

predecessors, and the opposition *I-THEY* includes such agents as Paksas and his predecessors.

c) This President states that he performed many actions that were beneficial to Lithuania, at the same time indicating that he did the country no harm. *THEY*, the State Security Department, the Parliament and the Provisional Investigation Commission of the Parliament, are again only associated with negative actions and legal violations. Paksas's words regarding this aspect introduce him as a passive mental subject and are meant to evoke society's compassion and support for him.

2. In the situation without public conflict. This communication is inevitable in electoral situations, which demonstrate a conflict of programmes, regulations and/or promises. Conflict with his predecessors may be observed in this President's inaugural speech. This conflict is implied through the concepts of *selfish values* and *limited opportunities* that he attributes to the previous governments. In the context of the post-election situation, this form of communication excludes Paksas from his predecessors and implies that he will be more beneficial to the state and society than the others were. Therefore, his conflict communication again includes the *I-THEY* opposition, where *THEY* stand for Paksas's political predecessors.

3.2.CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS IN THE DISCOURSE OF PAKSAS

At the beginning of his Presidential career, Paksas employs peaceful conceptual metaphors related to buildings. The situation changes when the process of impeachment begins. As a result, metaphors of WAR and MESS appear in his conflict communication with the opponents. Such metaphors are related to the oppositions analysed in the previous section.

At the beginning of Paksas's presidential career, the opposition *I-THEY* was expressed in his speeches. In other words, this opposition was actualized through the metaphor THE STATE IS A BUILDING, which has the function of uniting the Lithuanian citizens. This opposition suggests that the inclusive *WE* (you and I) have to construct the state building together, despite

our different attitudes. THE STATE IS A BUILDING conceptual metaphor is expressed in Paksas's inaugural speech (2003) and complemented at the beginning of 2004:

(264) *Trylika Nepriklausomybės metų sukūrė tvirtus laisvės ir demokratijos pamatus.* (2003)

(265) *Vasario 16-oji tautos sąmonėje yra ir išlikęs kaip valstybės kūrimo simbolis, todėl man itin džiugu Jus šiandien pasveikinti ir padėkoti, nes esate tie žmonės, kurie savo mintimis ir darbais svariausiai prisidedate prie to, kad vis aukščiau kiltų mūsų valstybės rūmas. Ant pastolių to didingo statinio, kurį vadiname valstybe, stovime visi – verslininkai ir poetai, policininkai ir žurnalistai, politikai ir aktoriai, buvę disidentai ir tremtiniai, mokslininkai ir ūkininkai, teisininkai ir dvasininkai, gyvenantys tėvų žemėje ir gyvenimo audrų svetur nublokšti tautiečiai. Valstybę kartu su mumis stato ir tie šviesūs žmonės, kurių, deja, jau nėra tarp mūsų.* (2004)

The linguistic expressions of this conceptual metaphor may be investigated in the examples as an expression of the strength of the Republic of Lithuania and the unity of its citizens. This power is revealed with the help of such phrases as *sukūrė tvirtus laisvės ir demokratijos pamatus, vis aukščiau kiltų mūsų valstybės rūmas, valstybę kartu su mumis stato* (*designed strong foundations of freedom and democracy, that the palace of our state would tower higher, together with us the state is being built*). Later, in 2004, other consequences of THE STATE IS A BUILDING conceptual metaphor, those with negative connotations, are actualized; now, instead of the process of building the state, Paksas suggests the idea of *destruction*:

(266) *Ar politiniais sprendimais lemdami teisinius procesus, politiniams tikslams naudodami slaptašias tarnybas negriauname valstybės savo rankomis?* (2004)

The *destruction* expression is related to Paksas's impeachment process and is applied to the opponents in his conflict communication. This statement indirectly implies that the impeachment is harmful to the state and, therefore, that the President's opponents are negative and non-beneficial. This statement

makes the target audience look at this particular situation from another angle and draw the intended conclusions: that Paksas is innocent, while all the opponents involved in this process are guilty. This idea is reinforced by the following statement, where the same metaphor may be observed:

(267) *Esu įsitikinęs: jeigu aš ir mano patarėjai nebūtume bandę griauti korumpuotos sistemos, nebūtų ir šio skandalo* (2004).

Moreover, the phrase *griauti korumpuotos sistemos* (to destroy the corrupt system) (see example (267)) determines a metaphor of *construction* and *destruction* that encourages the depiction of abstract subjects as buildings, rather than the *building* metaphor itself.

Another conceptual metaphor, POLITICS IS A JOURNEY, enables Paksas to describe his own actions positively and the actions of his opponents negatively. The first to be presented and analysed are those linguistic metaphors with positive evaluative connotations that are related to the *I* nomination in the opposition *I–THEY*:

(268) *Suvokiu, kad esame tik demokratinio kelio pradžioje ir turime daug ir kantriai mokytis.* (2004)

(269) *[...]laisvę atgavusi Lietuva eina pasirinktu Europos keliu [...].* (2004)

(270) *[...]i Europą turime ateiti ne tik su gerais ekonominiais rodikliais, bet ir kaip brandi teisinė valstybė.* (2004)

(271) *Tikiu, kad iš šios situacijos išeisime sustiprėję.* (2004)

(272) *2004 metais mūsų europinė dienotvarkė įgaus kokybišką pokytį: nuo narystės siekimo pereisime prie efektyvaus ir kokybiško narystės užtikrinimo.* (2004)

(273) *Trylika metų einame pasirinktu Europos keliu [...].* (2004)

In examples (268) and (271), the verbs *suvokiu* and *tikiu* (*understand*, *believe*) enable the target audience to treat Paksas as a mental subject. In most cases, this politician uses verbs related to thinking, in order to present himself as an opinion subject. However, the President says nothing about his real

actions. It is possible to observe that the conceptual metaphor POLITICS IS A JOURNEY, which determines linguistic metaphors and carries positive connotations, is presupposed through positive changes in example (268). Here the President talks about the beginnings of democracy in Lithuania, presenting the scene via comparison with a traveller who is at the beginning of his way: *esame tik demokratinio kelio pradžioje* (we are at the beginning of a democratic way). The noun *pradžia* (beginning) and the Present Simple Tense *esame* (are) indicate that democracy in Lithuania began with the governing of Paksas. This complements his political image with positive features. Example (271) indicates the positive end of the way: *išeisime sustiprėję* (we will leave this way being stronger). This example represents the beneficial result which will be achieved when the current difficult situation is over. The largest number of examples containing the conceptual metaphor POLITICS IS A JOURNEY refer to a journey in one direction only – the one which leads towards the European Union. In some cases Paksas even names that way *Europos kelias* (the European way), but in most cases he just indicates the direction. This way is especially closely related to the *benefit* domain which was analysed in the previous chapter.

The linguistic metaphors expressing the conceptual POLITICS IS A JOURNEY metaphor that are aimed at Paksas's permanent opponents, bear negative evaluative connotations:

(274) *Šiandien Seimas įžengė į galutinę Prezidento apkaltos proceso stadiją.*
(2004)

In this statement taken from Paksas's public appeal to the citizens of the Republic of Lithuania (April 05, 2004), delivered just before his suspension, the negative consequences of the actions he describes are presented with the help of the analysed metaphor: *įžengė į galutinę proceso stadiją* (entered into the final stage of the process). The Parliament and its members are perceived and presented as Paksas's main opponent, responsible for the choice of an unfair, non-beneficial and even detrimental way:

(275) *Esu įsitikinęs, kad šiuo metu Lietuvoje sukelta politinė sumaištis neturi sulėtinti mūsų žingsnių, einant pasirinktu keliu.* (2004)

(276) *Po keliolikos minučių Jūs balsuosite dėl apkaltos Respublikos Prezidentui. Tai - neturintis precedento įvykis Europos istorijoje, tampantis mūsų šalies savotiška vizitine kortele žengiant į senosios Europos namus.* (2004)

The examples presented above do not express any negative connotations of *way*, but they negatively characterize the situation. Those who act as obstacles along the way are reprehended with the help of this characteristic. On the other hand, the actualization of this metaphor in the speeches of Paksas helps to form a positive image of his politics and makes it possible for him to blame his opponents. Moreover, example (276) implies that one of Paksas's main opponents, the Parliament, is responsible for the formation of a negative image of the state, possibly leading to corresponding consequences or even obstacles in the President's preferred way: *žengiant į senosios Europos namus* (*entering the house of the old Europe*). This plays a crucial role in Paksas's conflict communication with his opponents, because the opposition is introduced as a power which may arrest the state's development and prevent its entrance to the promised bright future.

In order to add more negative features to the image of his opponents, the President Rolandas Paksas purposely uses the words *tvarkytis* and *apsivalyti* (*to clean, to brush*) on the basis of which an entailment of THE STATE IS A BUILDING metaphor, THE STATE BUILDING IS NOT CLEAN, may be observed:

(277) *Matyt, situacija valstybėje yra tokia - reikia tvarkytis, ir tai yra daroma. Nemanau, kad visi pareigūnai yra tokie jau blogi. Tokių yra tik dalis ir nuo jų reikia paprasčiausiai apsivalyti.* (2003)

(278) *Mano, kaip Prezidento, užduotis yra ta, kad valstybė kuo greičiau apsivalytų.* (2003)

These statements, delivered at the beginning of his presidential career, enable Paksas to show the target audience covert conflict communication with

his predecessors. He implies the idea that the governing periods of the previous heads of state were marked by disorder in the country. Disorder in politics connotes illegal actions, and it is therefore possible to conclude that Paksas actualizes the conceptual metaphor THE STATE BUILDING IS NOT CLEAN through a linguistic *disorder* metaphor. Moreover, he indirectly indicates that *THEY* are responsible for illegal actions and *I make order* by eliminating the sources, causes and consequences of those questionable actions. Paksas presents himself as the cleaner of the state and society through the introduction of such declarations as *reikia tvarkytis, reikia apsivalyti, mano, kaip Prezidento, užduotis yra ta, kad valstybė kuo greičiau apsivalytų* (it is necessary to clean, my task as President is to put the state in order as soon as possible). It is important to mention that these words are closely related to the name of the party, *Tvarka ir Teisingumas* (Order and Justice), which was represented by Paksas. By saying *reikia* (it is necessary), this politician reveals that he knows what should be done. The evidential modality is obvious in this situation, because, although the necessary actions become evident from the situation, the order in which they should be performed may not. It is also possible to assume that from the start of his term there was a lack of imperative intonations in Paksas's political discourse, indicating his lack of control over the situation.

In the year 2004, during the process of impeachment, the political situation changed; therefore, the subjects of the *I–THEY* opposition also changed. *I* remained the same, but *THEY* became all persons and institutions who were attacking or blaming Paksas:

(279) *Suprantu, kad Prezidentas, net ir pikčiausiai pjudomas ir juodinamas, neturi teisės daryti klaidų.* (2004)

(280) *Aiškiau negu bet kada pamatę mūsų gyvenimo piktžaidžes, privalome iš to pasimokyti ir iš klampios sumaišties išbristi švaresni ir atsinaujinę.* (2004)

Example (279) presents the very intense verb *juodinti* (to blacken) which expresses particularly negative evaluative connotations of the situation

and, at the same time, connotes that the indictee's image has been construed incorrectly. The phrase *klampi sumaištis* (*swampy tumble*) (see example (280)) is very closely related to the concept of *disorder*, as a tumble is a type of *disorder*. Moreover, it describes the current situation (the impeachment) in the state. Once again the opponents are shown to be responsible for such *disorder*. There is also an allusion to the *impurity* of the current situation, expressed with the help of the comparative case *švaresni* (*cleaner*). It should be emphasized that Paksas conveys his confidence in a felicitous resolution of the process; he also expresses belief in himself and common victory. Furthermore, this President identifies himself with the whole country. The presented statements disclose an allusion to the fact that THE STATE BUILDING IS NOT CLEAN. In other words, President Paksas indicates *disorder* in the state through the *disorder* metaphor.

Another conceptual metaphor which can be reconstructed in Paksas's speeches is LITHUANIAN POLITICS IS A SICK PERSON. The accusation of the opponents is actualized through this metaphor:

(281) *Paminėjau tik keletą labai pavojingų teisinės ir politinės sistemos negalavimo simptomų, tačiau ir jų užtenka, kad įstengtume suvokti, kur slypi tikrosios grėsmės valstybei ir demokratijai.* (2004)

(282) *Kad ir kokie skausmingi įvykiai klostytųsi Lietuvoje, mano nuomone, jie neturėtų pažeisti esminių demokratijos principų.* (2004)

Clinical symptoms of the legal and political systems are used to present a negative evaluation of the opposition's performance with the help of such adjectives as *labai pavojingi* and *skausmingi* (*very dangerous, painful*), which emphasize the importance of this situation. The nouns *negalavimas* and *simptomai* (*indisposition, symptoms*) bear negative connotations themselves, and signal the negative side of the issue, which may be perceived as detriment and harm to the state being the opponents' responsibility. The indicated consequences of the *disease* are eventually introduced as a threat to democracy. Moreover, the President, with the help of the phrase *įstengtume suvokti* (*would be able to understand*), once again introduces himself as a

mental subject, while the clinical symptoms are indicated as obstacles limiting the implementation of his intended actions.

The most widely developed conceptual metaphor in Paksas's conflict communication is POLITICS IS WAR. It is expressed through *fight/attack*, *defence* and *enemy* linguistic metaphors.

The *fight/attack* linguistic metaphor is the prevailing metaphor in Paksas's conflict communication with his opponents:

(283) *Aš matau aršų, ilgalaikį ir sunkiai suvokiamą pasipriešinimą.* (2003)

(284) *Kad ir kasdien kartočiau, jog nesu saistomas jokių kitų įsipareigojimų, išskyrus Prezidento priesaiką Lietuvai ir jos žmonėms, vis tiek būčiau kaltinamas, nes kaltintojų tikslas – ne išsiaiškinti tiesą, bet palaužti mane morališkai ir sunaikinti politiškai.* (2003)

(285) *Politinis nebrandumas ir egoizmas veda į tai, kad oponentas tampa ne pagarbos vertu idėjiniu priešininku, o mirtinu priešu, nes gali atskleisti nešvarius paties kaltintojo darbus. Toks pavojus telkia visą kariauną, ir kova tampa žūtbūtinė.* (2004)

(286) *Suprantu, kad Prezidentas, net ir pikčiausiai pjudomas ir juodinamas, neturi teisės daryti klaidų.* (2004)

(287) *Kad ir kaip pasibaigtų ši aštri politinė kova [...].* (2004)

(288) *Ar sugebėsime atskirti tikrą tiesą nuo tariamos, tikrus priešus nuo tų, kuriuos aštrioje politinėje kovoje sukuria laki fantazija?* (2004)

(289) *Kartu kiekvieną sykį susitikimuose išgyvenu, kad nedaug įstengiu Jums padėti, nes sistema, prieš kurią, eidamas į valstybės vadovo postą, pasiryžau kovoti, yra daug galingesnė, negu Jūs galite įsivaizduoti.* (2004).

(290) *Visada kovosiu prieš tikrąsias, o ne išgalvotas grėsmes valstybės nacionaliniam saugumui. Kovosiu prieš žmonių nuskurdinimą, korupciją, vis didėjantį turtinį atotrūkį, Europos Sąjungos lėšų grobstymą, narkomaniją ir narkomafiją, organizuotą nusikalstamumą, savanorišką dėl nepakeliamo vargo Lietuvos žmonių tremtį į svetimus kraštus.* (2004)

Examples (283) and (285–288) represent the opponents' *fight* against Paksas which is emphasized by such epithets as *žūtbūtinė*, *pikčiausiai*, *aštri*, *aršus* and *ilgalaikis* (*desperate*, *vicious*, *sharp*, *determined*, *long-term*),

revealing negative connotations related to the opposition. The consequences of the latter conceptual metaphor, expressed with the help of these adjectives, are to disclose the negativity and exaggeration of the opponents' performance and the helplessness or even insecurity of the President. The remaining statements reveal that conceptual metaphors are able to have various entailments. In Paksas's speeches, the *war* domain is concretized: it is *war* against dangerous phenomena which are named by abstract nouns. When this politician speaks about his opponents, *THEY fight* against one particular person – Paksas himself. Examples (284), (288–290) disclose interesting oppositions. The opposition *real enemies–false enemies* is evident in example (288) where it is implied that the enemies and dangers Paksas *fight*s against are real, while his opponents *fight* against false enemies that only exist in their imagination. This idea is complemented by example (290). The opposition *I–SYSTEM* is revealed in example (289). The fact that this politician is ready to fight against the whole system, named by him as very powerful, transforms his victim image into an attacker image and presents Paksas as an active physical subject. However, this attacker image is not dominant. The role of a victim or a person under attack is dominant in Paksas's political discourse.

The *war* scenario covers two sides: one side attacks and the other defends itself. As discussed elsewhere, Paksas takes the role of the defendant:

(291) *Visada gyniau ir ginsiu Lietuvos valstybės ir jos žmonių interesus.* (2003)

(292) *Tokia nuostata akivaizdžiai varžė mano teisę į gynybą, tačiau net ne tai yra svarbiausia.* (2004)

(293) *Bet kokioje situacijoje žmogus turi siekti teisingumo, ginti savo teises, suteiktas Lietuvos Respublikos Konstitucijos.* (2004)

Example (292) represents, and (293) implies, a situation in which the President wanted to defend his actions although his right to do so was limited. Such expressions as *varžė mano teisę į gynybą, ginti savo teises* (*derogated from my right to defence, to defend one's rights*) suggest that he is being attacked and must defend himself. It is obvious that Paksas introduces himself

as a victim. In this case the conceptual metaphor POLITICS IS WAR determines certain rhetorical peculiarities. As a result, example (291) further emphasizes the intended contrast by introducing the President as a positive person who represents the beneficial interests of the state in the processes of *fight* and *defence*.

Having carried out an analysis of the conceptual metaphor POLITICS IS WAR, it is possible to hypothesize that Paksas treats his opponents as enemies and indicates the metaphorical perception of *ideological enemy* (see example (294)) and a non-metaphorical perception of the *enemy* concept (see example (295)):

(294) *Politinis nebrandumas ir egoizmas veda į tai, kad oponentas tampa ne pagarbos vertu idėjiniu priešininku, o mirtinu priešu, nes gali atskleisti nešvarius paties kaltintojo darbus.* (2004).

(295) *Ar sugebėsime atskirti tikrą tiesą nuo tariamos, tikrus priešus nuo tų, kuriuos aštroje politinėje kovoje sukuria laki fantazija?* (2004)

The speeches of Paksas have a deep level – the opposition *I–THEY* (the parliament/system). Furthermore the conceptual metaphor IN LITHUANIA POLITICS IS WAR acts as a mediator between the opposition and the text. The consequences and nominations indicating that *I* am innocent, *I* am a victim while *THEY* are enemies and attackers all result from this metaphor. Example (294) is of special importance because it discloses the fact that, according to Paksas, the political conflict in Lithuania is interpersonal rather than ideological. In this context the metaphorical *fight* becomes a real *fight*.

The analysis of conceptual metaphors in Paksas's political discourse leads to the following conclusions:

1. The conceptual metaphors THE STATE IS A BUILDING, POLITICS IS A JOURNEY, THE STATE BUILDING IS NOT CLEAN, LITHUANIAN POLITICS IS A SICK PERSON and POLITICS IS WAR prevail in Paksas's political discourse.

2. This politician's speeches realize conceptual metaphors that are generally typical of political discourse. It is possible to observe that conceptual metaphors have an evaluative potential: the evaluations expressed through

linguistic metaphors and belonging to the same conceptual metaphor may differ and acquire both positive and negative connotations.

3. In Paksas's political discourse, the *I-THEY* opposition is actualized through metaphors. Through the metaphor POLITICS IS WAR Paksas presents himself as a victim; through the conceptual metaphor LITHUANIAN POLITICS IS A SICK PERSON, this politician indicates that the situation in the state needs "treatment." THE STATE IS A BUILDING metaphor conveys the idea that the state may be built as a result of group effort (joining forces) as well as destroyed. It is possible to conclude that the guilty side is the destroying side. The conceptual metaphor POLITICS IS A JOURNEY allows Paksas to use linguistic metaphors with both positive and negative evaluations.

4. The conceptual metaphors which provide a basis for text creation through linguistic metaphors allow the features of a victim to be attributed to Paksas. His opponents are granted the characteristics of attackers, people who are destroying the state, obstacles in the way of democracy who confuse ideological enemies with enemies of war.

3.3. OPPOSITIONS AND THEIR MEMBER NOMINATIONS IN THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF ARTŪRAS PAULAUSKAS

Paulauskas became the acting President after the suspension of Paksas. At that moment the conflict between the former President (Paksas) and his opponents was still being widely discussed and analysed. As a result, Paulauskas treats Paksas as his opponent and aims all of his conflict communication at the predecessor and his actions.

On the basis of Paulauskas's political discourse, a few nominations based on oppositions may be analysed. This politician's conflict communication is based on the binary *WE-THEY* model, where *WE* stands for the interim President and his supporters while *THEY* stands for the suspended President and his colleagues. Paulauskas mostly focuses on the *WE* part of the latter model, and he identifies himself with the state:

(296) *Kalbėdamas Jums visiems, sąmoningai vartojau įvardį “mes”. Mes – kaip tauta, mes – kaip valstybė. Mes – kaip Lietuva [...]. (2004)*

Moreover, Paulauskas introduces himself (*WE*) as a defender of freedom and a fighter against indifference, deception and the manipulation of people. Therefore, it becomes evident that negative features are attributed to Paulauskas's political opponents, who manipulate and deceive people.

The most important domain in Paulauskas's political discourse is *benefit*. The meaning fields *benefit–detriment* may be analysed in this domain.

Paulauskas expresses his resolution, opposes himself against the Constitution and understands this behaviour as a *benefit*:

(297) *Atsižvelgdamas į tai, kad šiandien Seimas pirmu balsavimu pritarė Konstitucijos 56 str. pakeitimui, neleidžiančiam asmeniui, Seimo pašalintam iš pareigų apkaltos proceso tvarka, būti renkamam anksčiau nei po 5 metų, tačiau Konstitucijos pakeitimas gali įsigalioti tik prieš pat Seimo rinkimus, nenorėdamas rizikuoti valstybės likimu, nusprendžiau teikti Seimui skubos tvarka svarstyti Prezidento rinkimų įstatymo papildymo įstatymą, kuris neleistų Respublikos Prezidentu rinkti asmenį, Seimo nušalintą apkaltos proceso tvarka. (2004)*

This extract expresses the personal merits of Paulauskas with the help of such words as *atsižvelgdamas, nenorėdamas rizikuoti, nusprendžiau* (*taking into consideration, reluctant to risk, decided*). These words directly help to present his reasons for acting, which, with the help of the euphemism *rizikuoti valstybės likimu* (*to risk the fate of the state*), acquire a shade of resolution. It should be evident that the politician takes responsibility for the state. On the other hand, it is obvious that he does not trust the nation and is afraid that Paksas will be re-elected. Paulauskas wants to appear to be a wise and resolute politician in his speeches. In this case a manipulative type of “black rhetoric” is used, as the President's real reasons are hidden behind euphemisms.

Paulauskas attributes the *detriment* meaning field to Paksas, who is implicitly accused of populism. This meaning field is related to such negative actions of the former President as lies, disrespect, violation of moral values and self-interest:

(298) *Todėl noriu kalbėti paprasta ir aiškia kalba: žmonės, netikėkite pigiais pažadais greitai ir be pastangų pakeisti jūsų gyvenimą ir sukurti gerovę. Taip nebūna. Pasaulio, o ir Lietuvos istorija rodo, kad kuo garsiau kas nors žada sukurti rojų žemėje, tuo greičiau jo vedami žmonės atsiduria aklavietėje. Dažniausiai – palikti savo vedlio likimo valiai.* (2004)

(299) [...] *Tad priesaika, buvo netikra. Pasirodo, netikra buvo ir pagarba savo šalies Konstitucijai.* [...]. (2004)

(300) *Lengvatikiai, vadinasi, ir populistai, atsiranda ten, kur trūksta pilietiškumo, pilietinės visuomenės, normalių profsajungų, piliečių bendruomenių.* (2004)

(301) *Didžioji visuomenės dalis tapo lengvatikiais ir tam tikros politinės jėgos jais netruko pasinaudoti.* (2004)

Examples (298–301) do not directly apply *detriment* to Paksas and his supporters, although from the broader context the target audience is able to perceive the former President as responsible for and guilty of detrimental actions. It is obvious that Paulauskas associates Paksas's performance with his promises; clearly all of these statements containing the phrases *pigūs pažadai* and *lengvatikiai* (*cheap promises, credulous*) are intended for the impeached President. Moreover, the last statement contains a reproach to society and accuses it of credulity. Example (299) does not contain any phrases indicating Paulauskas's opponents, but the target audience understands who is being addressed as it is acquainted with the situation and its participants very well.

The *detriment* characteristic used to identify Paksas is intensified by the following words:

(302) [...] *į Prezidento postą gali sugrįžti šiurkščiai Konstituciją ir priesaiką pažeidęs bei apkaltos keliu nušalintas Prezidentas Rolandas Paksas. Tai turėtų jau neprognozuojamų pasekmių mūsų valstybei, jos tarptautiniam įvaizdžiui.* (2004)

The last statement reveals Paulauskas's attitude towards his opponent as a person who rudely contravened the Constitution. Furthermore, this example introduces the idea that the Paksas administration will have unforeseeable results for the state and its international image. Moreover, a

hidden meaning is also present in the latter statement: if there is an opportunity for Paksas to hold the presidential office once again, he might be re-elected; therefore, the initiated law contradicts the volition of the larger part of society. The collocation *neprognozuojamų pasekmių* (*unforeseeable results*) conveys a negative connotation intended to frighten the public. In Lithuanian political discourse, international image names a concept generally used as an argument against some particular actions.

In order to disassociate from his opponent Paksas, Paulauskas uses the inclusive pronoun *we*, including himself and the part of society which does not support Paksas. It is evident that the latter part of society is presented as the whole country. Moreover, his frequent usage of the adjective *tarptautinis* (*international*) helps Paulauskas to introduce himself as a person who is concerned about the image of Lithuania abroad and the international evaluation and acknowledgment of the state:

(303) *Tikiu Lietuva, kuri per keturiolika metų klysdama ir taisydama savo klaidas, vis dėlto eina pirmyn. Šiuo ėjimu jau pelnėme tarptautinę pagarbą ir esame laukiami – ir laukiami jau ne kaip svečiai įtakingiausiose Europos ir pasaulio organizacijose. (2004)*

The negativity of the ex-President Paksas is reinforced by attributing a *fear* meaning field to his picture with the intention of frightening society. This characteristic is a very beneficial and helpful weapon in Paulauskas's conflict communication aimed at his predecessor, as it enables him to enthrone the governing side and to marginalize the opposition. The intended aim is to win the support of the electorate and to gain a larger share of their votes during the forthcoming presidential elections. The following example illustrates the attribution of the *fear* characteristic to the opponent:

(304) *Tik noriu pasakyti, kad jeigu ne Rolandas Paksas ir jo komanda šių priešlaikinių iškilnių apskritai nebūtų buvę. Todėl nekalbėti apie tai neįmanoma. Nekalbėti neįmanoma ir todėl, kad yra pakankamai daug politinių jėgų ir joms tarnaujančios propagandos, kurios labai norėtų, kad visa tai kaip galima greičiau užmirštume. Ir viską būtų galima pradėti iš naujo... Dalykas,*

kurio jie labiausiai bijo - tai mūsų atmintis. Kartais man atrodo, kad jie bijo visai be pagrindo. Gyvenimas kužda, kad tauta ima prarasti atmintį. (2004)

Repetition of the noun *atmintis* is a particularity of Paulauskas's rhetoric. He appeals to *memory* as to a value. Paksas, conversely, appeals to history, because history has the connotation of a fair judge. According to Arnautova (2006), memory cannot be a source of objective facts, because memories may be false, fragmentary or purposely created. Moreover, two accusations are evident in these statements. One is implicit, intended for *HIM*, the opponent Paksas, who is blamed for propaganda: *daug politinių jėgų ir joms tarnaujančios propagandos (a lot of political forces and the propaganda that serves them)*. Another reproach is intended for the part of society that still supports Paksas: *tauta ima prarasti atmintį (the nation has started to lose its memory)*. This may raise the question of whether Paulauskas really believes in democracy if he feels free to reproach Lithuanian society. However, as is already obvious from the *fear* analysis, this politician wants the citizens to pay attention to the negative actions of the suspended President and is willing to employ various methods to ensure that Paksas does not return to his former position. These methods include both the formation of a negative image of the opponents and the intimidation and accusation of society.

The analysis of Paulauskas's texts expressing conflict with his opponents revealed oppositions and their member nominations, and it is possible to draw the conclusion:

1. that the interim President, with the help of the meanings connoted by *I/WE*, associates himself with the following characteristics: *I* am resolute, *I* want to save the state from its mistakes, *I* care about the international image of the Republic of Lithuania. At the same time, *HE/THEY* lie, give unsupported promises, and are credulous people who easily lose their memories of negative events.

3.4. CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS IN THE DISCOURSE OF PAULAUSKAS

The words used in Paulauskas's political discourse enable the target audience to observe such typical political conceptual metaphors as POLITICS IS A JOURNEY and POLITICS IS WAR. The prevailing metaphor is POLITICS IS A JOURNEY, which helps to draw a contrast between the actions of the interim (Paulauskas) and the former (Paksas) Presidents. It is possible to hypothesize that movement forward along the political way is associated with the governing of Paulauskas and all former Presidents except for Paksas, and is perceived as especially positive. The opponent Paksas, meanwhile, is described as having got lost along the way:

(305) *Tai juk jo, Mindaugo, nustatyta kryptimi įveikusi natūralias ar dirbtines užtvaras ir prietarus, skiriančius mus nuo Vakarų civilizacijos, pagaliau nuėjo Lietuva.* (2004)

(306) *Tikiu Lietuva, kuri per keturiolika metų klysdama ir taisydama savo klaidas, vis dėlto eina pirmyn.* (2004)

(307) *Mes – kaip Lietuva, įžengianti į penkioliktuosius laisvės metus, pasiryžusi ir toliau eiti demokratijos, tolerancijos, humanizmo ir kūrybos keliu. Dėkoju visiems, kuriuos sutinku šiame kelyje, ir dar kartą sveikinu Lietuvą ir visus jos žmones su nepriklausomybės atkūrimo diena.* (2004)

Example (305) reveals the fact that the direction of the way is indicated historically; Paulauskas and his supporters are said to be following the way begun in the 13th century by the King Mindaugas. This is an appeal to history and memory. In the rest of the statements, the years of Lithuanian independence are conceptualized as a way. The phrase *ir toliau eiti demokratijos, tolerancijos, humanizmo ir kūrybos keliu* (to move further along the way of democracy, tolerance, humanism and creativity) expresses further movement along this way, therefore, the concepts presented in the phrase are metaphorized as the direction of that way. It is also obvious that Paulauskas, with the help of an I–THEY opposition, indicates the forward direction of his chosen way: *įžengti, eiti pirmyn* (to enter, to move forward). It may be

observed that both Paksas and Paulauskas share the same aim: a democratic way. This once again supports the hypothesis that this conflict does not have an ideological nature.

THEY (Paksas and his supporters) are associated with movement backwards and even depicted as being lost along the way:

(308) *Atotrūkis tarp valstybės ekonominių rodiklių augimo tempų ir jos piliečių gyvenimo gerėjimo tempų (jeigu pastaruosius apskritai galima vadinti tempais...) pasidarė toks didelis, kad žmonės ėmė dairytis į kitą pusę. Arba net atgal... (2004)*

(309) *Tikiu, kad tai laikinas partijų paklydimas [...]. (2004)*

In the last statement, Paulauskas addresses the political parties and encourages them to offer presidential candidates who would be acceptable to Lithuanian society. With this statement, this politician disassociates himself from the parties and does not consider himself as lost on the political way. He chooses another way, enabling him to take a teacher's position. Unlike his opponent Paksas, Paulauskas is an opinion subject: in most cases, he presents himself as a subject of belief in the Lithuanian future.

The POLITICS IS WAR conceptual metaphor may be observed in Paulauskas's political discourse:

(310) *Todėl Mindaugas turėjo likti patenkintas, regėdamas kaip Lietuva, jo mokyta gintis, sėkmingai įveikė geopolitinius svyravimus ir apkaltos procese, ir pastarųjų Prezidento rinkimų batalijose. (2004)*

(311) *Tačiau šiandien savo laisvę vėl turime ginti. Ne nuo priešų tankų. Nuo klastos, nuo savo abejingumo, nuo varge esančių žmonių mulkinimo, nuo pigaus manipuliavimo jų vargais. (2004)*

Example (310) implies that under the governing of Paulauskas the Republic of Lithuania has overcome all the difficulties associated with the former President. In this case the POLITICS IS WAR metaphorical expression helps to draw a clear line between the *fighting* camps – Paulauskas and his supporters are the positive camp, while Paksas represents the negative side. The positivity of the interim President's image is intensified by the verb *įveikti*,

which indicates the concept of victory. Example (311) serves the same purpose, though in this case Paulauskas focuses more on the negativity of his opponents. In this *battle*, Paulauskas denominates himself as the successor of Mindaugas, i.e., he again returns to historical memory and indicates Lithuania and *US* as subjects of *defence* but not as subjects of *attack*.

After the analysis of conceptual metaphors in Paulauskas's political discourse, the following conclusions may be drawn:

1. The conceptual metaphors POLITICS IS A JOURNEY and POLITICS IS WAR prevail in Paulauskas's political discourse.

2. The speeches delivered by this politician make use of conceptual metaphors that are generally typical of political discourse. It is possible to observe that a conceptual metaphor has an evaluative potential – the evaluations expressed through linguistic metaphors and belonging to the same conceptual metaphor may differ and acquire both positive and negative connotations.

3. The majority of these conceptual metaphors are actualized through the opposition *I-HE/THEY*, where the main opponent is *HE*, the suspended President, and *THEY* are his supporters. In this case, the conflict is more interpersonal than ideological. Therefore, in the POLITICS IS WAR metaphor, Paulauskas introduces himself as a defender of the state and the nation, while *HE/THEY* are presented as attackers. POLITICS IS A JOURNEY indicates *MY/OUR* forward way and contrasts it with *HIS/THEIR* backwards way and the act of being lost along the way.

4. Paulauskas's speeches make use of more special rhetorical means than those of Paksas. These devices include the rhythm of language through homogeneous parts of the sentence and the usage of parcel structures. In such a way, the speeches of Paulauskas are meant to affect both the structures of the addressee's consciousness and the psychic structures of the subconscious in order to encourage the addressees of the speeches to accept the attitude of the speaker.

5. Paulauskas presents himself as the successor of Lithuanian historical traditions. He also presents his opponent as the violator of such traditions.

6. Paulauskas does not only take part in the conflict with Paksas; he also forms a particular impression of himself, probably related to the forthcoming presidential elections.

3. 5. OPPOSITIONS AND THEIR MEMBER NOMINATIONS IN THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF VALDAS ADAMKUS

Adamkus was the only President to serve two terms on the political stage of the independent Republic of Lithuania. The period of his governing includes many significant decisions and numerous political steps. There is one more aspect which allows him to be treated as a pioneer in Lithuanian political life: Adamkus was the first President since the restoration of independence not to belong to any political party.

Despite his initial political neutrality, throughout his time as President Adamkus acquired supporters and opponents. As a result, he carried out conflict communication with his opponents and employed linguistic means to make it effective. Like all the political leaders that have been analysed so far, Adamkus employs the *WE–THEY* model where the first nomination stands for him and his actions while the second stands for his opponents. After investigation of the research material, which is mostly annual reports of Adamkus, it is possible to state that this President perceives the Parliament, the Government and most of the functionaries as opponents. Moreover, the head of state, with the help of the already indicated *WE–THEY* model expressed in the annual reports, not only carries out conflict communication with the introduced opponents, but he also indicates defects in their performance and actions that should be taken to improve it. Furthermore, it is necessary to point out that the political discourse of Adamkus differs greatly from the political discourse of other Lithuanian Presidents analysed in this dissertation, because there is no open conflict in his discourse. Only the President himself feels the conflict and can express it. Adamkus expresses his own dissatisfaction and gives the

impression that a conflict exists between his actions and plans and those of the state institutions. Therefore, in this part of the analysis two new terms will be introduced – Adamkus will be denominated as the protagonist, while the people and institutions opposing him will be denominated as the antagonists.

The *benefit* domain may be analysed on the basis of Adamkus's political discourse of both terms. First, the meaning fields *strength–weakness* will be presented and investigated:

(312) *Mūsų valstybė šiandien stipri. Pasaulis mus pažįsta ir pripažįsta kaip patikimus partnerius.* (2003)

(313) *Nesileisiu įtraukiamas į tuščias diskusijas, nepalaikysiu populistinių kaltinimų ir reikalausiu atsakomybės visa Prezidento galia, kurią man suteikia Konstitucija.* (2007)

In the first example, (312), taken from the 2003 annual report of his first term, Adamkus relates *WE* to *I*. In other words, this politician identifies himself with the state. Therefore, when the state is granted the characteristic of *strength*, it can be said that the head of state is granted the same feature. This characteristic is complemented and intensified by a reliability feature: *WE* are reliable partners (*patikimi partneriai*). The second statement, taken from Adamkus's appeal to the nation, "The Attack Against State Institutions is Dangerous" (2007), contains this *strength* implication: I am powerful and strong, therefore I am not going to employ populist methods. Moreover, the President uses the verb *reikalauti* (*to require*); the adjectives *stiprus* and *patikimas* (*strong, reliable*); and the noun *galia* (*power*) in order to form the *strength* image that he attributes to his own personality. The antagonists are granted *weakness* and *indecision* characteristics, which are closely related with *detriment*:

(314) *Mūsų partijos tebėra silpnos. [...]Dėl šių akivaizdžių silpnumo ženklų Lietuvos piliečiai partijomis nelinkę pasitikėti. Jie nėra tikri, ar partijos išties atstovauja jų interesams.* (2001)

(315) *Jau septinti metai kalbama, kad reikia patvirtinti Valstybės politikų etikos kodeksą. Šiandien jo trūksta labiau negu bet kada, tačiau Seimui ir dabar trūksta politinės valios jį priimti.* (2006)

(316) *Skelbiamas siekis plėtoti Lietuvoje aukštosiomis technologijomis ir kvalifikuota darbo jėga grindžiamą verslą, tačiau iki šiol nesiryžtama nustatyti vadinamąsias Sodros įmokų lubas.* (2007)

(317) *Valdžios neryžtingumas ir sprendimų bei atsakomybės baimė, permainų baimė ir atsivėrimas nuo pasaulio stumia į neviltį mūsų piliečius.* (2008)

(318) *Apgailestaudamas turiu konstatuoti, kad ir dabar Seimas nesugeba sutarti dėl pagrindinių teismų sistemos problemų ir neturi ryžto jas spręsti.* (2008)

Looking at the dates of these annual speeches, it is possible to conclude that President Adamkus carried out conflict communication with various opponents in which he created their image as *weak* throughout his two terms. It is evident that in example (314), his reproach for *weakness* is not initiated by ideological differences, as in this case Adamkus wants to strengthen all parties as political organizations. Moreover, these statements reveal that an *indecision* characteristic is being attributed to the parties, executive institutions, the Parliament and the Government. This characteristic, expressed through various linguistic means, is based on the following clauses: *Mūsų partijos tebėra silpnos; Seimui ir dabar trūksta politinės valios jį priimti; tačiau iki šiol nesiryžtama nustatyti vadinamąsias Sodros įmokų lubas; Valdžios neryžtingumas ir sprendimų bei atsakomybės baimė, permainų baimė ir atsivėrimas nuo pasaulio stumia į neviltį mūsų piliečius; Seimas nesugeba sutarti dėl pagrindinių teismų sistemos problemų ir neturi ryžto jas spręsti* (Our parties are still weak; The Parliament still lacks the political willpower to enact it; but they are still hesitant to determine the so-called ceiling of Sodra instalments; The hesitation of the Government and its fear of responsibility and changes, as well as its isolation from the world, lead our citizens to despair; The Parliament has not managed to reach a consensus on the main problems of the court system and lacks the resolution to solve them).

In example (314) the subject is indicated directly: the political parties, whose major characteristic is expressed by the adjective *silpnas* (weak); *THEIR* actions are characterized negatively because *THEY* do not represent the interests of the citizens. Another clearly indicated subject in the conflict communication is the Parliament, which is granted features of a lack of political will, an inability to solve problems and indecision. One more antagonist is disclosed in the speeches of the President: the legislative and executive authority. This subject is implied in example (316), where it becomes evident from the list of actions that have not been completed due to a lack of resolution on the part of the latter institution. The next statement expresses an apparent opposition between the President and the legislative and executive authority. Adamkus reproaches the Government for its *indecision* and *fear*; due perhaps to his experience living in a country where a strong political system exists, he probably wants to organize the Lithuanian political system according to a particular prototype of democracy. This gives rise to the observed conflict between the President's opinion about the necessary situation and the current situation, though not a conflict between ideologies. Moreover, the noun *neryžtingumas* (*hesitation*) which prevails in Adamkus's political discourse reveals his attitude towards his numerous antagonists and reinforces their *weakness* characteristic. This characteristic of the opposition members enables the President to form a positive image of himself in the eyes of the electorate. It has already been mentioned that Adamkus is dissatisfied with the performance of institutions, therefore, he disassociates himself from their actions through his conflict communication. Adamkus demonstrates the intended situation and strives to support his authority.

The *strength* meaning field determines another closely related meaning field, *danger*, which is attributed to the antagonists. The *danger* concept is expressed through the corresponding nomination and words formed from the same root. It is applied by the President to the image of his antagonists and presents the contrast between himself and the Government and Parliament:

(319) *Turiu galvoje savotišką mūsų politinio gyvenimo pakrikimą, kuris darosi pavojingas. Pavojingas, nes pakerta pasitikėjimą valstybės institucijomis ir demokratinio gyvenimo vertybėmis. Todėl kyla pavojus mūsų laisvei ir Konstitucijoje įtvirtintam valstybingumui.* (2005)

(320) *Artėjant rinkimams matau aiškius bandymus išbalansuoti Lietuvos politinę sistemą ir puolimą prieš pačių sukurtas valstybines institucijas. Tai pavojinga jaunai valstybei ir jos suverenumui.* (2007)

According to examples (319–320), the *danger* characteristic is based on the antagonists' actions, which are dangerous to the state, democratic values, independence, statehood and the state's sovereignty. With the help of such a contrast between the positive actions of the President and the negative actions of the state institutions, Adamkus portrays himself as a profound politician who wants to maintain stability in the country. The antagonists are depicted as acting recklessly to evoke danger. In this case, *I* is presented as a positive and beneficial side, while the Government and most of the politicians are depicted in gloomy colours. The aim of this counterposition is to change the political situation in the state in the desired direction and to win the support of society.

The positive image of President Adamkus and the negative image of his antagonists is further reinforced with the help of another pair of opposite meaning fields, *responsibility–irresponsibility*, included in the *benefit* domain. Adamkus relates his own *responsibility* to the Constitution and its regulations, accepting this *responsibility* even for negative events and concepts while, on the other hand, blaming the antagonists for their *irresponsibility*:

(321) *Nenuveiktų darbų našta ištis didelė. Atsakomybę už ją turime jausti visi.* (2001)

(322) *Taigi neturime kito kelio kaip imtis asmeninės atsakomybės už savo ir bendruomenės gyvenimą, imtis iniciatyvos, imtis įtempto protinio ir fizinio darbo konkurencijos sąlygomis.* (2001)

(323) *Suvokdamas savo, kaip Valstybės vadovo, atsakomybę, ir kartu aiškiai suprasdamas savo įgaliojimų ribas, noriu pareikšti, kad tokia padėtis valstybiniu požiūriu yra nepriimtina.* (2005)

(324) *Prieš metus prisiėmiau atsakomybę, paskirdamas Algirdą Brazauską Lietuvos Ministru Pirmininku. (2005)*

(325) *Konstitucinė atsakomybė mane įpareigoja apžvelgti ir įvertinti praėjusių metų šalies gyvenimą, Vyriausybės veiklą ir aptarti galimus bendrus sprendimus valstybės ir jos piliečių gerovei užtikrinti. Atlikdamas šią pareigą, šios kadencijos Seimui noriu išsakyti savo mintis apie mūsų dabartį ir perspektyvas, apžvelgti laimėjimus ir problemas. (2008)*

It can be observed that Adamkus perceives *responsibility* in two ways: as a personal *responsibility* and as a *responsibility* required by his position. He therefore concludes that the person bearing such *responsibility* may require it from all governmental branches. The President's statements connote the idea that his sense of *responsibility* grants him mandate and obliges him to require *savo, kaip Valstybės vadovo, atsakomybę; konstitucinė atsakomybė (my responsibility as the head of state; constitutional responsibility)*.

The *irresponsibility* meaning field can easily be traced in the following statement:

(326) *Noriu priminti, kad politinės partijos, vengiančios atsakomybės pradėti realias permainas, turi ir turės prisiimti atsakomybę už stringančias reformas, už nuostolius, kuriuos dėl mokslo ir studijų sistemos netobulumo šiandien patiria ir ateityje patirs Lietuva. (2007)*

In this case the President indicates *THEM*, the actual agents (political parties), and presents *THEIR* characteristics as *irresponsible* or, in his words, *vengiančios atsakomybės (avoiding responsibility)*.

Another set of meaning fields, *opportunities–promises*, exists in Adamkus's political discourse. At the beginning of his term the President introduces only his own actions and states in his self-characteristic that his actions provide the citizens of the Republic of Lithuania with various *opportunities*. Two years into his term, these *opportunities* are opposed to a *promise* characteristic attributed to the antagonists, because *THEY* are only able and willing to *promise* but not to fulfil these promises.

(327) *Pradėjome dešimtuosius laisvės metus. Pagrįstai galime džiaugtis nepriklausomybės ir demokratijos laimėjimais. Minties, judėjimo laisvė,*

savarankiško verslo ir ūkininkavimo galimybės, nevaržoma kultūros kūryba, nepriklausoma žiniasklaida - tai reikšmingi veikiančios demokratijos požymiai. Lietuvos tikrovė iš tiesų tapo veikiama piliečių valios. (1999)

(328) *Prieš metus buvau išrinktas Lietuvos valstybės vadovu, piliečių daugumai pritarus pamatinėms mano programos nuostatomis. Jos itin glaustos: laisvas žmogus, atvira visuomenė, stipri valstybė. Šios nuostatos žymi mano siūlomą tėvynės projekciją, galimą Lietuvos kelią. Jo centre pirmiausia matau savarankišką, iniciatyvų žmogų. Žmogų, kuriam tarnauja valstybė, gindama jo teises, sudarydama sąlygas visapusiškai išskleisti asmeninius gabumus, siekius, pašaukimą. (1999)*

These two statements, taken from the first annual report, suggest that Adamkus relates the idea of *opportunities* to two different concepts – democracy as in example (327) and human potential as in example (328). Furthermore, in example (327) it is again possible to observe *I* identified with *WE*, with all the citizens of the Republic of Lithuania. The achievements of the President during the first years of his term are expressed through *WE*. Moreover, this statement contains a direct nomination of the *opportunities* concept, *galimybės*, which is emphasized by numerous adjectives: *savarankiškas, nepriklausoma, nevaržoma (independent, unrestricted)*. The second example, (328), reflects the idea of *opportunities* through the following features that are essential to human potential: *savarankiškas, iniciatyvus žmogus; asmeniniai gabumai, siekiai, pašaukimas (independent, proactive person; personal talent, aspirations, mission)*. In these statements the conflict communication is not open; here, *I* achievements, based on personal attitudes, are indicated. The hidden implication is that *THEY* do not have such attitudes; the fact that *THEY* have not reached such achievements may be considered as the basis for the investigated communication.

As discussed above, during the third year of his first term, the President depicts his antagonists as his contrast and characterizes them as only capable of *promises* but not real actions that would provide the electorate with beneficial *opportunities*. *THEY* are also introduced as the part of society that is used to living in a paternal state:

(329) *Tokie faktai liudija, kad didelė dalis Lietuvos žmonių gyvena kai kurių politikų populizmo sukurtoje nerealių lūkesčių tikrovėje, gyvena manydami, kad visas jų problemas privalo išspręsti valdžia.* (2001)

(330) *Šiandien vienas po kito leidžiami atskiri mokesčių įstatymai ir jų pataisos. Užmiršus duotus rinkimų pažadus, mokesčių tvarka keičiama biudžetinių metų viduryje.* (2002)

(331) *Todėl dar kartą noriu paprašyti ir Seimo, ir Vyriausybės narių: ne tik deklaruokime, bet ir siekime realiai įgyvendinti išsikeltus tautos ir valstybės raidos prioritetus. Mažinkime atotrūkį tarp žodžių ir darbų.* (2003)

(332) *Tą nepasitikėjimą dar labiau gilina kiekvienu rinkimų metu žarstomi įspūdingi pažadai. Pabrėžiu: ne rimti pertvarkos projektai, o tik pažadai – suformuluoti be atsakomybės ir orientacijos į ilgalaikį gerovės siekį, nerealiūs ir pataikaujantys piliečiams, iš anksto užkoduoti kaip neįvykdomi. Piliečiams tas pažadų nevykdymas kelia nusivylimą ir nepasitikėjimą valdžios institucijomis, tuo tarpu žadėtojai paskęsta veiklos imitacijoje – skandaluose ir komisijose, kovose dėl įtakos sferų.* (2007)

(333) *Kada pagaliau tos kalbos taps konkrečiais sprendimais?* (2007)

(334) *Nors Vyriausybė žadėjo, kad iki 2008 metų bus parengti bendrieji planai ir žemės reforma bus baigta, planų dar nėra daugelyje Lietuvos savivaldybių.* (2007)

(335) *Būkime atviri, žemės reforma iki 2007 metų pabaigos nebus baigta ir nemažai žmonių dar neatgaus savo turto, nors jiems ne kartą tai buvo žadėta.* (2007)

These statements support the *promise* meaning field and include the actual addressees – the Government, the Parliament and the politicians. Almost all these examples contain the key noun *pažadai* (*promises*) or the verb *žadėti* (*promise*), which emphasize the negative performance of the President's antagonists. There are also cases in which this key noun is replaced with a synonymous noun such as *kalbos* (*speeches*) or the verb *deklaruoti* (*declare*). Clearly this is a conflict between institutions, but not an ideological or interpersonal conflict.

It is possible to discuss other meaning fields, *transparency–non-transparency*, within the *benefit* domain. These meaning fields also include the concept of self-interest. Adamkus's political discourse discloses that his own

actions and ideas are introduced as *transparent*, while the actions of his antagonists are presented as totally *non-transparent* and based on their own, usually material, interest. This political leader emphasizes his own *transparency* and the *transparent* actions of the team that supports him. This characteristic is emphasized by the constant repetition of noun *skaidrumas* (*transparency*), which is put into the corresponding context and makes the target audience believe in the reliability of this characteristic and the person who is granted such features:

(336) *Noriu dar kartą priminti savo vidinį moralinį principą – niekada nė per centimetrą nesitrauksiu nuo savo aiškių nuostatų. Politika turi būti skaidri, morali.* (2005)

(337) *Kartu noriu pabrėžti - pasitikiu savo komanda. Mano žmonės yra susitelkę ir pasiryžę tęsti pradėtus darbus bei mano vykdomą politiką, kurios pagrindiniai principai yra skaidrumas, atsakomybė ir moralumas.* (2006)

(338) *Siekdamas daugiau skaidrumo ir atvirumo, pasisakau už įvairių lygių teismų pirmininkų rotaciją.* (2008)

The importance of this characteristic is presented in several annual reports, and the attitude is emphasized by such intense verbal expressions as *noriu dar kartą priminti; noriu pabrėžti; pasisakau* (*I want to remind once again; I want to emphasize, I speak for*). These expressions, presented in the first person, should depict this President as standing for the rights and benefit of the state and its citizens. Moreover, here (see example (337)) the explicated conflict between institutions is expressed; otherwise, there would be no need to talk about trusting the President's team. On the other hand, this political leader is contrasted with the performance of the antagonists, thus creating tension and enabling the occurrence of conflict communication. As already mentioned, the antagonists are granted the *non-transparency* meaning field, including the following specific concepts: *doubtful necessity, self-interest, suspicion, etc.:*

(339) *Tačiau steigama vis naujų valstybinių institucijų, nors jų funkcijos paprastai supainiotos, menkai koordinuotos, o neretai - ir abejotino reikalingumo.* (1999)

(340) *Labai stinga visų su nusikalstamumu kovojančių institucijų veiklos koordinavimo, jų konstruktyvaus bendradarbiavimo. Žmonėms kyla įtarimų, ar šios institucijos pajėgia dirbti savarankiškai, nepataikaudamos politinei konjunktūrai.* (1999)

(341) *Todėl bendromis pastangomis privalome iš esmės keisti valdžios ir verslo santykius. Būtina pereiti prie skaidrios kooperacijos.* (2001)

(342) *Lietuvos valstybės tarnyba tampa pažeidžiama ir dėl korupcijos. Nemažėjanti šešėlinė ekonomika ir kontrabanda taip pat liudija ne ką kita, o mūsų valstybinės sistemos silpnumą. Piliečiams nesuvokiama, kodėl šių klausimų vis neatsiranda Vyriausybės ir Seimo darbotvarkėje?* (2005)

(343) *Valstybės valdymo sistema vis dar remiasi ne profesionalumo ir visuotinių tikslų pagrindu ir dažnai tampa asmeninių ir siaurų partinių interesų įkaite.* (2006)

(344) *Už „viešojo intereso“ ir „teisingumo“ šūkių neretai slepiasi savanaudiškumas, cinizmas ir siauri partiniai interesai.* (2006)

(345) *Valstybės institucijos dažnai vadovaujasi savo, bet ne piliečių interesais, todėl pastarieji jaučiasi visiškai priklausomi nuo sudėtingų biurokratinių procedūrų.* (2007)

(346) *Dar viena nepasitikėjimo politine sistema priežastimi laikau politinių partijų uždarumą. Neaišku, kokios ideologinės, politinės ar dar kitokios priežastys lemia jų politinius sprendimus. Daug abejonių kelia partijų rinkimų kampanijų finansavimas iš privačių šaltinių.* (2007)

(347) *Būkime atviri, žemės reforma iki 2007 metų pabaigos nebus baigta ir nemažai žmonių dar neatgaus savo turto, nors jiems ne kartą tai buvo žadėta. Dauguma valdžioje buvusių ar esančių šios problemos, atrodo, nepajus. Ne vienas sėkmingai pasinaudojo priimtų įstatymų teikiamomis galimybėmis susigrąžinti žemes, įsigyti naujų sklypų.* (2008)

The timeline of numerous statements illustrating, supporting and explaining the *non-transparency* characteristic gives the electorate the possibility to observe and to perceive that this meaning field has been applied to the image of the antagonists throughout both of Adamkus's presidential terms. Additionally, the President names the actual people who he finds guilty of *self-interest* (related to *non-transparency*). It is especially evident in examples (343–345). This list includes such participants as politicians, political parties, state institutions, business groups, the Government and the Parliament.

Although the key word *non-transparency* is not directly employed in the President's political discourse, the enumeration of so many negative actions and the worried tone of these statements imply the idea, and also the negative results of the antagonists' *non-transparency* and *self-interest*. This helps the President to achieve the intended aims in this conflict communication: to depict himself as caring for the benefit of the state and acquire more support from the electorate, while making the citizens aware of the unfairness of the performance of the antagonists. Moreover, the opposition *I* (the President)–*THEY* (the state institutions) is evident in example (345). This opposition, expressed in the 2007 annual report of the President, introduces state or governmental institutions as representing all such institutions. The broader context of the latter report discloses the formation of such an opposition, indicating that governmental institutions should serve people. However, these are only words but not reality, and Adamkus disassociates himself from the legislative authority and forms a positive image of himself in the eyes of society.

This presentation of the negative aspects of Adamkus's antagonists' performance makes it possible to observe another pair of opposite meaning fields, *rescuer of the state*–*maulers of the state*, in his political discourse. These meaning fields are of exceptional importance in the context of conflict communication, as they enthrone one side, in this case the President, making that side a favourite. At the same time, they introduce the antagonists as a threat to the state and its citizens. The *rescuer of the state* meaning field, including such specific concepts as *fight against corruption*, *culture protection*, *poverty elimination*, could be based on the following examples:

(348) *Per ligšiolinį valstybės raidos etapą mes labiau siekėme išsaugoti tautos kūrybinį potencialą: mokslo, kultūros, meno institucijas.* (2002)

(349) *Taigi būtina rimtai kovoti su korupcija.* (2005)

(350) *Vaikų skurdo panaikinimas – vienas iš svarbiausių uždavinių, kuri išsprendus bus galima sustabdyti iš kartos į kartą paveldimą skurdą.* (2008)

Examples (348–349) directly convey the idea of *rescue* with the help of such verbs as *išsaugoti* (*to save*) and *kovoti* (*to fight*). These verbs present the particular actions taken by the President to protect the state and society. The last example, (350), contains the expression *vaikų skurdo panaikinimas* (*elimination of children poverty*). In the latter context the noun *panaikinimas* (*elimination*), usually having a negative connotation, acquires a positive meaning and signals the end of poverty. These statements perform the function of linguistic influence. The antagonists are introduced as a contrast:

(351) *Biudžeto išlaidos pastaruojų metu kasmet didėjo gerokai daugiau, negu augo ūkis. Taigi valdžia ima gyventi ne pagal šalies ūkio išgales. Šito pasekmės - laiku nesurenkamas šiųmetinis valstybės biudžetas, didėjančios "Sodros" skolos, vėluojančios pensijos.* (1999)

(352) *Šiandien išaugusios valstybės skolos rodo ir prastą valstybės išdą valdymą.* (2000)

(353) *Neatsižvelgiant į tai, ką jie ateityje nutars, man pirmiausia nepriimtina, kad politinė taryba bando daryti sprendimus, kurie pagal kompetenciją priklauso Vyriausybei arba įstatymų leidžiamajai valdžiai, o tuo pačiu yra pažeidžiami demokratinės valdžios pasidalinimo principai.* (2006)

(354) *Ir valdžia neturi teisės trypti Lietuvos žmonių požiūrio, vertinimų ir savigarbos.* (2006)

(355) *Tyrimai liudija, kad pagrindinės kliūtys ekonomikai ir konkurencingumui stiprėti yra glaudžiai susijusios su prastu valstybės institucijų darbu.* (2006)

(356) *Dėl užsitęsusių ir neskaidrios žemės reformos netenkame milijardų litų, kurių taip reikia švietimui, sveikatos apsaugai ir socialinėms reikmėms.* (2007)

(357) *Pastarieji metai mums visiems skaudžiai patvirtina šią tiesą - bendrų tikslų, socialinės partnerystės, tikėjimo valstybe ir pasitikėjimo bendrapiliečiais stoka, pilietinis ir politinis susvetimėjimas privedė Lietuvą prie valstybės tapatybės krizės.* (2007)

Despite the fact that throughout his conflict communication the President presents all the negative actions performed by the antagonists as detrimental, he forms a separate *maulers of the state* meaning field that includes the most detrimental actions. The target audience is already

acquainted with the agents – the Government and the governmental institutions. Their negative actions include both material and moral detriment. The presented statements do not contain a direct expression of *mauler* or *detriment*, but they cover all the negative performance of the antagonists. It is possible to observe that the *maulers of the state* characteristic is formed on the basis of such specific concepts as: *laiku nesurenkamas šiųmetinis valstybės biudžetas, didėjančios “Sodros” skolos, vėluojančios pensijos; išaugusios valstybės skolos; pažeidžiami demokratinės valdžios pasidalinimo principai* (*this year’s state budget has not been collected on time, debts of “Sodra” are increasing, pensions are late; increasing debts of the state; distribution principles of democratic government are violated*). These statements and the latter meaning fields enable the target audience to draw the very interesting conclusion that President Adamkus avoids any personal responsibility for the negative events and phenomena taking part in the state, but rather blames the antagonists for that and implicitly grants *THEM* responsibility for the state’s identity crisis (see example (357)). This disassociation from the state institutions helps to form a positive image of one person and enables the target audience to arrive at the conclusion that this President is as helpless as the former President Paksas.

It is also possible to trace the meaning fields *good strategist–bad strategists* in Adamkus’s political discourse. Naturally, the President grants himself the *good strategist* characteristic, while his antagonists acquire the image of *bad strategists* during the process of conflict communication. This image may be denominated as a specific concept:

(358) *Sėkmingai švietimo raidai reikia ilgalaikės strategijos.* (1999)

(359) *Šiuo metu baigiama tobulinti dabarties visuomenei itin svarbi Skurdo mažinimo strategija.* (2000)

(360) *Jau šiandien žinių visuomenės, sykiu ir žinių ekonomikos bei elektroninės valdžios, kūrimą privalome laikyti strateginiu valstybės uždaviniu.* (2001)

(361) *Valdžios ir visuomenės dialogui mums šiandien reikia tvirto pagrindo - reikia aiškios valstybės ir tautos raidos strategijos, kuri labai konkrečiai kiekvienam Lietuvos žmogui atsakytų į klausimą, kaip mūsų kraštas pasinaudos būsima Europos Sąjungos parama ir pasieks sparčios pažangos. Reikia strategijos, kuri ne tik argumentuotai išskirtų aiškius raidos prioritetus, bet ir juos pagrįstų būsimų investicijų planu. Tokia strategija padėtų atsirasti labiau įpareigojančiam, platesniam ir realiai veikiančiam nacionaliniam susitarimui. Tiesa, šiandien turime ir neblogų strateginių dokumentų, ir pasirašytą Nacionalinį susitarimą siekiant ekonominės ir socialinės pažangos. Tačiau kasdieniai politiniai sprendimai labai dažnai nutolsta nuo visuomenei pristatyto strateginio brėžinio, paversdami mūsų dokumentus tik tuščiomis deklaracijomis, kuriomis piliečiai neturi pagrindo pasitikėti.* (2003)

(362) *Manau, kad iš šių trijų iššūkių kyla ir trys strateginiai Lietuvos tikslai:*
- sukurti savarankišką piliečių visuomenę, politinę tautą;
- įveikti krašto ir jo regionų ekonominį, socialinį, technologinį atsilikimą ir kartu padėti pagrindus didesniam socialiniam teisingumui;
- atkurti piliečių pasitikėjimą savimi, savo tauta, savo valstybe, užtikrinti gyvybingą tautos ateitį. (2005)

The presented statements suggest that strategic planning for the benefit of the state and its citizens was one of Adamkus's priorities throughout his presidential terms. Consequently, the *good strategist* meaning field is based on such specific concepts as *skurdo mažinimo strategija*; *valstybės ir tautos raidos strategija* (*strategy of poverty reduction*; *strategy of the evolution of the state and the nation*). The latter characteristic is related to education, moral and social values and the future of the nation. The relevance of the *good strategist* meaning field is emphasized by such adjectives as *ilgalaike* and *itin svarbi* (*long-term, especially important*). It is evident that this political leader will benefit from such a presentation of his own actions and strategic plans for the welfare of the state, as it will help him to acquire more supporters. Contrast is employed as one of the most important means in the conflict communication Adamkus aims at his antagonists. This can easily be observed in example (361), where, after introducing himself as a *good strategist*, the President blames his antagonists for their inefficient performance: [...] *kasdieniai politiniai sprendimai labai dažnai nutolsta nuo visuomenei pristatyto strateginio brėžinio, paversdami mūsų dokumentus tik tuščiomis deklaracijomis, kuriomis piliečiai neturi pagrindo pasitikėti* (*everyday political*

decisions frequently distance themselves from the strategic draft that was presented to the society. They turn our documents into empty declarations and the citizens do not have any reasons to trust them). This grants them a totally contrastive *bad strategists* characteristic. It is also evident in the following statements:

(363) *Įvardysiu keletą šios krizės priežasčių. Pirmutinė ir svarbiausia iš jų – ne kartą mano minėta strateginio mąstymo stoka.* (2008)

(364) *Vienas iš daugybės ydingo strateginio planavimo pavyzdžių – nedovanotinai uždelstas mokytojų atlyginimų klausimas.* (2008)

The President indirectly names the antagonists in the above presented statements but, according to the indicated actions, and considering that the most important antagonists of the President responsible for the introduced performance are the Parliament and the Government, it immediately becomes evident who or what is referred to. The negativity of the antagonists is intensified even more by such specific concepts as *strateginio mąstymo stoka* and *ydingas strateginis planavimas* (*the lack of strategic thinking; faulty strategic planning*) and the introduction of the consequence *krizė* (*crisis*).

The *benefit* domain is the most plentiful in Adamkus's political achievements and, consequently, the most widely used in his conflict communication with his antagonists. Therefore, *efficiency-inefficiency* opposite meaning fields are included in the latter domain. The President declares that all his actions and decisions are highly *efficient*, while the antagonists are depicted as being responsible for all the *inefficient* performance. There are two types of statements supporting the *efficiency-inefficiency* characteristics. One type contains the words *efficiency/inefficiency*, while the other provides the target audience with plenty of examples of actions which imply, suggest and support the latter idea. However, Adamkus characterizes himself with the help of the actual word *efficiency* in order to give it more relevance:

(365) *Ypatingai svarbu šiandien modernizuoti valstybės valdymą, padaryti jį labiau efektyvų, labiau skaidrų ir patikimą.* (2003)

(366) *Sieksiu, kad VSD būtų tęsiamos reformos, kad saugumui garbės nedarantį informacijos nutekimą pakeistų efektyvi parlamentinė kontrolė, kad pareigūnai būtų susitelkę darbui ir Saugumo departamentas tarp sąjungininkų išliktų patikimu partneriu.* (2006)

The adjective *efektyvus* (*effective*) not only provides a basis for the *efficiency* characteristic, but it also prompts the electorate to pay attention to its importance in the process of welfare creation. As a result, the President acquires a much better image than his antagonists. As mentioned above, the *inefficiency* characteristic is based on dual linguistic expressions. First, the accusation involves the direct expression of *inefficiency*:

(367) *Visuomenei per brangu išlaikyti neefektyvią valdininkiją.* (2001)

(368) *Kol kas kova su korupcija nėra efektyvi. Valdžios pastangomis šioje srityje yra nusivylę ir piliečiai.* (2004)

(369) *Turime pripažinti, kad mūsų kuriama visuomenės apsaugos sistema veikia nepakankamai efektyviai, ir daugybė piliečių nesijaučia saugūs nei savo valstybėje, nei savo namuose.* (2006)

(370) *Šiandien vykdomas medicininių paslaugų paskirstymas šalyje akivaizdžiai virsta sveikatos priežiūros įstaigų protegavimo politika – iš esmės ydinga, neefektyvia ir neracionalia.* (2006)

Examples (367–368) contain the direct subjects *valdininkija* (*officialdom*) and *valdžia* (*government*), while examples (369–370) do not define the actual antagonists; nevertheless it is clear that the same institutions should take responsibility for the *inefficiency*. The latter characteristic may be based on such specific concepts as the fight against corruption and thesecurity and healthcare systems. The second group of statements introduces cases in which the President's antagonists perform *inefficiently*:

(371) *Manau, kad metas Seimui ir Vyriausybei pereiti nuo vienadienių politinių spektaklių prie nuoseklios švietimo ir mokslo reformų tąsos.* (2001)

(372) *[...]Lietuvoje per dažnai politikai imasi reikalų, kuriuos sutvarkyti gali patys žmonės ar jiems tarnaujančios savivaldos ir valstybės institucijos.* (2002)

(373) *Gaila, kad Seimas neišvengė blaškymosi dėl referendumo organizavimo, jo pobūdžio ir trukmės.* (2003)

(374) *Seimui įnikus į debatus dėl Valstybės saugumo departamento, liko apleistos kitos tiesioginio jo darbo sritys, sustojo būtinos permainos.* (2008)

(375) *Apmaudus faktas: dėl politinių ambicijų, kovos dėl valdžios, neprofesionalumo, intrigų, korupcijos ar populizmo nesugebėjome išjudinti nė vienos reikšmingos mūsų šalies vidaus ekonominio ir socialinio gyvenimo reformos.* (2008)

In the statements presented above, the *inefficiency* meaning field is supplemented and intensified by nouns which have a negative and even derogative meaning in the political context, e.g., *spektaklis, blaškymasis, neprofesionalumas, intrigos, korupcija, populizmas* (*performance, flounce, amateur, intrigue, corruption, populism*), the verbs *sustoti* and *nesugebėti* (*stop, not to manage*) and the adjective *apleistas* (*derelict*). These words show the attitude of the President towards his antagonists, who are directly named in the latter statements. In example (375), Adamkus, with the help of the words *nesugebėjome išjudinti* (*we did not manage to propel*) and through a *WE* expression, delivers an indirect reproach and implies actual perpetrators. Once again it can be seen that in the discourse of President Adamkus, conflict exists between institutions, while the conflict of the Presidents analysed above was interpersonal.

Adamkus grants himself several characteristics belonging to the *benefit* domain that have no corresponding negative ones applied to his antagonists. In conflict communication, such non-opposite characteristics are intended form a positive and attractive image in the eyes of the electorate. It is possible to observe the non-opposite characteristic *welfare*. Adamkus states that *welfare* is one of his priorities:

(376) *Socialinė, ūkinė, kultūrinė mūsų regionų plėtra - vienas didžiausių šiandienos uždavinių. Tai labai įvairūs ir konkretūs darbai, bet jų paskirtis viena - mūsų bendra gerovė.* (2001)

(377) [...] *mūsų valstybė neturi aukštesnio siekio už visapusę savo piliečių gerovę.* (2001)

(378) *Palaiapsniui turi kilti tiek žemdirbių, tiek mokslininkų, mokytojų, gydytojų, kultūros darbą dirbančių žmonių gerovė.* (2003)

The President associates the *welfare* meaning field with such actions as *socialinė, ūkinė, kultūrinė mūsų regionų plėtra; visapusė savo piliečių gerovė* (*social, economic, cultural development of our regions; comprehensive welfare of our citizens*). He states that all working people should live in a state which cares about the *welfare* of its citizens. Adamkus uses the possessive pronouns *mūsų* and *savo* (*our*) which imply that the President identifies himself with all the residents of Lithuania, which is why he is so concerned with their *welfare*. Furthermore, all the actions regarding the latter issue are presented as having been suggested and initiated by Adamkus. This supports and complements the intended characterization of the President.

In the President's political discourse *THEY*, the antagonists, are granted the following characteristics: *defiance, bureaucracy, incompetence, discord, intrigue, distrust, and indetermination*.

As discussed above, the President perceives his own actions and decisions as very beneficial, so the *defiance* of the antagonists is introduced as one of the most detrimental actions:

(379) *Žinau, kad mano idėjos ir konkretūs siūlymai ne visada įgyvendinami, ne visada sulaukia Vyriausybės ir Jūsų, gerbiamieji Seimo nariai, paramos.* (2000)

(380) *[...]pasiūliau Seimui priimti įstatymo pataisas, kurios padėtų partijoms išvengti finansinių grupuočių įtakos. Apgailestauju, kad šis mano siūlymas taip ir liko Jūsų rimtai nesvarstytas.* (2000)

(381) *Turime Lietuvoje sukurti pastovias ir palankias, dirbtinių biurokratinių kliūčių nevaržomas verslo sąlygas. Mano supratimu, tokios sąlygos - tai pagrindinė prielaida verslui atsigauti, kartu - ir žmonių gerovei augti. Ši uždavinį savo metiniame pranešime kėliau jau pernai, bet tuometinės Vyriausybės likau nesuprastas.* (2000)

(382) *Priėmiau šį sprendimą, prieš tai ne kartą įspėjęs Seimą ir Vyriausybę, kad, nesubalansavus mūsų pajamų ir išlaidų, galime nesuvaldyti infliacijos ir kainų augimo. Vyriausybė patikino, kad imasi atsakomybės už mūsų krašto*

ekonominę ir socialinę gerovę, o tam įtikinama balsų dauguma pritarė Seimas. Prezidento veto jau nieko nepakeistų. (2008)

These statements express helplessness, *defiance*, open counterposition and present the Parliament and the Government as antagonists who hinder the President's intentions and actions. This characteristic is formed on the basis of such verbs as *neįgyvendinti, nesulaukti, nesvarstyti, nesuprasti* and *nepakeisti* (*not fulfil, not attain, not consider, misunderstand, not change*), which help to achieve the intended aim of presenting the President's institution as a positive power of the state while depicting the other state institutions as performing inefficiently and not caring about the welfare of the nation.

This intended image of the antagonists is intensified by another meaning field, *bureaucracy*, which is perceived and treated negatively in any democratic society. This could be illustrated by the following statements:

(383) *Tarp valdžios ir piliečių išlieka nomenklatūrai būdingas atotrūkis. Jį nuolat primena ir tūkstančiai man adresuotų laiškų. Juose matau nevirtį žmonių, atsimušusių į storą naujojo, lietuviškojo, biurokratizmo sieną.* (1999)

(384) *Manau, kad biurokratinė inercija, skaidrių finansavimo principų stoka gerokai lėtina sveikatos apsaugos pertvarką.* (2000)

(385) *Dabartinės medicinos krizės tikrai neįveiksime tik imdamiesi vis naujų biurokratinių priemonių ir kamšydami iššvaistyto biudžeto skyles paskolomis, kaip, atrodo, šiandien mėginama daryti.* (2002)

(386) *Grįždamas iš susitikimų rajonuose parsivežu šūsnis žmonių laiškų, valdininkų biurokratinio atsirašinėjimo bylų.* (2008)

The *bureaucracy* characteristic attributed to the antagonists includes the Government, institutions and their officers. The prevailing form of the expression of this meaning field is the adjective *biurokratinis* (*bureaucratic*). There is also a case with the noun *biurokratizmas* (*bureaucracy*). The negativity of the latter meaning field and the antagonists' actions is represented through such picturesque phrases as *biurokratizmo siena, biurokratinė inercija; biurokratinės priemonės; biurokratinis atsirašinėjimas* (*bureaucracy wall, bureaucratic inertia; bureaucratic means; bureaucratic correspondence*).

The metaphor *biurokratizmo siena* (*bureaucracy wall*) depicts the antagonists as an obstacle in the citizens' attempts to secure a better life. This image is reinforced by the verb *atsimušti* (*bounce off*), implying that there is no way for progress or any kind of movement. *Biurokratinė inercija* (*bureaucratic inertia*) stands for the power of the bureaucrats, but it too is related to an obstacle that prevents movement. In general, *means* (*priemonės*) have a neutral meaning, but in the latter context and coupled with the adjective *biurokratinės* (*bureaucratic*), they represent the same attitude and features as the previously mentioned *biurokratinė inercija* (*bureaucratic inertia*). Finally, in the phrase *biurokratinis atsirašinėjimas* (*bureaucratic correspondence*), both the noun and the adjective have a negative connotation. This adjective has already been described, and the focus here is on the noun *atsirašinėjimas* which expresses a negative evaluation as it depicts a form of indifferent and inefficient work intended to form an image of the antagonists as being totally non-beneficial.

Attribution of the *intrigue* meaning field to the antagonists may also be observed in the political discourse of President Adamkus:

(387) *Artėjant rinkimams matau aiškius bandymus išbalansuoti Lietuvos politinę sistemą ir puolimą prieš pačių sukurtas valstybines institucijas. Tai pavojinga jaunai valstybei ir jos suverenumui.* (2008)

In this case the Lithuanian political leader does not indicate the actual agent(s), but it is obvious that the latter words are aimed at his antagonists. Such specific concepts as *bandymai išbalansuoti Lietuvos politinę sistemą ir puolimas prieš pačių sukurtas valstybines institucijas* (*attempts to disbalance the Lithuanian political system and an attack on the state institutions that were established by us*) may be regarded as the basis of the *intrigue* meaning field. The verb *išbalansuoti* (*disbalance*) and the noun *puolimas* (*attack*) suggest the idea that the antagonists *weave a plot*. Therefore, the President's antagonists begin to appear dangerous to the state, even like potential enemies.

The concepts of *incompetence*, *discord*, *distrust* and *indetermination* are formed in Lithuanian with the prefix *ne*, which gives them their negative meaning. Therefore, they express the intended aim of the President, who grants

his antagonists the latter characteristics. The most important meaning field is *incompetence*, because such concepts as *discord* and *indetermination* stem from it. The following statements illustrate this characteristic:

(388) *Koaliciją sudarančios partijos nėra stiprios. Kol kas joms akivaizdžiai stinga valdymo patirties, veiksmų kryptingumo ir nuoseklumo.* (2001)

(389) *Neatsižvelgiant į tai, ką jie ateityje nutars, man pirmiausia nepriimtina, kad politinė taryba bando daryti sprendimus, kurie pagal kompetenciją priklauso Vyriausybei arba įstatymų leidžiamajai valdžiai, o tuo pačiu yra pažeidžiami demokratinės valdžios pasidalinimo principai.* (2006)

(390) *Įstatymai dažnai rengiami ir pateikiami skubotai, rimtai nesigilinant į ekonominius ir socialinius padarinius, neįsigilinus į kitų šalių patirtį, ir dėl to dažniausiai lieka tinkamai neįvertinti viešieji interesai.* (2006)

(391) *Nesugebėjimas laiku baigti žemės reformą, valdžios nerangumas sprendžiant teritorijų planavimo klausimus dirbtinai riboja žemės pasiūlą statyboms.* (2008)

(392) *Deja, tie Seimo nariai, kurie privalo rūpintis nacionaliniu saugumu, ieško, kaip susiaurinti iš aukščiausių šalies vadovų sudarytos Valstybės gynimo tarybos funkcijas.* (2008)

While suggesting the idea of *incompetence*, Adamkus indicates the actual, conventional antagonists: the Parliament, the Government and the political parties. First, a negative image of the antagonists is created with the help of such verbs and verbal expressions as *stigti, nebūti reikliam, nepaprašyti atsiskaityti, nesigilinti, neįvertinti, susiaurinti* (*lack, to be undemanding, not to ask to report, not to go into details, not to assess, narrow*). All these expressions signal the incompetent actions of the antagonists which are detrimental to the state. Secondly, the employment of the noun *nesugebėjimas* (*incapacity*) further reinforces the negative image of the antagonists. The President supports this meaning field with the noun *kompetencija* (*competence*). The context given is: *politinė taryba bando daryti sprendimus, kurie pagal kompetenciją priklauso Vyriausybei arba įstatymų leidžiamajai valdžiai* (*the political council is attempting to make decisions that belong to the government or the legislative authority on the basis of competence*). This

expresses the idea that the political institutions are *incompetent*. In order to intensify the significance of the *incompetence* characteristic, Adamkus provides the target audience with the non-beneficial results of the antagonists' *incompetent* actions. This method is widely used in his conflict communication.

Discord is another result of the antagonists' *incompetent* actions, therefore, the President perceives his antagonists as being guilty of this issue and tries to convey this idea to the electorate with the help of the *discord* meaning field:

(393) *Aišku, kad kasdieniai skandaliukai, nesutarimai nesudaro gerų sąlygų dinamiškai veiklai. [...] Norėtuši, kad būtų kuo mažiau vidinio tarpusavio stumdymosi, o tą energiją skirtume kūrybingam darbui.* (2005)

(394) *Seimas pastaraisiais metais nuėjo lengviausiu - politinių peštynių – keliu.* (2005)

(395) *Dėl vidaus politikos nesutarimų piliečiai pradeda manyti, kad Lietuvai neverta imtis ir aktyvios užsienio politikos.* (2007)

(396) *Deja, Lietuvai šiandien itin stinga solidarumo, pasitikėjimo, pakantumo ir tarp socialinių grandžių, ir tarp valdžios institucijų. Per keliolika mėnesių atsidengė mūsų parlamentinės valdžios susipriešinimas ir silpnybės.* (2007)

The core of the *discord* meaning field is based on the following nouns: *nesutarimai*, *peštynės*, *susipriešinimas*, *stumdymasis* (*disagreement*, *fight*, *counterposition*, *hustle*). It is also supplemented by the verb *stigti* (*lack*), standing for the lack of such moral values as solidarity, trust and tolerance. The target audience is already well acquainted with the antagonists, the Parliament and the Government. This characteristic belongs to the *benefit* domain because no performance can be beneficial or efficient if it takes place under conditions of *discord*. Furthermore, the antagonists dedicate all their energy to various disputes, thereby distracting their attention from their main duties and more important issues. This may serve as one of the reasons for the origin of another meaning field, *distrust*. The President depicts his antagonists and their actions as *distrustful*:

(397) *Manau, kad kasdien kuriamos Seimo komisijos nebekelia pasitikėjimo ne tik visuomenei, bet ir patiems politikams.* (2005)

(398) *Mano pasitikėjimo jau neturi ministrai Vladimiras Prudnikovas ir Žilvinas Padaiga, kurie privertė rimtai suabejoti jų politinę etiką ir kultūrą.* (2006)

The President's *distrust* meaning field is represented via the linguistic expressions *nekelti pasitikėjimo* and *neturėti pasitikėjimo* (*to be unreliable*), containing the key word *trust* and supplementing it by verbs expressing his negative attitude. Moreover, the expression *privertė rimtai suabejoti* (*made us seriously question*) supplements the latter characteristic. This meaning field is exceptional because, in addition to the conventional abstract antagonists (e.g., parliamentary commissions), the names of particular antagonists are presented. It is obvious that the ministers *Vladimiras Prudnikovas* and *Žilvinas Padaiga* are the most significant antagonists granted the *distrust* characteristic.

The *benefit* domain influences the formation of another significant domain, *change*, which is strongly associated with the performance of President Adamkus. This is because the latter political leader lived in the USA for a long period and was associated with new Western values, which were and still are so attractive to post-Soviet Lithuania. The electorate associated this *change* with democracy, freedom, independence, opportunities and wealth. The USA was a dream land for many generations of Lithuanians, so the election of its former citizen to the presidential post was perceived by society as the beginning of a new and attractive era. Consequently, there is no doubt that in the *change* domain, the President will again grant himself positive characteristics, while his antagonists will be depicted as a regressive power. There are several pairs of opposite meaning fields in this domain, but the prevailing meaning fields are non-opposite, applied by the President to his own personality.

The first and most relevant of the opposite meaning fields in this domain is *progress– regress*. This pair includes not only the *progress* concept, but also such specific concepts as *modernization* and *change*, which lie in the

basis of the *progress* meaning field. The following statements provide material for analysis:

(399) *Beje, ta proga galime pasidžiaugti, kad pastaraisiais metais gyventojų pajamos vidutiniškai augo sparčiau nei kainos ir kad pagal tarptautinius investicinės aplinkos bei ekonominės laisvės vertinimus Lietuva atrodo tikrai gerai.* (2006)

(400) *Auga ekonomika, vis sėkmingiau dalyvaujame Europos ir pasaulio rinkose [...].* (2006)

(401) *Šiandien, vertinant Lietuvos laimėjimus, krinta į akis sparti ūkio plėtra, visuomenės demokratėjimas ir laipsniškas gerovės kilimas.* (2006)

(402) *Sparčiu ekonomikos augimu šiandien dar galime džiaugtis.* (2008)

It is evident that the President forms the *progress* meaning field by basing it on the noun and the verb with the same root *aug- augti, augimas* (grow, growth) and the synonymous noun *plėtra* (development). Positive features and the success of the *progress* are expressed with the help of such expressions as *ekonominė laisvė* (economic freedom) and *Lietuvos laimėjimai* (breakthrough of Lithuania); the verbs *pasidžiaugti, džiaugtis* (rejoice) and the adjective *spartus* (rapid) added to the nouns representing development. These statements reveal that Adamkus associates *progress* with economic growth. Clearly the *benefit* and *change* domains are very closely interrelated. It has already been mentioned that *progress* includes the *modernization* concept as well:

(403) *Mūsų kuriama moderni Lietuva privalo turėti saugios ateities perspektyvą.* (1999)

(404) *Pradėjęs savo kadenciją, inicijavau Vyriausybės reformą, skatinau nuosekliai modernizuoti valstybę ir jos valdymą.* (1999)

(405) *Prieš trejetą metų keldamas laisvo žmogaus, atviros visuomenės, stiprios valstybės siekius, suvokiau juos kaip būtiną Lietuvos modernizavimo, Lietuvos vakarėjimo pagrindą.* (2001)

(406) *Tačiau šiandien labai svarbu nesustoti pusiaukelėje: turime tęsti ir spartinti šalies ginkluotųjų pajėgų modernizavimą.* (2002)

The latter concept is related to two issues – the state and armaments. The President bases the *progress* meaning field on the verb *modernizuoti* (modernize) and the noun with the same root and meaning, *modernizacija*

(*modernization*). Example (403) introduces the result of such *progress*: *moderni Lietuva (modern Lithuania)*. Adamkus grants himself the latter characteristic in order to achieve *modernization*, through employment of the first person narrative *inicijavau, skatinau, suvokiau (initiated, encouraged, perceived)*. Furthermore, in order to emphasize the significance of *progress*, the President involves society in the process of *modernization* with the help of the modal verbs *turime tęsti ir spartinti šalies ginkluotųjų pajėgų modernizavimą (we ought to continue and speed up the modernization of the country's armed forces)*. In this case, Adamkus once again expresses his identification with the state and society through *WE*.

Finally, *progress* is perceived as a kind of *change*. President Adamkus regards two types of *change* as the basis of the *progress* meaning field. The first is related to positive changes that have already taken place, and the second is related to the changes that he himself has initiated for the benefit and welfare of the country:

(407) *Esminių pokyčių reikia šiandieninei socialinės paramos sistemai. (2001)*

(408) *Teigiamos ūkio permainos jau pasiekė ir dalį visuomenės. (2003)*

(409) *Kad būtų padėti tvirti pamatai pilietinei visuomenei, savarankiškai politinei tautai, būtinos permainos: turime iš esmės keisti žmonių ir valstybės, piliečių ir valdžios santykius. (2005)*

(410) *Pirma, turime nedelsdami keisti visuotinį dvasinį Lietuvos klimatą, turime kovoti su visose visuomenės grandyse tyrančia nepagarba, agresija, cinizmu, susvetimėjimu. (2007)*

Example (408) complements the President's image with positive features, as it introduces the *progressive changes* that have already taken place during his governing. Positive features are expressed through the adjective *teigiamos (positive)* and are associated with beneficial economic *changes*. The other statements present the necessity for *change*. Here the nouns *permainos and pokyčiai (changes)* and the verb *keisti (change)* provide a basis for the *progress* meaning field. Its significance is intensified with the help of such adjectives as *esminiai and būtinas (essential)* and the verbs *reikėti, turėti and kovoti (have, fight)*, which are related to the intended and necessary *changes*. It

is obvious that the latter meaning field is formed on the basis of social, political and even moral *changes*. *Changes*, especially supplemented by some positive features, are of special importance to the electorate, as it associates *changes* with the beginning of a new, beneficial and attractive period or stage of life.

The President's antagonists are granted a *regress* meaning field, which may be observed in the following statement:

(411) *Kol kas tik kalbame apie šalies gerovę ir europines vertybes, o iš tikrųjų inertiškai judame sąstingio ir nuosmukio link.* (2008)

No specific antagonists are indicated in the presented example, but considering the fact that the President grants himself the *progress* characteristic, based on *modernization* and *change*, it becomes clear that a *regress* characteristic is being applied to the antagonists in order to form a negative image of them. This meaning field is based on two nouns with negative connotations: *sąstingis* and *nuosmukis* (*stagnation, decline*). As a result, the opposite meaning fields *progress–regress* are closely related with movement and could be represented through motion along a straight path; the President depicts himself as moving forward (*progress*) while his antagonists are granted the charmless stereotype of those who are moving backwards (*regress*).

Another pair of opposite meaning fields included in the *change* domain are *reformer–stuck-in-the-middle*. The President perceives himself as the initiator of all the progressive *reforms*, and thus associates the *reformer* characteristic with his own personality. The antagonists are introduced as a contrast and granted the *stuck-in-the-middle* meaning field. The *reformer* characteristic is based on the *reforms* which either have already been implemented or are planned and going to be carried out in the nearest future:

(412) *Turime reformuoti valstybės paramą kultūrai, aiškiai apibrėžti rėmimo principus.* (2005)

(413) *Lietuva sugebėjo pradėti švietimo reformą, kuri ir toliau tęsiama. Mums pavyko nemažai nuveikti.* (2005)

(414) *Sieksiu, kad VSD būtų tęsiamos reformos, kad saugumui garbės nedaranti informacijos nutekinimą pakeistų efektyvi parlamentinė kontrolė, kad pareigūnai būtų susitelkę darbui ir Saugumo departamentas tarp sąjungininkų išliktų patikimu partneriu.* (2006)

The *reformer* characteristic is expressed in a direct way, involving the use of the noun *reforma* (*reform*) and the verb *reformuoti* (*reform*). This meaning field presents the President to the electorate as an especially attractive personality, because the reforms are related to various areas of social and political life: security, culture, the economy, education, etc. The significance of the President's input is intensified with such verbs as *sugebėti*, *pavykti*, *nuveikti* and *tęsti* (*manage, succeed, achieve, continue*). *Reforms* are the results of *change* associated with the election of this political leader and his performance in his post. The presented examples suggest that Adamkus has lived up to the electorate's hopes and may be perceived as a highly successful and attractive political figure who is totally different from his predecessors and antagonists. This helps to draw a clear line between the President and his antagonists, indicating the "white" and the "black" sides. This effect is achieved by granting the antagonists the *stuck-in-the-middle* meaning field:

(415) *Daugelyje sričių, kuriose tikėtasi reformų, susiduriame su stagnacijos reiškinais, neveiklumu, ryžto trūkumu.* (2005)

(416) *Tyrimai liudija, kad pagrindinės kliūtys ekonomikai ir konkurencingumui stiprėti yra glaudžiai susijusios su prastu valstybės institucijų darbu. Su pernelyg lėta tokių paslaugų, kaip švietimas ar sveikatos apsauga, reforma, neefektyviu nuosavybės atkūrimo ir apsaugos bei žemės naudojimo problemų sprendimu.* (2006)

(417) *Tačiau praktinių aukštojo mokslo pokyčių nepastebime iki šiol.* (2007)

(418) *Akivaizdu, kad vykdomų reformų sparta – tikrai nepatenkinama. Ypač giliai įstrigusi visiems Lietuvos žmonėms aktuali sveikatos apsaugos reforma.* (2007)

In this case, as in the previous *regress* meaning field, the actual antagonists are not indicated, though they are implied through the *stuck-in-the-middle* characteristic. This meaning field is based on the nouns *stagnacija* and

neveiklumas (stagnation, inactivity), which directly express the idea of being stuck in the middle. It is also based on the adjective *lėtas* (slow), which conveys the idea that something is slow and unwilling to change. The expression *reformų sparta – tikrai nepatenkinama* (the speed of reforms is really unsatisfactory) adds support to the formation and application of this meaning field. Finally, the participle *įstrigusi* (stuck), supplemented by the adverb *giliai* (deeply), which suggests a desperate situation, consolidates the *stuck-in-the-middle* characteristic. As already mentioned, society associates the election of Adamkus with changes and the start of a new era, so the application of the *stuck-in-the-middle* characteristic to his antagonists is sure to decrease the number of their supporters and may result in their elimination from the political field. Moreover, examples (415–417), based on changes, show that both Lithuanian and British political leaders share some similar discourse features.

In his speeches President Adamkus actualizes the opposition *new–old* and introduces himself as a representative of the *new*. This meaning field is especially attractive and beneficial to the political leader because he is associated by the electorate with something *new*, with various changes. The revelation of this characteristic indicates that the President has satisfied society's needs and answered their hopes. The following statements provide research material for the *new* meaning field:

(419) *Kaimo ateitį sieju su atnaujinta švietimo sistema.* (2000)

(420) *Norėčiau, kad aiškiai suprastume: dabartis mums duoda istorinę galimybę įveikti sovietinės praeities trauką, seno mąstymo, seno elgesio įpročius ir atsakingai imtis naujo bendrų reikalų tvarkymo. Imtis naujos politikos.* (2000)

It is evident that the basis of the latter meaning field lies in such concepts as the education system, reality, challenges, opportunities and politics. The key elements which represent *new* are the synonymous adjectives *atnaujintas*, *naujas*, *naujasis* and *neišmėgintas* (renewed, new, untested),

related to the already introduced concepts. The significance of this meaning field is intensified by the employment of the noun *ateitis (future)* in relation to the new education system. The introduction of challenges and opportunities further reinforces the positive and beneficial nature of the President's performance and the meaning field itself. Example (420) contains an implication that the old Soviet ideology and system is still attractive to some politicians. Consequently, such politicians are perceived as antagonists. Furthermore, this image of the antagonists serves as a contrast in the design of the positive image of Adamkus.

The domain of *political moral values* is one more explicit domain which may be analysed in Adamkus's political discourse. The President associates his personality with *moral values*, while his antagonists are accused of a lack of such values. The first opposite meaning fields to be analysed in the latter domain are *society–disassociation from society*. Adamkus presents himself as a representative of Lithuanian society, while his antagonists are introduced as a contrast – they are depicted as *disassociated* from the problems and needs of society. The President's relationship with society is usually represented through the personal pronoun *we*:

(421) *Ir vis dėlto - ar visas laisvės teikiamas galimybes mes, kaip nepriklausomos valstybės piliečiai, įstengiame išnaudoti?* (1999)

This *WE* in the *society* meaning field is reinforced by the following phrase: *mes, kaip nepriklausomos valstybės piliečiai (we, the citizens of an independent state)*. This meaning field presents President Adamkus to society as a very attractive personality and political leader, for it enables the citizens to perceive him as a common person, as “one of them.” The *society* meaning field suggests the idea that this is the only President who understands society and its needs, who takes the actions necessary to improve the welfare of the state and society. The conflict communication aimed at Adamkus's antagonists includes the *disassociation from society* meaning field, a very powerful tool that helps

to depict the negative hierarchical features associated with the President's antagonists:

(422) *Tarp valdžios ir piliečių išlieka nomenklatūrai būdingas atotrūkis.* (1999)

(423) *Jos paskirtis - įveikti atotrūkį tarp visuomenės ir valdžios, atkurti bendro kryptingo veikimo galimybes.* (2001)

(424) *Deja, mūsų politika ir šiandien išlieka per daug uždara, nepakankamai socialiai jautri, per daug atitrūkusi nuo kasdienių žmonių rūpesčių.* (2003)

(425) *Būtina priartinti sprendimus prie vietos žmonių, kad jie pajustų savo galią ir savo teises.* (2005)

(426) *Aš erozijos požymių pastebiu mūsų politikoje, dylančioje atsakomybėje savo rinkėjams, atotrūkyje nuo žmonių.* (2007)

All these examples, except (425), contain a direct *disassociation from society* expression: the noun *atotrūkis* (*disassociation*). Example (425) presents an implication of *disassociation from society*, which is expressed through the verb *priartinti* (*approach*) and stands for some gap or distance which should be eliminated. This meaning field involves two key agents – the Government and the citizens/society. The Government is the agent guilty of maintaining a hierarchy, while society is represented as a victim of the detrimental actions of the President's antagonists. The Government is clearly the antagonist, and is granted the *disassociation from society* characteristic. Example (426) suggests the idea that not only the Government, but most politicians as well could be granted the same characteristic. It is conveyed by the phrase *dylančioje atsakomybėje savo rinkėjams* (*decreasing responsibility to its electorate*), and could also be complemented by *mūsų politika ir šiandien išlieka per daug uždara, nepakankamai socialiai jautri* (*and today our political system still remains over-isolated, insufficiently socially sensitive*).

The domain of *political moral values* can be supplemented with another pair of opposite meaning fields, *sensitivity–indifference*. The President is introduced as a political leader who is *aware* of all the problems of society

and, simultaneously, contrasted with the *indifference* of his antagonists. The *sensitivity* meaning field is directly expressed in the following statement:

(427) *Nei kaip valstybės vadovas, nei kaip asmuo, dalyvaujantis formuojant teisėjų korpusą, negaliu likti abejingas šiandieninei situacijai teismų sistemoje.* (2006)

Here the President states that he cannot be indifferent to the current situation in the legal system. It is obvious that the latter meaning field is based on the contradiction of the *indifference* concept: *negaliu likti abejingas (I cannot remain indifferent)*. The antagonist is defined by the first person narrative. The *indifference* characteristic applied to the image of the antagonists could be based on more cases of political discourse than that of *sensitivity*:

(428) *Mūsų valdžia vis dar pernelyg abejinga asmens teisių ir laisvių varžymui, kasdieniam biurokratiniam žmogaus žeminimui.* (2000)

(429) *Ar neturėtų Vyriausybei ir parlamentinėms partijoms rūpėti, kaip Vakaruose išsilavinusiais žmonėmis būtų galima sustiprinti Lietuvos valstybės ir savivaldos institucijas?* (2005)

In example (428), the *indifference* meaning field is based on the adjective *abejinga (indifferent)*, used to characterize the Government of the Republic of Lithuania. Here, once again, the meaning field is introduced in order to depict the citizens of the state as victims, aggrieved at the particular performance of the Government. Example (429) contains a rhetorical question, *Ar neturėtų Vyriausybei ir parlamentinėms partijoms rūpėti (Shouldn't the government and parliamentary parties be concerned)*, which strongly implies that the Government and political parties are *indifferent* to the welfare of the state. This concept is expressed through the verb *rūpėti (feel concern)* and the negative connotation it acquires in this context. It can be seen that there are two main antagonists – the Government and the parties.

All these significant issues related to *political moral values* provide a basis for a set of opposite meaning fields which, in a sense, summarize the

whole domain. These meaning fields are *political morality*–*lack of political moral values*. As mentioned above, President Adamkus associates himself with *morality*, while his antagonists are blamed for their *lack of political moral values*. *Political morality* may be observed in the following statements by Adamkus:

(430) *Noriu dar kartą priminti savo vidinį moralinį principą – niekada nė per centimetrą nesitrauksiu nuo savo aiškių nuostatų. Politika turi būti skaidri, morali. Ir asmenys, atstovaujantys valstybės institucijoms, turi griežtai laikytis šių principų. Tai mano politinis kredo ir to paties reikalausiu iš kitų pareigūnų.* (2005)

(431) *Kartu noriu pabrėžti - pasitikiu savo komanda. Mano žmonės yra susitelkę ir pasiryžę tęsti pradėtus darbus bei mano vykdomą politiką, kurios pagrindiniai principai yra skaidrumas, atsakomybė ir moralumas.* (2006)

These statements contain the adjectives *moralinis*, *skaidri*, *morali* (*moral*, *transparent*) and the nouns *skaidrumas*, *atsakomybė*, and *moralumas* (*transparency*, *responsibility*, *morality*) which directly indicate and support the characteristic applied to the image of the President. Furthermore, these expressions are employed to define Adamkus's principles, credo and implemented policies. They help to emphasize the *morality* meaning field and to reveal its significance. The repetition of the noun *principas* (*principle*), in some cases complemented by the adverb *griežtai* (*strictly*), suggests the validity of the meaning field.

The antagonists are depicted in a totally different way:

(432) *Šiandieniniuose politikų ginčiuose jau nebesusigaudoma, kas yra svarbiausios vertybės. Vis labiau įsigali nuo bet kokio valstybinio intereso atsietos tarpusavio kovos. Jeigu paminama žmogiškoji moralė, politikos etika ir valstybės interesai, netenka prasmės bet kokios kalbos apie vyriausybių ar koalicijų stabilumą.* (2006)

(433) *Dažnai girdime apgailestavimų, kad šiandien patriotinės vertybės nėra tokios svarbios kaip Sąjūdžio laikais. Bet išžiūrėję į šią problemą atidžiau, įsitikinsime, kad patriotiškumo labiausiai stinga mūsų valdžiai, politikams.* (2006)

(434) *Į šių vertybių trūkumą visuomenė atsako nepasitikėjimu politine sistema. Tą nepasitikėjimą dar labiau gilina kiekvienu rinkimų metu žarstomi įspūdingi pažadai.* (2008)

The statements presented above define the actual antagonists granted the *lack of moral values* meaning field: the politicians and the Government. They do so by reflecting such features of a lack of political ethics and morality as a lack of patriotism and promising. Examples (432–433) directly indicate the antagonists, while example (434) contains implied antagonists who can be perceived as politicians with little effort: *Tą nepasitikėjimą dar labiau gilina kiekvienu rinkimų metu žarstomi įspūdingi pažadai* (*That distrust is further increased by the striking promises that are given during every election*). The *self-interest* of the antagonists may be regarded as the basis of this meaning field. It is evident that the *lack of moral values* characteristic stems from such concepts as *žmogiškoji moralė, politikos etika* and *patriotinės vertybės* (*human morality, political ethics, patriotic values*). This meaning field is very beneficial in Adamkus's conflict communication with his constant antagonists, as it helps to mould the intended public opinion that any person who does not have any socially accepted values, or who violates them, is unable to be a fair politician.

The *political morality–lack of political moral values* opposite meaning fields are the last set to be analysed in the *moral values* domain.

Adamkus presents himself as an active President who controls his institution and initiates necessary actions. Therefore, a counterposition appears between the President and those institutions which cannot operate properly:

(435) *Pernai ilgokai raginau Vyriausybę baigti formuoti Teismų departamentą.* (1999)

(436) *Tai matydamas, kreipiuosi į valstybės teisėsaugos institucijas ir raginu jas sutelktomis jėgomis nedelsiant iširti visuomenei nerimą keliančius įtarimus ir pateikti teisinį jų įvertinimą.* (2005)

(437) *Reikalauju, kad būtų pradėtas išsamus tyrimas, kaip Turniškes administruojanti akcinė bendrovė bankams užstatė du trečdalius viso valdomo nekilnojamojo turto ir pradėjo galimai nelegalias statybas. Sieksiu, kad būtų*

atliekamas ne tik parlamentinis tyrimas, bet ir nedelsiant būtų pasitelktos kitos atsakingos institucijos - STT, Generalinė prokuratūra, Valstybės kontrolė. (2006)

(438) *Reikalavau ir reikalausiu, kad, vertinant politikų ir valstybės tarnautojų elgesį, politinės moralės kriterijai būtų laikomi ne mažiau svariais už teisinius.* (2006)

These statements, used as the basis for a *stringency* meaning field, are picturesque examples of the conflict communication, as they express the contrast between the non-beneficial actions of the antagonists and the necessary *stringency* of the President. The characteristic of an active President is expressed through the verbs *raginti* and *reikalauti* (*encourage, require*). The variety of tenses proposes the idea that Adamkus is, was and will be a strict person when the situation concerns the state and society. The first person narrative adds support to the application of this meaning field to the image of this political leader. Although the introduced verbs carry and cause negative connotations, they acquire positive connotations in the given context, because they suggest the idea that the *stringency* of the President will change the current situation for the better, secure a better life and ensure the welfare of the state and society. Here Adamkus wants to look like a person who understands the needs of society. Moreover, he wants to be seen as a guarantee of the satisfaction of these needs. The President identifies himself with society and, together with it, opposes himself against the state institutions.

Having considered the meaning fields intended by Adamkus for conflict communication with his antagonists, it is now possible to draw the following conclusions:

1. Three large domains – *benefit, change* and *political moral values* – prevail in the President's political discourse. These domains include numerous meaning fields which are intended to create a positive and beneficial image of the President. At the same time, they are also used to present a detrimental and unattractive image of his antagonists. The President introduces himself as an initiator and supporter of changes, an example of moral values in politics. His

antagonists are presented as inhibitors of changes who lack moral values and cause detriment to the state.

2. Adamkus's conflict communication is unidirectional; his discourse contains numerous features of conflict communication, but this conflict is not a verbally expressed conflict in which both sides have the opportunity to express their grievances. For this reason, in his *I/WE–THEY* model, *I/WE* may be defined as a protagonist, *THEY* as antagonists. The Parliament, the Government and the state institutions perform the role of antagonists in the political discourse of the President. This makes the discourses of Adamkus and Paksas similar. The difference lies in the fact that Paksas takes part in conflict communication as a dialogue between himself and his opponent institutions: he responds to the indictments that they present. Adamkus carries out conflict communication against the same institutions, but only as an institution (the head of the Presidential Office) against other state institutions. In both cases conflict communication is not the result of ideological differences.

3. Moreover, the President can be seen as helpless, because his discourse has an advisory nature. It is evident that in the cases where positive results are achieved in politics and national affairs, Adamkus identifies himself with Lithuania – including his antagonists. On the other hand, when a negative situation or negative results emerge, the President disassociates himself from the Parliament, the Government and the social institutions.

3.6. CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS IN THE DISCOURSE OF ADAMKUS

Adamkus's conflict communication with his opponents, denominated as antagonists in the previous chapter, includes not only the application of some particular nominations, but also metaphorical imagery, which may be generalized on the basis of the underlying conceptual metaphors. These help to reveal the political and moral attitudes that Adamkus wants to present in his speeches and to convey to the Lithuanians.

This dissertation investigates conflict communication, therefore, the analysis of conceptual metaphors should begin from one of the most popular conceptual metaphors in political discourse: POLITICS IS WAR. In the case of Adamkus's conflict communication, this metaphor may be actualized in order to indicate the participants of the conflict and their functions. In the opposition *I-THEY*, *I* (Adamkus) is the attacking side while his antagonists are presented as the enemies who must be attacked. In this situation, the attacker *I* is not conventional because he is introduced as a positive agent, proactively attacking in order to protect the state from the detrimental actions of the antagonists. This is perfectly reflected in the following statements:

(439) *Kad ir pavėlavę, turime grumtis su korupcija ir savivaldybėse, ir aukščiausiose valdžios institucijose.* (2000)

(438) *Veršlininkų, ypač smulkių ir vidutinių, veikla pagaliau turi būti išlaisvinta iš perdėto ir neskaidraus reglamentavimo, iš valdininkų savivalės ir savito reketo, iš "žiaurių akcijų" palikimo.*(2001)

(439) *Per būsimą raidos laikotarpį turime įveikti ekonominį krašto atsilikimą ir sukurti modernų, pažangiomis technologijomis pagrįstą, Lietuvos ūkį.* (2002)

(440) *Visus penkerius metus stengiausi pats ir raginau Jus įveikti kliūtis, kurios trukdo stiprėti mūsų pilietinei santarvei, trukdo atkurti žmonių pasitikėjimą savo visuomene ir valstybe.* (2003)

(441) *Mano ginamos pozicijos ir principai Jums gerai žinomi: penkerius metus juos ne tik skelbiau, bet ir mėginau įtvirtinti kasdieniu darbu.* (2003)

(442) *Taigi būtina rimtai kovoti su korupcija.* (2005)

Adamkus does not indicate particular political forces as enemies that should be fought against and defeated. He talks about abstract things – corruption, the economic lag of the country, and the selfishness of the officers – but these statements enable the target audience to observe hidden conflict communication with the implied conventional antagonists of the President: the Government and the social and political institutions. In this conceptual metaphor, the rescuer's position is expressed through the following verbs and verbal phrases: *turime grumtis*, *turime įveikti*, *būtina kovoti* (*we should fight*,

we should defeat, it is necessary to fight); and the participles *ginamos, išlaisvinta* (*defended, liberated*). These words and phrases help to create and define the positive image of the President, because they introduce the beneficial, defensive actions taken in order to protect the citizens and the state from the detrimental actions of the antagonists, whose performance may be defined as an act of war. The defender's role is further emphasized by the adjective *rimtai* (*seriously*) and the nouns *pozicijos* and *principai* (*positions, principles*), which signal the significance of the current situation. On the other hand, his usage of the inclusive verb *turime* (*we have*), which is related to defensive and attacking actions, discloses this politician as a passive subject who merely indicates the necessary actions that emerge from the situation, without assuring the audience that these actions will really be performed.

The POLITICS IS WAR conceptual metaphor is expressed through linguistic metaphors that reveal the internecine battles of the antagonists. This phenomenon is evaluated negatively. *I* fights against phenomena, *THEY* fight against other people. It is possible to state that Adamkus does not acknowledge the political war that takes part between elections as beneficial to the Republic of Lithuania. This discloses his conflict communication, because the President does not approve of the actions of these political forces and wants to terminate the situation. The following statements illustrate this idea:

(443) *Ar partijos, užuot atsakingai dirbusios bendroje komisijoje, stengiasi išsaugoti pretekstą politinei kovai?* (2001)

(444) *[...] šiandien negalime leisti, kad dėl interesų grupių kovos nukentėtų tolesnis privatizavimo procesas.* (2001)

(445) *Šiandieniniuose politikų ginčuose jau nebesusigaudoma, kas yra svarbiausios vertybės. Vis labiau įsigali nuo bet kokio valstybinio intereso atsietos tarpusavio kovos.* (2005)

(446) *Tyrimo metu kilo tikras politikų mūšis: buvo kovoje gandas, emocingais kaltinimais, pamiršus mūsų pačių sukurtas taisykles – Konstituciją ir įstatymus.* (2006)

(447) *Seimas pastaraisiais metais, atrodo, nuėjo lengviausiu politinių peštynių keliu.* (2007)

The realization of the conceptual POLITICS IS WAR metaphor through linguistic metaphors may be based on the nouns *kovos*, *mūšis*, *peštynės* (*fight*) and the verb *kovoti* (*fight*). The agents are indicated as political parties, politicians and the Parliament. In this case the President indicates the forces which have become involved in the internecine fight and thereby forgotten about the state's welfare. This is conflict communication in which the speaker reproaches his addressees. The negative nature of the antagonists' actions is reinforced by the introduction of non-beneficial consequences, e.g., *dėl interesų grupių kovos nukentėtų tolesnis privatizavimo procesas* (*further process of privatization would suffer from the infighting of interest groups*). The presented statements imply another aspect of the latter metaphor: that politicians fight each other for their own self-interest and benefit. This idea is supported by the following phrases: *politinė kova*, *interesų grupių kova*, *tarpusavio kovos* (*political fight*, *fight of interest groups*, *infighting*). The phrase *politinės peštynės* (*political free-for-all*) discloses the pejorative attitude of the President towards the behaviour of his antagonists. This attitude is complemented by the following battle picture: *buvo kovojava gandais, emocingais kaltinimais, pamiršus mūsų pačių sukurtas taisykles – Konstituciją ir įstatymus* (*it was fought with the help of rumours and emotional indictments. The rules we ourselves created – the Constitution and laws – were forgotten*). As a result, the expressions of the latter conceptual metaphor are intended to reveal the contrast between the President and his antagonists, in order to enable the target audience to perceive the basis of the President's reproaches and their veracity.

The last example, (447), may serve as a basis not only for POLITICS IS WAR, but also for the POLITICS IS A JOURNEY conceptual metaphor. This metaphor expresses a two-way road – the *way forward* when it concerns President Adamkus, but the way backwards when applied to his antagonists. Linguistic *forward way* metaphors bearing positive evaluative connotations will first be presented and analysed:

(448) *Toli pažengėme, formuodami valdininkų valdžios valstybę. Bet mažai nuveikėme, kurdami šiuolaikišką, kvalifikuotą, piliečių ir tautos interesams jautrią valstybės tarnybą.* (1999)

(449) *Šiomet reikia žengti praktinius žingsnius - pertvarkyti "Lietuvos energiją", pradėti "Lietuvos dujų" privatizavimą [...].* (2001)

(450) *Mūsų visų, kaip tautinės bendruomenės, laukia viltinga, daug naujų galimybių teikianti kelio atkarpa. Todėl nestoviniuokime vietoje, bet veržkimės į priekį.* (2002)

(451) *Tačiau šiandien labai svarbu nesustoti pusiaukelėje: turime tęsti ir spartinti šalies ginkluotųjų pajėgų modernizavimą.* (2002)

(452) *[...]šiandien einame į naują tikrovę, kurioje mūsų laukia nauji iššūkiai ir dar neišmėgintos galimybės.* (2002)

(453) *[...]siekti jau anksčiau mano kelto strateginio tikslo – ekonomiškai pasivyti Europą.* (2007)

Movement forward is based on the following verbs: *pažengti, veržtis, nesustoti, eiti į, pasivyti* (*step, thrust, not to stop, move towards, overtake*). The positive meaning of such *movement* is intensified by the adverb *toli* (*far*) and phrases which contain nouns directly corresponding to or indicating the positive evaluative connotations of such a JOURNEY: *reikia žengti praktinius žingsnius; laukia viltinga, daug naujų galimybių teikianti kelio atkarpa* (*it is necessary to take practical steps; hopeful part of the way, providing numerous opportunities, is waiting*). The positive image and performance of President Adamkus are complemented by the presentation of the destination of that JOURNEY – the European Union, modernization and a new reality. The essential point of the President's actions, as understood through the POLITICS IS A JOURNEY conceptual metaphor, is the way that leads to a new economic and legal reality, that leads to Europe.

The same POLITICS IS A JOURNEY conceptual metaphor is expressed in a totally different shade when it is applied to the image of the President's antagonists. In the following examples, *THEIR* way expresses the negative

connotations of the metaphor, which is introduced here as a *way backwards*, one which leads to detriment and various crises:

(454) *Kokiu pražūtingu keliu eita, parodė mūsų valdžios bejėgystė Rusijos krizės akivaizdoje.* (2001)

(455) *Jei politinės jėgos ją ir toliau dirbtinai palaikys, vargu ar išvengsime rimtų socialinių sukrėtimų, sykiu - ir grįžimo atgal iš pradėtų reformų kelio.* (2001)

(456) *Esminė sveikatos apsaugos reforma taip ir nepajudėjo.* (2003)

(457) *Gerbiamieji Seimo nariai, akivaizdu, kad nepajudėjome nė per žingsnį.* (2007)

(458) *Pastarųjų mėnesių diskusijas dėl mokesčių politikos pavadinčiau neabejotinai žingsniu atgal.* (2008)

In these examples of Adamkus's political discourse, the agents (the antagonists) are not indicated, except in the example (457). However, they are implied, and the target audience, which is very well acquainted with the given context, can easily define them as the Parliament and the Government. Moreover, the actions and results that are presented reveal the real antagonists. In these examples the *way* negatively characterizes the situation and is based on the verb *nepajudėti* (*not move*) and such phrases as *pražūtingas kelias*, *grįžimas atgal*, *žingsnis atgal* (*disastrous way*, *coming back*, *a step back*). It is therefore evident that the conceptual metaphor itself does not have positive or negative evaluative connotations part from the context of its use; within that context, it has evaluative potential, as the linguistic metaphors determined by conceptual metaphors already have evaluative meaning.

THE STATE IS A BUILDING is one more conceptual metaphor which can be seen in the political discourse of President Adamkus. The opposition *I–THEY* is realized through this metaphor and is used to depict both sides, the President and his antagonists. It should be emphasized that the features of conflict communication are not immediately evident in all of the statements, though the broader context shows that the characteristics of different sides may

be presented through the realization of some particular conceptual metaphor.

The President is introduced as a builder in the following statements:

(459) *Mes, Lietuva, atstatėme savo valstybę, sugrįžome į civilizuotą pasaulį, esame pajėgūs jame gyventi ir susikurti savo bei vaikų gerovę čia, savo tėvynėje.* (2001)

(460) [...] projektuodami šiandien savo gyvenimą kartu su Europos Sąjungos ir NATO šalimis, neturime pamiršti vieno esminio dalyko. (2001)

(461) [...] privalome drąsiau projektuoti savo švietimo ateitį. (2002)

(462) *Kad būtų padėti tvirti pamatai pilietinei visuomenei, savarankiškai politinei tautai, būtinos permainos: turime iš esmės keisti žmonių ir valstybės, piliečių ir valdžios santykius.* (2005)

(463) *Ko ir kokiomis priemonėmis turime siekti, kad sutvirtintume ilgalaikės mūsų piliečių gerovės pamatus?* (2008)

In these cases, a succession of metaphorical descriptions of the world may be observed: earlier we rebuilt our state, then we designed our life together with the European Union. Later we should design in a braver way and finally, we should strengthen the foundations of the welfare. Clearly this metaphor is significant in Adamkus's contemplation of the process of state creation.

BUILDINGS and the building process are based on the verbs *projektuoti*, *sutvirtinti*, and *padėti* (*design*, *strengthen*, *lay*) in combination with the noun *pamatai* (*foundations*). It is evident that the latter political leader perceives the Republic of Lithuania as a BUILDING, having strong foundations and located in the European Union. Moreover, the head of state is presented as a builder of the state, suggesting the similarity of these functions. In fact, verbs related to building are mostly used in the plural in Adamkus's discourse, thereby performing an inclusive function and revealing the identification of this politician with Lithuania and all its citizens (see example (459)). The President is also depicted as a beneficial and successful builder who cares about the welfare and future of the state and society. This positive image is

reinforced even more by the verb *atstatyti* (*rebuild*), referring to the process of rebuilding the state, perceived as highly successful in the eyes of the electorate.

The antagonists are presented in sharp contrast. THE STATE IS A BUILDING conceptual metaphor helps to convey the idea that Adamkus's antagonists are destroyers of the state:

(464) *Ar galime šiandien žmonėms paaiškinti, kodėl vienoje apskrityse žemę susigrąžinti buvo įmanoma, kitose – atsimušta į neįveikiamą biurokratijos sieną?* (2000)

(465) *[...]mūsų valstybei ypatingai pavojingas būtų ekonominių nusikaltimų ir politinės galios susijungimas. Jis galutinai pakirstų teisingumą, griautu valstybės pagrindus.* (2001)

(466) *Kreipiuosi į visų teisėsaugos institucijų vadovus: jums patikėta teisėtumo priežiūra valstybėje, todėl jūsų pareiga – garantuoti, kad įstatymai galiotų visiems. Teisės normų poveikio neturėtų slopinti net pačios storiausios valdžios institucijų sienos.* (2007)

Linguistic metaphors of *destruction* help to actualize negative connotations through the verb *griauti*, standing for the *destroying* action, and such phrases as *neįveikiama biurokratijos siena*, *pačios storiausios valdžios institucijų sienos* (*unassailable wall of bureaucracy, the thickest walls of the government institutions*). The negative connotations of *wall* should be emphasized. Adamkus introduces his antagonists as the builders of an inconvenient *wall* which is an obstacle in the *forward movement* of the country. In this case there is a direct intersection of the BUILDING metaphor with the JOURNEY metaphor. The agents responsible for this detrimental action are defined as the governmental institutions, perceived by the President as antagonists. The metaphor of thick and unassailable bureaucratic *walls* suggests that the clerks in the governmental institutions are not interested in the needs of society. The same idea is intensified by verb *atsimušti* (*bounce off*). The realization of THE STATE IS A BUILDING conceptual metaphor mostly serves for the presentation of positive aims, but clearly some parts of the BUILDING may be metaphorized with negative connotations.

Another conceptual metaphor that can be apprehended through the already mentioned *I-THEY* opposition is POLITICS IS A GAME. It associates unfair political games with the antagonists while attributing achievements solely to the President. As GAME is the key element in this metaphor, the analysis will begin from it:

(467) *Šių kontrastų akivaizdoje visi valdžioje esantys - ir pozicija, ir opozicija - privalo įveikti senų, nuo tikrovės atitrūkusių politinių žaidimų inerciją ir sutelkti jėgas realioms krašto problemoms spręsti.* (2001)

(468) *Gaila, bet praeitą savaitę valdančiosios daugumos balsais Seime priimtas Vyriausybės įstatymas pratęsė šį valstybei žalingą žaidimą.* (2002)

(469) *Jei mūsų politika iš atsakingo bendrų tautos reikalų tvarkymo taptų tik valdžios siekimo ir išsaugojimo technologija, tik jėgos žaidimais, kuriuose viskas leistina, mūsų demokratijai ir mūsų pilietinei visuomenei iškiltų rimtas pavojus.* (2003)

(470) *Per keliolika mėnesių atsidengė mūsų parlamentinės valdžios susipriešinimas ir silpnybės. Pamirštant įstatymų leidybos ir parlamentinės kontrolės priedermes, įsitraukta į rizikingus politinius žaidimus dėl įtakos.* (2007)

It is obvious that the antagonists, depicted through this conceptual metaphor, are the conventional ones – the Government and the Parliament. Their role in the POLITICS IS A GAME metaphor is presented as very risky and dangerous: *žalingas žaidimas, jėgos žaidimai, rizikingi žaidimai (detrimental game, power games, risky games)*. The reason for such detrimental actions is given as the self-interest of the antagonists. This reason is often used by the President when forming the intended negative image of his antagonists. In the cases presented above, the GAME is represented through the direct noun *žaidimas (game)*. The following statements convey the same idea with the help of other words:

(471) *Ir pozicijoje, ir opozicijoje esančios partijos į Seimo rinkimus ėjo, žadėdamos švietimui skirti prioritetinį dėmesį. [...] Imtasi ne gerai apgalvotų reformos darbų, bet deklaratyvių įstatymų ir manipuliavimo valstybės biudžeto eilutėmis.* (2001)

(472) *Kartu mažės ir politikų galimybės prieš rinkimus populistiškai manipuliuoti didesnių pašalpu pažadais*. (2007)

Examples (471–472) contain a verb and a noun that share a root, *manipuliuoti* and *manipuliavimas* (*manipulate, manipulation*). The connection between *manipulation* and *game* may be explained with the help of Rudinov's (1978) definition, where manipulation is presented as behaviour stimulation invoking deception or playing with the implicit weaknesses of another person. These words are used to negatively characterize the GAME situation because they distinguish one of the negative methods of game play – manipulation. Furthermore, the negative connotations depict unfair and possibly illegal actions. Consequently, the target audience perceives the antagonists as dishonest. Therefore, Adamkus's antagonists should lose some of their supporters amongst the electorate.

The slippery and complex nature of the politics carried out by Adamkus's antagonists may be defined as POLITICS IS A TRAP. This conceptual metaphor is realized through linguistic metaphors present in the following statements:

(473) *Kol kas paini, netobula Lietuvos mokesčių sistema stabdo verslo plėtrą* [...]. (1999)

(474) *Lietuvos Aukščiausiąjį Teismą kviesčiau kur kas daugiau dėmesio skirti vieningos teismų praktikos formavimui. Ji itin reikalinga, kai dabartiniame senų ir naujų įstatymų labirinte pasiklysta net teisės specialistai*. (1999)

(475) *Šių teisės buvo pažeistos, nes valstybės pareigūnų veikla prieštaravo įstatymams, nes įstatymų neatitiko pareigūnų sukurta pojstatyminių aktų painiava*. (2001)

(476) *Juk būtent kasdienio valdymo lygmenyje sukuriamą įvairių kliūčių verslui, griaušančių iniciatyvių žmonių pastangas imtis naujovių ir kelti visų gerovę*. (2005)

(477) *Noriu priminti, kad politinės partijos, vengiančios atsakomybės pradėti realias permainas, turi ir turės prisiimti atsakomybę už stringančias reformas* [...]. (2007)

The TRAP is represented through various linguistic means: nouns such as *labirintas* and *painiava* (*labyrinth, tangle*), the participle *stringančios* (*stuck*), the adjective *paini* (*complex*). These words describe the actions of the Government, the Parliament, governmental institutions and the political parties, all of which acquire negative features and negatively characterize the situation. Indeed, the TRAP metaphor evokes negative connotations in itself. It is evident that this metaphor is applied to the self-interest of all the enumerated antagonists, and refers to the fact that traps are usually built artificially and are only beneficial to their creators. The indicated non-beneficial and even detrimental results of these TRAPS enable the target audience to perceive the President's antagonists as treacherous politicians, who do not care about the wealth of the state or society. Furthermore, they are depicted as the ones responsible for retarding the change and reform processes. This conceptual metaphor helps the target audience to perceive the winning and the losing sides in the conflict communication taking part between the President Adamkus and his antagonists.

The analysis of conceptual metaphors in Adamkus's political discourse leads to the following conclusions:

1. Expressions of the conceptual metaphors POLITICS IS A JOURNEY, POLITICS IS WAR, THE STATE IS A BUILDING, POLITICS IS A GAME and POLITICS IS A TRAP prevail in Adamkus's political discourse.

2. The speeches delivered by this politician make use of conceptual metaphors that are generally typical of political discourse. It is possible to observe that a conceptual metaphor has an evaluative potential – that the evaluations expressed through linguistic metaphors and belonging to the same conceptual metaphor may differ and acquire both positive and negative connotations.

3. The opposition *I–THEY* is realized through the majority of these conceptual metaphors, where the main antagonists, *THEY*, are introduced as the Parliament and the Government. Therefore, in THE STATE IS A BUILDING metaphor, *I* is expressed as the builder of the state building and *THEY* are

presented as its destroyers. POLITICS IS WAR discloses the attitude of Adamkus towards himself as the attacker of the antagonists, who are depicted as enemies. However, in this case the attacker is granted positive features because he proactively attacks in order to defend the welfare of the state and society from the detrimental actions of the antagonists. POLITICS IS A JOURNEY indicates *MY* way forward and *THEIR* way backwards. POLITICS IS A GAME shows the contrast between *MY* clean games and *THEIR* dirty ones.

4. In the political discourse of Adamkus, the expressions of the conceptual metaphor POLITICS IS A TRAP are only attributed to the antagonists. This conceptual metaphor acquires negative connotations and negatively characterizes the antagonists with the help of evaluative linguistic metaphors.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Conflict political communication embodies a clash of political forces. Such communication is marked by extra-linguistic and intra-linguistic factors, helping the audience to perceive that the speaker is taking part in a conflict with opponents. Political conflict may be open, e.g., the competition of political parties with different ideologies, or a political scandal. It may also be hidden, expressed implicitly, as when one state institution is dissatisfied with another's performance or the winner of a political battle compares himself/herself with his/her predecessors.
2. The analysis revealed the fact that conflict communication has an ideological nature in the political life of Great Britain. In the rhetoric of both political leaders, Blair and Brown, conflict is expressed as a discrepancy between ideologies; it is a real, sharp ideological conflict between the Labour Party and the Conservatives. In the speeches of Blair and Brown, *the Conservatives* is a nomination used exclusively with negative connotations.
3. In the discourse of Blair and Brown the same major and broad domains of *change* and *benefit* exist. These domains include similar meaning fields related to the welfare of the state and society. Here the opponents, the Conservatives, are granted negative nominations belonging to these domains. They are contrasted with the positive nominations attributed to the Labour leaders and the party under their leadership.
4. Blair openly indicates the actions that he has already taken or is planning to take, thus introducing himself as a positive action subject. Unlike his predecessor, Brown does not indicate particular actions of his, preferring to talk about his belief (cf. his frequent usage of the phrase *I believe*); this enables the target audience to perceive this politician as not very energetic, more of a mental than an action political subject. Brown, as opposed to Blair, avoids direct accusations. In conflict communication this political leader prefers to characterize his opponents with the help of implications.
5. The analysis of the conceptual metaphors of the political leaders of Great Britain allows the conclusion to be drawn that the same POLITICS IS WAR,

POLITICS IS A JOURNEY and THE STATE IS A BUILDING conceptual metaphors prevail. These metaphors are generally characteristic of political communication, therefore, it is possible to state that they have a universal nature.

6. In the discourse of the Lithuanian political leaders, political conflict is not expressed as an ideological conflict. Rather, a situation of interpersonal conflict exists, i.e., conflict between a person and institutions (in the cases of Paksas and Paulauskas) or inter-institutional conflict (in the case of Adamkus).

7. The conflict communication discourses of President Adamkus and the interim President Paulauskas are based on the model *WE–THEY*. The conflict communication of Paksas is based on a slightly transformed version of the previously presented model *I–THEY*.

8. The *benefit* domain is present in the discourse of all three Lithuanian Presidents, while the discourse of Adamkus also includes domains of *change* and *political moral values*.

9. The analysis disclosed the fact that a dual conflict exists in the discourse of President Paksas. It may be defined as open public conflict combined with conflict communication without extra-linguistic factors, i.e., conflict with his predecessors.

10. From the analysis of the speeches of the interim President Paulauskas it is obvious that in the *WE–THEY* model of conflict communication, the *WE* part is associated with Paulauskas and his supporters, while Paksas and his colleagues belong to *THEIR* side. Moreover, it is possible to state that *WE* includes any part of society that does not support Paksas.

11. It is obvious that there is no open conflict in the discourse of President Adamkus. The conflict is felt and may be expressed only by the President himself. Adamkus expresses his dissatisfaction, giving the impression that a conflict exists between his own actions and plans and the actions of the state institutions.

12. Although Adamkus introduces himself as a strict head of the state, his discourse has an advisory nature. It is possible to conclude that there is a

conflict between the President's opinion about the necessary situation and the present situation. Therefore, conflicts between the President's institution and other institutions exist in the discourse of Adamkus.

13. POLITICS IS WAR and POLITICS IS A JOURNEY metaphors prevail in the discourse of all three Presidents. The conceptual metaphor THE STATE IS A BUILDING, expressed through linguistic metaphors, may be observed in the discourses of Paksas and Adamkus. THE STATE BUILDING IS NOT CLEAN and LITHUANIAN POLITICS IS A SICK PERSON are individual metaphors of Paksas, existing in his political discourse. POLITICS IS A GAME and POLITICS IS A TRAP are individual metaphors of Adamkus, existing in his political discourse.

14. The research disclosed the fact that conceptual metaphor, which lies on the certain level of a text, has an evaluative potential. Therefore, the same metaphor may determine linguistic metaphors which acquire both positive and negative connotations.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Akimov, Varanov, Sergejev – Акимов В. П., Баранов А. Н., Сергеев В. М., 1990. Компьютерная модель текущего сознания в системе Авгур. *Исследования по когнитивным аспектам языка*. Тарту.
- Aristotle. 1994. *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civil Discourse. Book III*. (Translated by G. Kennedy). Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Arnautova – Арнаутова Ю. А., 2006. *Культура воспоминания и история памяти*. История и память: Историческая культура Европы до начала Нового времени. М: Кругъ.
- Blakar – Блакар Р.М., 1987. Язык как инструмент социальной власти. *Язык и моделирование социального взаимодействия*. М.: Прогресс.
- Benveniste E., 1979. *Problems in General Linguistics*. University of Miami Press, Coral Gables.
- Berger P., Luckmann, N., 1966. *The Social Construction of Reality*. New York: Doubleday.
- Bielinis L., 2002. Lingvistiniai politinės komunikacijos supratimo aspektai. *Respectus Philologicus* 2(7).
- Bielinis L., 2005. *Visuomenė, valdžia ir žiniasklaida*. Eugrimas.
- Birch A. H., 1993. *The British System of Government*. Routledge.
- Bolinger D., 1980. *Language – the Loaded Weapon: the Use and Abuse of Language Today*. – London and New York: Longman.
- Bolinger – Болинджер Д., 1987. Истина проблема лингвистическая. *Язык и моделирование социального взаимодействия*. Москва.
- Budajev, Chudinov – Будаев Э.В., Чудинов А.П., 2006. *Современная политическая лингвистика*. Екатеринбург.
- Cambridge International Dictionary of English, 1998. Cambridge University Press.
- Chilton P. A., Schäffner Ch. (Eds.), 2002. *Politics as Text and Talk. Analytical approaches to political discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Chilton P. A. ,2004. *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. New York: Routledge.

- Chudinov – Чудинов А. П., 2001. *Россия в метафорическом зеркале: когнитивное исследование политической метафоры (1991-2000)*. Екатеринбург.
- Chudinov – Чудинов А.П., 2006. *Политическая лингвистика: Учеб. пособие / Москва. Изд-ва «Флинта», «Наука».*
- Cibulskienė J., 2005. *Konceptualioji metafora Lietuvos ir Didžiosios Britanijos rinkimų diskursuose*. Vilnius.
- The Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia, Sixth Edition, 2003. Columbia University Press.
- The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics, 2003. Oxford University Press.
- Connolly W. E., 1993. *The Terms of Political Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Degtiarev – Дегтярев А. А. 2005. *Основы политической теории*. М.: Высшая школа.
- Demjankov – Демьянков В.З., 2002. *Политический дискурс как предмет политологической филологии*. Политическая наука. Политический дискурс: История и современные исследования. № 3. Москва.
- A Dictionary of British History, 2004. Oxford University Press.
- Есо – Эко У., 1998. *Отсутствующая структура. Введение в семиологию*. ТОО ТК «Петрополис».
- Fairclough N., 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Foucault M., 1972. *The Archeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock.
- Graber D. A. with the assistance of Smith J. M., 2005. *Political Communication Faces the 21st Century*. Journal of Communication, vol.55, p. 479-507.
- Goatly A., 2007. *Washing the Brain. Metaphor and Hidden Ideology*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Grimes J., 1975. *The Thread of Discourse*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Gurdjan – Гюрджян Н. С., 2008. *Речевые манифестации когнитивного конфликта в диалоге (на материале английского и русского языков)*. Пятигорск.

Hall S., 1992. The West and the Rest: Discourse and power // *Formations of modernity* /Ed. by S. Hall, B. Gieben, pp. 276-332. Cambridge : Polity/Open University.

Honderick T., 2005. *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*. Oxford University Press.

Janda K., Berry J.M., Goldman J., 1995. *The Challenge of Democracy. Government in America*. Houghton Mifflin Company.

Kövecses Z., 2002. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Karaulov, Petrov – Караулов Ю. Н., Петров В. В., 1989. *От грамматики текста к когнитивной теории дискурса* // Дейк Т. А. ван. *Язык. Познание. Коммуникация*. М.

Khmeltsov – Хмельцов А.И., 2004. Сборник научных трудов "Актуальные проблемы теории коммуникации". СПб. - Изд-во СПбГПУ.

Krupavičius A., 1999. *Demokratinė politika ir informacijos visuomenės iššūkiai*. Kaunas: Technologija.

Kubriakova – Кубрякова Е. С., Демьянков В. З., Панкрац Ю. Г., Лузина Л. Г., 1996. *Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов*. Москва.

Kurina – Купина Н. А., 2000. Агитационный дискурс: в поисках жанров влияния. *Культурно-речевая ситуация в современной России*. Екатеринбург.

Laclau E., Mouffe C., 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy. Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.

Laclau E., 1996. The Death and Resurrection of the Theory of Ideology. *Journal of Political Ideologies*.

Lakof G., 1981. *Metaphors we live by* /George Lakoff and Mark Johnson. Chicago : The University of Chicago Press.

Landowski E., 2007. Protas ir kūnas politiniame diskurse. *Kūno raiška šiuolaikiniame socialiniame diskurse*, psl. 155- 170. Baltos lankos.

Lassan – Лассан Э., 1995. *Дискурс власти и инакомыслия в СССР: когнитивно-риторический анализ*. Вильнюс.

Lasswell H. D., 1936. *Politics is who gets what, when, and how*. New York: Meridian.

Lasswell H. D., 1948. The Structure and Function of Communication in Society. *The Communication of Ideas*. New York: Institute for Religious and Social Studies.

Littlejohn S. W., 1999. *Theories of Human Communication*. Wordsworth Publishing Company.

Musolff A., 2004. *Metaphor and Political Discourse: Analogical Reasoning in Debates about Europe*. Palgrave Macmillan.

O'Halloran K., 2003. *Critical Discourse Analysis and Language Cognition*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Orwell G., 1990. *Nineteen eighty-four*. London: Penguin.

Philips, Jorgensen – Филипс Л., Йоргенсен М. В., 2008. *Дискурс анализ. Теория и метод*. Харьков: Гуманитарный центр.

Poškienė A., 2007. *Kas yra diskursas*. Kaunas: Technologija.

Riabova – Рябова Т.Б., 2008. Политический дискурс как ресурс «создания гендера» в современной России. Личность. Культура. Общество. Т.V III. Вып. 4 (32).

Sillars A. L., 1986. *Manual for Coding Interpersonal Conflict*. University of Montana.

Schäffner C. (Eds.), 2002. Politics as Text and Talk. *Analytical approaches to political discourse*, pp. 204-236. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Sheigal – Шейгал Е. И., 2000. *Семиотика политического дискурса*. Москва.

Thompson, J. B., 1991. *Ideology and Modern Culture*. Stanford.

Tuzikov – Тузиков А. Р., 2003. *Теории идеологии в западной социологии (От критики ложного сознания к анализу дискурсивных практик масс-медиа)*. Москва.

Van Dijk T.A., 1989. Structures of Discourse, Structures of Power. In J.A. Anderson (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 12*, pp. 18-59. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Van Dijk T.A., 1995. Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis. In: C. Schäffner & A. Wenden (Eds.), *Language and Peace*, pp. 17-33. Aldershot: Dartmouth Publishing.

Van Dijk T.A., 1995. Ideological Discourse Analysis. Special issue *Interdisciplinary approaches to Discourse Analysis*, ed. by Eija Ventola and Anna Solin, pp. 135-161. New Courant (English Dept, University of Helsinki).

Van Dijk T. A., 1997. Cognitive Context Models and Discourse. In M. Stamenow (ed.), *Language Structure, Discourse and the Access to Consciousness*. Amsterdam, Benjamins.

Van Dijk, T. A., 1998. *Ideology. A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London:Sage.

Van Dijk T. A., 1999. Towards a Theory of Context and Experience Models in Discourse Processing. In H. van Oostendorp and S. Goldman (eds.), *The Construction of Mental Models during Reading*. Hillsdale NJ, Erlbaum.

Vorobjov – Воробьев Г., 1986. *Кибернетика стучится в школу*. Москва.

Watkins Ch., 1974. *An Analytic Model of Conflict*. Speech Monographs 41.

Widdowson H. G., 1995. Discourse Analysis: a Critical View. *Language and Literature* 4, pp.157- 72.

Yokoyama O.T., 1978. Disbelief, Lies and Manipulations in of Transactional Discourse Model. *Ethics*, Vol. 88, P. 338-347.

Žvaliauskas G., 2007. *Ar partijos Lietuvoje demokratiškos?* Kaunas: Technologija.

Современные теории дискурса: мультидисциплинарный анализ (Серия «Дискурсология»), 2006. Екатеринбург:Издательский Дом «Дискурс-Пи».

SOURCES

<http://adamkus.president.lt> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://www.britannica.com> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://cain.ulst.ac.uk> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://www.guardian.co.uk> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://www.elta.lt> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://www.independent.co.uk> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://www.klaipeda.daily.lt> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://www.krugosvet.ru> (Accessed 23 09 2009).
<http://www.labour.org.uk> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://www.ldp.lt> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://www.londonozinios.com> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://www.lrytas.lt> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://www.lrs.lt> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://www.mediabv.lt> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://news.sky.com> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://www.number10.gov.uk> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://news.bbc.co.uk> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://www.paksas.lt> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://paksas.president.lt> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://www.paulauskas.lt> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://paulauskas.president.lt> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://www.president.lt> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://www.politics.co.uk> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en> (Accessed 15 10 2009).
<http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://www.time.com> (Accessed 15 10 2009).
<http://www.timesonline.co.uk> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://tonyblairoffice.org> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).
<http://www.uksbd.co.uk> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).

<http://www.ve.lt> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).

<http://www.welshlabour.org.uk> (Accessed 30 06 2007- 31 08 2007).