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Leadership literature contains ample recommendations that leaders need to have a vision and be competent in visioning. A small subset of that literature recommends that leaders communicate their visions. There are few resources, however, that guide leaders how to communicate their visions.

This study consists of an application of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), including Genre Theory, and an extension of SFL, Appraisal Theory, on four visionary speeches in the field of political discourse—Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address, Churchill’s “We Shall Fight on the Beaches,” Kennedy’s inaugural, and Martin Luther King Jr.’s “I Have a Dream”—to discover how these leaders were able to utilize the rich resources of language to communicate their visions in such a compelling manner that their listeners and followers were willing to cast aside their own individual desires and implement the
vision for the common good. These four speeches were selected as the data set because of their “recognizability” factor and because they were delivered in turbulent times in which great visions were needed to effect great change.

This study first synthesized the recommendations in leadership literature on what features should be present in an effective vision. When the four speeches were then compared to those “benchmark” features, only three of the four speeches were found to contain all the recommended benchmark features; Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address, perhaps because of its brevity, did not contain some aspects of the benchmarks.

Then I conducted a thorough linguistic analysis of the speeches through the lenses of SFL and Appraisal Theory to discover how language enabled the expression of the features of an effective vision. From this linguistic analysis, I found that the four orators used the Appraisal resources of judgment, both positive and negative, to communicate their stance on what was good and what was bad to their listener-followers. Not surprisingly, we were depicted in positive judgment terms while they were depicted in negative judgment terms. The resources of appreciation enabled the orators to refer to those things that would support their vision of the future in positive terms while those expressed in negative terms would not have a place in the envisioned future. The resources of amplification, both augmentation and enrichment, and circumstance of location were found to have facilitated the expression of imagery in the four speeches and the also to have enabled the ability of the orator to communicate the emotion around his personal commitment to his vision. The resources of engagement, particularly proclamation, and Mood choices furthered the orator’s ability to communicate certainty and commitment to his vision through the exclusion of alternative voices from the texts.
Through the subsequent application of Genre Theory to the four texts, eight common stages, each with its own obligatory statements and common linguistic features, were found. These stages were labeled as follows: situational positioning of the past (then); situational positioning of the present (now); a statement identifying the purpose of the speech; a synopsis of the orator’s vision or goal—how the future should be; statement(s) on how the vision/goal might be implemented or the change effected; the timetable for needed change and an expression of urgency; statement(s) of the orator’s personal commitment to the vision/changes needed; and, finally, a call to action or the issuing of a rallying cry. Future research will confirm the finding of a new genre of visionary speech.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Problem

There is pervasive agreement and ample documentation in the literature that leaders need to have a vision. Vision plays a large role in numerous leadership theories, especially transformational leadership (Bass, 1990; Bennis & Nanus, 2003; Hackman & Johnson, 2004), charismatic leadership (Conger, 1989; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Weber, 1947), and in the literature on organizational change (Kotter, 1998, 2001). Vision is also identified as a key competency for leadership (Bass, 1990; Bennis & Nanus, 2003; Borchok & Bryne, 2008; Dantzer, 2000; Hackman & Johnson, 2004; Quigley, 1994; Sandstrom & Smith, 2008; Watson, 2000).

The need for leaders to communicate their vision is documented in a small subset of the literature on leadership (Bennis, 1994; Bennis & Nanus, 2003; Kouzes & Posner, 1995). However, despite the focus in the literature recommending leaders have a vision and, in a smaller set of resources, recommending leaders communicate that vision, there is little in the literature guiding leaders on how to put those recommendations into practice, that is, how to articulate their visions. The very few resources in the leadership literature that do claim to provide such guidance (Baldoni, 2003; Conger, 1991), while not derived from robust linguistic analysis, do provide leaders with recommendations on specific words to use when communicating vision. These resources are, however, too few
This scarcity of literature on how to use the rich resources of language in accomplishing the key leadership goal of having and communicating a vision leaves leaders without critical guidance on how to communicate vision effectively. Yet, in the body of literature that comprises linguistic theories, there are numerous studies in which leaders’ visionary speeches have been analyzed using various discourse analytical methodologies. As well, there are examples of great, visionary speeches delivered by renowned leaders to which leaders could turn for guidance and that, if analyzed using linguistic methodologies, could reveal how language was used to articulate the leader-orator’s vision in a compelling and memorable way.

**Statement of the Problem**

Although many leadership experts acknowledge the importance of language to leaders, few specifically address language use in communicating vision. Despite the emphasis in the literature devoted to leaders needing to have a vision and, while on a smaller scale, leaders needing to communicate their vision, there are very few references guiding leaders on how to use the rich resources of language to communicate their visions.

**Purpose of the Study**

This study contributes to the meager literature on how to use language to communicate vision by analyzing four visionary speeches. The goal of the analysis was to discover discernable patterns, trends, language choices, or discursive strategies in those
speeches (henceforth referred to as “discursive strategies”) to guide leaders in articulating their own visions. These discursive strategies were discovered through applications of the theory of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and its extension, Appraisal Theory as well as Genre Theory.

The texts that were analyzed are four well-known speeches from the realm of political leadership, namely: Abraham Lincoln’s *Gettysburg Address*, Winston Churchill’s *We Shall Fight on the Beaches* speech, John F. Kennedy’s inaugural address, and Martin Luther King, Jr.’s *I Have a Dream* speech. These four speeches were chosen because they are memorable for their powerful visions and because they were deemed to be sufficiently well-known as icons of visionary discourse to be recognized by most North American leaders. This study explains how four great leader-orators used language to communicate their visions in such a way that these visions continue to live decades, and in one case, centuries, after they were communicated.

**Research Questions**

In conducting this study, I was guided by three research questions. The first of these related to identifying what features the leadership literature recommended be present in an effective vision and then asking: Do these four speeches contain those recommended features? The second question I asked was: How did the language utilized by the orators enable the expression of those features and thereby convey vision to the listener-followers? The third question I asked was: Are there similar stages in the four speeches that would suggest there is a visionary speech genre?
Research Design

This is a qualitative study of four cases (visionary speeches) to discover similarities in discursive strategies in communicating vision and to examine common stages in the obligatory statements of those four speeches to discover a genre of visionary speech.

This study comprised two distinct analyses. The first of these followed a literature search for vision in the leadership literature that resulted in the synthesizing of the recommended features of an effective vision into eight features. These eight features, and several sub-themes within those features, were designated as benchmarks against which the four visionary speeches in the data set were compared.

Second, an application of the theory of Systemic Functional Linguistics and Appraisal Theory was conducted on those four visionary speeches to discover how language choices and discursive strategies were utilized by the orators to enable the expression of those eight benchmark features in the speeches. Finally, an application of Genre Theory was applied to the speeches. This analysis required the identification of stages in each speech and then a cross-analysis of all four speeches to see if the stages were common across all four and if they contained common linguistic features.

The steps undertaken in this study are depicted in Figure 1.

Method

Figure 1. Process and results of the analyses.

- **Literature review**
  - How vision appears in the literature (Chapter 2)

- **Synthesis**
  - 8 benchmark features of an effective vision (Chapter 2)

- **Analysis**
  - Determination of how each speech contains the recommended features of an effective vision (Chapters 4-7)

- **Analysis SFL/Appraisal**
  - Raw analysis (Appendices A - D) and summary in each chapter (4-7) of how language enabled the expression of each of the benchmark features

- **Analyze/comparing stages**
  - Identification of stages that are common to all four speeches; examine for common linguistic features

- **Describe new genre**
  - Description of common linguistic features and a genre of visionary speech (model, Chapter 8)
Martin & Rose, 2003, 2008; Martin & White, 2005; Nunan, 2008), and an extension of SFL, Appraisal Theory (Eggins & Slade, 1997; Martin, 2000, 2003b; Martin & White, 2005), provided the method for this study. Through this application the patterns, trends, language choices, discursive strategies, and stages that enabled those texts to communicate vision were discovered.

Within the field of linguistics, the theory of Systemic Functional Linguistics provides an explanation of how language operates in society and exactly how specific language choices create meaning for the members of that society. Systemicists, the name given to those who embrace the systemic functional linguistics theory of language (such as Eggins, 2004; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004; Hodge & Kress, 1988; Martin, 2001), take the position that language is a social semiotic, a resource to be used for making meanings in society.

Systemic Functional Linguistics has been used to study various leadership texts. Harrison and Young (2004), for example, used SFL to examine a Canadian federal government leader’s spoken and written discourse. Dunmire (2005) studied Bush’s speech of October 7, 2002, in which he offers his rationale for war against Iraq. Augustinos, Lecouteur, and Soyland (2002) studied discourse in which Australian leaders apologized to Aboriginal Australians known as the Stolen Generations, and Olson (2006) studied President Clinton’s speeches addressing the attacks on American embassies in Africa. Lazar and Lazar (2004) analyzed a corpus of speeches and written statements made by three American presidents (Bush Sr., Clinton, and Bush) to show how these leaders defined in language the new world order in the context of three key historical
moments (the Gulf War, the American military action in Afghanistan and Sudan, and the events of 9/11 respectively).

An extension of Systemic Functional Linguistics, Appraisal Theory proved to be important for this study. Appraisal Theory allows us to discover and share our viewpoints, emotions, tastes, and assessments to elicit a response from the addressees (Martin & White, 2005). This communication of our evaluations of someone or something is a vital necessity in creating the solidarity and bonding (Martin, 2000) between leaders and their listener-followers that leads to the vision being implemented. A few linguists who have used Appraisal Theory to analyze political discourse include Ponton (2010), who used appraisal theory to study how Margaret Thatcher’s gender-identity was developed following her taking the lead of the Conservative Party in 1975, and Ortieza (2009), who analyzed a report by the Chilean Rettig Commission that was investigating the truth about human rights violations during the dictatorship of Pinochet using Appraisal Theory.

**Conceptual Framework**

Two distinct bodies of literature provided the conceptual framework for this study: the leadership literature on vision and the linguistics literature on the theory of Systemic Functional Linguistics, Appraisal Theory and Genre Theory. In addition, historical documentation was reviewed in order to identify the situational context in which each of the speeches was delivered; this context of situation is a key component in any application of the theory of Systemic Functional Linguistics.
Significance of the Study

This work contributes to the knowledge on leadership: leaders are expected to have and to communicate their visions, yet are not provided sufficient guidance on the use of the linguistic resources to articulate those visions.

Conger (1991) wrote that, while much has been learned about the necessity of strategic vision and effective leadership, the critical link between vision and a leader’s ability to communicate its essence powerfully has largely been overlooked. The ability to transform an organization by dictate is a way of the past, according to Conger, and a more educated, more intrinsically motivated workplace demands that “[leaders] recast their image more in the light of an effective political leader, [learning] to sell themselves and their mission . . . [which] depends on highly effective language skills” (pp. 31-32). This study provides those highly effective language skills in the context of examining effective visionary leadership speech.

Furthermore, while there are recommendations in the literature on the necessity of communicating a vision, this action is not often taken by leaders. According to Kotter (2008), leaders make the error of “under communicating the vision by a factor of 10” (p. 99). This may be because, according to a study conducted by Kouzes and Posner (2009, p. 21), “what leaders struggle with the most is communicating a vision of the future that draws others in—that speaks to what others see and feel.” These factors may be the reason that Quigley (1994) states that although the concept of vision is highly topical, not one in 20 corporations has what could pass as a vision statement. . . . Fewer than one in 100 has a clear vision statement that has been effectively communicated to its people. . . . Equally important, there has been little written on how to communicate vision. (p. 37)
This dissertation may also be of significance because political speeches delivered in times of great crises were analyzed. Nutt and Backoff (1997) suggested that visions are especially needed in times of turbulence such as those periods in which the four speeches were delivered and, I believe, the times in which we currently live. The fear of terrorism, the fear of corporate failure in financial systems and other sectors, epidemics of deadly viruses, and the discrediting of leaders who were pillars of society until their deeds were disclosed, are all crises that face our leaders. As Covey (2005) suggested:

> We live in a constant, churning, changing environment. In turbulent white water, every single person must have something inside them that guides their decisions. They must independently understand the purpose and guiding principles of the team or organization. If you try to manage them, they won’t even hear you. The noise, the roar, the immediacy and urgency of all the dynamic challenges they face will simply be too great. (p. 105)

In these turbulent times, like those times in which the four orators appealed for the support of their listener-followers, vision in the form of a rallying call (Lazar & Lazar, 2004) may be our best tool to provide sustenance during times of change and crisis (Hunt, 1999).

Another way in which this study is significant relates to its ability to support leaders being competent in language use. As Westley and Mintzberg (1989) noted:

> One is hard-pressed to find an example of a visionary leader who was not also adept at language. Language has the ability to stimulate and motivate [and] rhetoricians since Aristotle have carefully observed the potential of linguistic devices such as alliteration, irony, imagery and metaphor among other things to provoke identification and emotional commitment among listeners. (p. 20)

The ability to use language is especially important in communicating vision. Charteris-Black (2005) argued that “the most important type of behavior [through] which leaders mobilize their followers is their linguistic performance. In democratic frameworks, it is primarily through language that leaders legitimize their leadership”
The need to be linguistically capable extends beyond politics to our corporate and bureaucratic sectors. As Deetz (1994) noted:

Of all the organizational forms, language has a special position. All other organizational forms may be translated into language. Further, every perception is dependent on the conceptual apparatus which makes it possible and meaningful as this conceptual apparatus is inscribed in language. Talk and writing are thus much more than the means of expression of individual meanings: they connect each perception to a larger orientation and system of meaning. The conceptual distinctions in an organization are inscribed in the systems of speaking and writing. (p. 135)

In addition to the study being important to the field of leadership, my literature review indicated that this study is unusual in the field of linguistics in that others have focused on a single orator’s corpora of speeches (Fairclough, 1995, 2000, 2005; Olson, 2006). This study instead examined texts from four orators, seeking patterns and trends in the language choices they all made to communicate their visions.

The study is also unusual in that it is cross-disciplinary—not only because it involves an analysis of political leadership discourse, the findings of which may guide leaders in other domains (the church, academia, corporations) in communicating their visions, but also because it spans two bodies of knowledge, linguistics and leadership.

**Definitions**

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions will apply.

**Vision:** A “mental image conjured up by a leader that portrays a highly desirable future state . . . an ideal or . . . far-reaching dream” (Conger, 1989, p. 38) and “a shared meaning . . . a common, meaningful goal” (Bennis, 2003, p. 336).
Systemic Functional Linguistics: A theory on how language works as a semiotic system in society to help interactants exchange meaning. Language is seen as a “resource for making meanings” (Matthiessen & Halliday, 1997).

Appraisal theory: About how language enables us to share our viewpoints, our emotions, tastes, and assessments to elicit a response from the addressees (Martin & White, 2005).

Context of situation: The environment in which the text had been produced (Malinowski, 1923/1946).

Discourse: The process of language in some recognizable social contexts(s) (Hasan, 2004).

Genre: a staged, goal-oriented process (Martin, 2009); “a purposeful, socially constructed oral or written text such as a narrative, a casual conversation, a poem, a recipe or a description [with] each genre [having] its own characteristic structure and grammatical form that reflects its social purpose” (Nunan, 2008, p. 57).

Listener-followers: A term created for this dissertation; it is used to suggest that the orators are communicating their visions, not only to the immediate listeners who are present (in person or through the media) as the speeches are delivered, but also to that larger audience of those followers who are needed to implement the vision.

Register: The three relevant dimensions—field, tenor, and mode—in the context of situation that have a direct and significant impact on the type of language that will be produced; the three aspects in any situation that generate linguistic choices that are made or discarded as options by the language-user and which therefore generate meaning (Eggins, 2004; Halliday & Hasan, 1989).
Basic Assumptions

This study was guided by the assumption that these four speeches contained common patterns and trends in language choices made by the orators that make them exemplary cases of communicating vision. Furthermore, an assumption was made that, when these common patterns and trends were revealed through an application of the theory of Systemic Functional Linguistics, including Genre Theory and Appraisal Theory, they could contribute to the small body of knowledge that guides leaders on how to use language to communicate vision.

Limitations and Delimitations

This study was guided by three considerations: first, the fact that only speeches delivered by male orators were found to be of sufficient gravitas and import to other leaders to be analyzed; second, that, despite SFL analysts also examining texts at the level of auditory and visual form, one of the speeches (Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address) was unavailable in those formats and I could therefore not conduct a study of voice or non-verbal behaviors; and, third, that I did not examine the character of the orator, an aspect of charismatic leadership that some (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Yukl, 2002) suggest has an important influence on the vision of that leader.

Regarding the first factor, the male-only orators, in the initial search for discourse to analyze, both male and female orators were sought. The thought behind this search was that it would be useful to leaders to see how male and female leaders communicate their visions. Unfortunately, another search factor, that the texts to be analyzed be recognizable and credible, eliminated several texts delivered by female orators from the data to be analyzed. In addition, had there been a text delivered by a female, I would have
had to examine the literature on gender differences in speech to ensure that the analysis would not be skewed by the differences in speech patterns between the genders. Gender difference in speech, while an interesting topic for future study, was believed to be beyond the scope of this dissertation.

Regarding the second factor, the lack of a phonological analysis of the texts, many SFL analyses start with identifying the language choices we make in three strata: semantic (the system of meanings), lexico-grammatical (vocabulary and rules of the language), and phonological, the sound system of language (Fromkin, Rodman, Hultin, & Logan, 2001, p. 16). For one of the texts (the Gettysburg Address, Lincoln, 1946), the only existing transcription is in writing and there is therefore no text to be analyzed at the phonological level or from the visual perspective to evaluate non-verbal behavior. The absence of audio-visual formats for one of the texts in the data set precluded a cross-case analysis of all the texts in that format and I therefore limited my analysis to the semantic and lexico-grammatical levels.

The third factor, the character of the orator having an impact on the vision, appears in the literature on charismatic leadership. Some experts (Conger & Kanungo, 1987, Yukl, 2002) suggest that the character of the orator adds part of the appeal of the vision. Followers may believe the vision because they have such strong faith in the character of the orator, promoting their “mythic perceptions of the leaders . . . develop[ing] a notion that their leader is truly superhuman and extraordinary” (Conger & Kanungo, 1987, p. 155). Whether the character of any of the four orators to be examined in this dissertation was perceived to have these superhuman attributes was thought to be beyond the scope of this study and was therefore not considered.
The study was also delimited by two other factors: first, a decision to study only discourse delivered in English (that is, not translated from another language into English) and, second, by studying discourse from the point of view of the orator, not the audience.

This decision to restrict the analysis to only those speeches delivered in English was based on the fact that the theory of Systemic Functional Linguistics permits analysis at a very profound level of delicacy and detail and therefore “discourse analysis papers should reproduce and analyze textual samples in the original language” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 186). Analyzing English texts only for this dissertation was intended therefore to ensure that no meaning was lost in translation. This potential loss of meaning in non-English speeches would have been especially true in cases in which metaphor shaped part of the meaning of the speech. Additionally, intertextual references in the non-English language text that may have been important to the understanding of the speeches would not have been understood. The registerial significance of these metaphors and intertextual references would have been apparent only in terms of the contexts of situation in which the speeches were delivered. And so, while other leaders, among them Hitler and Mao, would have been interesting to analyze to determine how they used language to express their visions in ways that made them palatable to their respective audiences, these orators were eliminated by virtue of their speeches having been delivered in German and Chinese.

Then, finally, the decision to focus on the discourse from the point of view of the orator’s intentions, rather than how the vision was received by the audience, was taken because it was deemed beyond the scope of this study to pursue this latter aspect.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This dissertation is based on the argument that vision is a critical and continuing key component of leadership. This argument arose during my initial reading of the leadership literature when I remarked on the prevalence in that literature on the subject of vision and was corroborated by a search which found that leadership and vision/leadership remain of interest in the literature. In fact, resources on both leadership and vision as a component of leadership have increased steadily since the 1930s, with a large, almost 100%, increase in the data in the years since 2000. The data are displayed in Table 1 showing references for leadership and leadership and vision for 10-year intervals from 1930 to 2009.

The prevalence and growth of references to vision and leadership are especially relevant to the research that was undertaken for this dissertation and speak to the importance of the topic. Vision is critically important to leaders and, while the literature confirms this importance, it provides very little in the way of guidance for leaders on how to use language to communicate their visions.

This chapter consists of reviews of three bodies of literature: first, leadership literature in which vision is discussed; second, a review of literature in which the need for communicating vision is identified; and, third, a review of those few resources that
Table 1

Leadership and Vision/Leadership since 1930

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>References for Leadership</th>
<th>References for Leadership/Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1930-39</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-49</td>
<td>1,872</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-59</td>
<td>3,925</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-69</td>
<td>5,818</td>
<td>1,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-79</td>
<td>9,321</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-89</td>
<td>11,142</td>
<td>1,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-99</td>
<td>14,812</td>
<td>4,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-09</td>
<td>28,024</td>
<td>9,922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

provide guidance to leaders on how to use language to communicate their visions.

A literature review of the chosen methodology, the theory of Systemic Functional Linguistics, its extension, Appraisal Theory, and Genre Theory appears in chapter 3, Methodology. The documentation that was reviewed to position each of the speeches in its historical context appears in chapters 4-7, in the individual analyses of each of the speeches in the data set.

Vision in the Leadership Literature

This review of how vision is discussed in leadership literature is organized around the various themes in which vision is discussed in the literature as follows:

1. Vision: An emerging concept
2. Vision as a key leadership competency
3. Definitions of vision in the literature
4. The purpose of a vision

5. Shared vision

6. The features of an effective vision

7. The role of followers in visioning.

Vision: An Emerging Concept

Vision emerged as an organizational concept out of the management by objectives and strategic planning concepts of the 1950s and 1960s (R. Allen, 1995). By the late 1980s and early 1990s, following a number of groundbreaking works on leadership (DePree, 1987; Kotter & Heskett, 1992; Kouzes & Posner, 1995), vision was becoming a recognized concept in the literature and among leaders. In fact, the concept was so well-known that, in his political dictionary, Safire (2008) recalled how George Bush, Sr., was heard in 1987 to refer awkwardly to “that vision thing,” while Bob Dole called it “the V-word.” Safire noted that vision is “a world-weary acknowledgement that a leader must articulate inspiring goals” (p. 780).

Although present in the literature of the time, vision was not a uniform or unanimously accepted feature of corporate culture: Some successful corporations did not have a clear corporate vision or agreement on a clear direction for the corporation to pursue (R. Allen, 1995). While many organizational leaders were embracing the concept of visioning, some notable corporate leaders were not. R. J. Eaton (then Chairman of Chrysler), Louis Gerstner (then CEO of IBM), and Bill Gates of Microsoft, for example, avoided visioning, preferring instead to focus on the day-to-day running of their businesses (Quigley, 1994).
By the late 1980s, leaders like Max DePree (1987) of Herman Miller were beginning to make their voices heard, and leadership became a topic of interest in organizations. In the early 1990s, Kotter and Heskett (1992) released their 4-year study of firms in 20 industries, stating that a strong corporate culture, based on a foundation of shared values, outperformed other firms, growing their revenues more than four times faster, creating jobs seven times faster, and growing their stock price 12 times faster. Kotter and Heskett had set out to determine whether there was a relationship between corporate culture and long-term economic performance; and then, if there was such a relationship, to clarify the nature of that relationship between the two, explore why it existed, and then determine if it could be exploited to improve corporate performance. In their studies, Kotter and Heskett found that the “single most visible factor that distinguishes major cultural changes that succeed from those that fail is competent leadership at the top . . . [in particular] a new leader who . . . established a new vision and a set of strategies for achieving that vision” (p. 84).

Also by the early-1990s, according to Quigley (1994), vision had been discussed by others, but little thought had been given to defining the content of a vision. A few years later, vision was becoming a largely accepted notion as a “must” in business. Even legendary Louis Gerstner Jr., who, on taking the helm at IBM in 1993 during a time of turmoil for the company, is quoted as having said that “the last thing IBM needs is a vision” had become convinced of the need: By 1995, when he delivered the keynote address at the computer industry trade show, Gerstner articulated IBM’s new “vision” (Blanchard & Stoner, 2004, p. 23).
In the mid-1990s, when Larwood, Falbe, Kriger, and Miesing (1995) conducted a meta-analysis of over 1,000 articles and books on the topic of organizational vision, they found that vision technically remained a “hypothetical construct” (p. 740) at the time and that researchers had, with few exceptions, largely ignored the actual content of vision statements. Larwood et al.’s study addressed this lack of research on the content of vision statements by employing a self-evaluation instrument to examine the manner in which top executives themselves defined vision. The study involved 331 persons in firms of different regions and sizes in the United States who responded to a self-evaluation instrument that included writing a brief statement of their vision. Larwood et al. (p. 742) found that there was support for the idea of vision as involving far-reaching strategic planning and also for the notion that strategic leaders should be able and willing to share and communicate with others.

As Bennis (2003) noted, by the early 2000s, the idea of vision had been widely embraced, not only in the corporate world but among leaders of educational institutions, churches, and other nonprofit organizations as well. Bennis’s research at the time found that one of the most critical elements of successful leadership was a clearly articulated vision, or sense of direction, to focus the attention of everyone associated with the organization. Bennis stated that “it is generally recognized that all successful organizations need not just a clear mission and purpose, but also a widely shared vision and that few leaders can succeed without both” (p. ii).

Vision as a Key Leadership Competency

One theme in the literature is that vision or “visioning” is a key competency required of a leader. This section discusses the vision competency as it appeared in the
early and most recent literature and then explores the opinions in the literature on how leaders are meeting the competency.

It was during the late 1980s and early 1990s that the concept of vision as a leadership competency became prevalent in the literature. In particular at that time, the literature on theories of charismatic and transformational leadership (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Kouzes & Posner, 1987; Larwood et al., 1995; Nanus, 1992) contained guidance for leaders to have a vision. Weber was one of the first scholars, to the best of my knowledge, to mention vision when he wrote in the late 1940s of charismatic leadership (Hackman & Johnson, 2004). Weber used the term “charisma” to describe secular leaders, expanding the term beyond its traditional meaning of “a gift from God,” to include all leaders who attract followers through their exceptional powers. Of charismatic leaders, Weber wrote the following description:

[He] is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities . . . such as are not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as of divine origin or as exemplary and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a leader. (Hackman & Johnson, 2004, p. 111)

Since then, various scholars have added to Weber’s concept of the charismatic leader. Of these, Conger and Kanungo (1987) are cited for their behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings in which charisma is defined in terms of the perceptions of followers. Conger and Kanungo identified five leadership behaviors that are likely to be seen as charismatic: possessing a vision that is unique and attainable; acting in an unconventional, counter-normative manner; demonstrating personal commitment and risk taking; demonstrating confidence and expertise; and demonstrating personal power. Yet Collins and Porras (1991) later challenged the myth that building a
visionary organization requires a charismatic leader who is “somehow blessed with almost mystical or super-human visionary qualities,” noting that “charisma’s role in setting vision is vastly overrated” and that all leaders can and should have a vision (p. 51).

Several sources in the literature on the theory of transformational leadership also contain references to leaders needing a vision and suggest that being visionary is a key competency of leadership. In this literature, Hackman and Johnson (2004) stated, for instance, that transformational leaders share five characteristics: They are creative, interactive, visionary, empowering, and passionate. These five characteristics distinguish transformational leadership from its precursor, transactional leadership (Burns, 1978), in which the leader is most concerned with satisfying employees’ physiological, safety, and belonging needs and, in order to help employees meet those needs, a leader will exchange rewards or privileges for desirable outcomes (Hackman & Johnson, 2004, p. 89). Bass (1990), taking issue with transactional leadership, suggested that those transactional communications that explain to employees what is required of them and what compensation they will receive if they fulfill these requirements are, at best, “a prescription for mediocrity” (p. 20) and that

[superior leadership] occurs when leaders broaden and elevate the interests of their employees, when they generate awareness and acceptance of the purposes and mission of the group, and when they stir their employees to look beyond their own self-interest for the good of the group. (p. 21)

This superior leadership, which Bass (1990) called transformational, allows leaders to achieve results by: being charismatic and inspiring their followers, meeting their employees’ emotional needs, or intellectually stimulating employees. Bennis and Nanus (2003) contributed to the literature on vision as a leadership competency of transformational leaders in their 1996 study of 90 successful leaders from various sectors
(business, education, sports, and government). Bennis and Nanus found that one of the most critical elements of successful leadership was a clearly articulated vision, or sense of direction, that focused the attention of everyone associated with the organization. They reported that “today it is generally recognized that all successful organizations need not just a clear mission or purpose, but also a widely shared vision and that few leaders can succeed without both” (Bennis & Nanus, 2003, p. ii).

The need for leaders to be competent in visioning extends beyond the theories of charismatic and transformational leadership. Confirming the contention of vision being a leadership competency, Quigley (1994), for example, referred to a survey by Korn/Ferry International which (in 1994) surveyed 1,500 senior leaders from 20 countries to describe the key traits that were desirable for a CEO at that time and also asked that respondents project leadership competencies that would be needed in 2000. The dominant behavior identified by 98% of the leader-respondents for both periods of time was a strong sense of vision. As Borchok and Bryne (2008) noted, “[i]t is almost impossible for any organization to embark on any major brand-led transformation without the catalytic influence of its leader. The leader drives the vision. The leader leads every employee to make that vision a reality” (p. 14).

In their book on legacy leadership, Sandstrom and Smith (2008) also address the influence of leaders, but suggesting that leaders cannot actually influence others. At best, leaders can leave a legacy that inspires others to change. Sandstrom and Smith identified five Legacy Practices, the first of which is to be a holder of vision and values. Great legacy leaders, according to Sandstrom and Smith, are “conscious guardians of both
personal and organizational vision and values [and] this guardianship becomes part of who they are and guides all they do” (p. 35).

Bennis (2010) also addressed the need for leaders to be competent in visioning, noting that, as he reflected on his own experience as a leader, when he was most effective it was because he knew what he wanted. Bennis concluded from his experience that the first leadership competency is the management of attention, through a set of intentions or a vision. In an earlier work, Bennis (1995) had noted that “nothing serves an organization better—especially during times of agonizing doubts and paralyzing ambiguities—than leadership that knows what it wants, communicates those intentions accurately, empowers others and knows how to stay on course and when to change” (p. 378).

Bennis’s (2010) article was written based on work he and Nanus (Bennis & Nanus, 2003) had conducted earlier when they interviewed 90 leaders, asking open-ended questions about their strengths and weaknesses, whether any particular experience or event in their life had influenced their management philosophy or style, and what major decision points had shaped their career and how they felt about those choices (p. 22). From these interviews, Bennis and Nanus concluded that leaders have five areas of competency or “human handling skills” (p. 25) that contributed to their success: attention through vision, meaning through communication, trust through positioning, the deployment of self through positive self-regard, and “the Wallenda factor” (a reference to the great tightrope walker, Karl Wallenda who, like leaders, put all his energy into a task). The first of these competencies, attention through vision, allowed leaders, “the most results-oriented individuals in the world” (p. 26), to create focus, to compel and pull people toward their intentions.
Similarly, Watson (2000) and Dantzer (2000) collaborated on two studies to determine what competencies were judged to be necessary for 21st-century leaders. Using mail-in questionnaires and telephone surveys, Watson and Dantzer asked respondents in Canada’s public sector, Canada’s private sector, and the general Canadian public to rate a set of leadership competencies. In the case of all respondents, the private and public sectors and the general public, vision was identified as the top competency required of leaders in the 21st-century.

Several experts in the field (Bennis, 1994; Conger, 1989; Kouzes & Posner, 2009) have contributed the distinction of vision being the competency that differentiates leaders from managers or other non-leaders. Of these, Conger (1989) was one who made the distinction, noting that managers are responsible for maintaining the status quo and addressing tactical goals, while leaders have an intolerance for “what is” and impatience for “what was,” striving instead to identify “what could be.” Bennis (2003) agreed with Conger’s assessment, indicating that leaders need to have a strongly defined sense of purpose, “a sense of vision and that [this] is the essential difference between leading and managing—that leading means doing the right things while managing just means doing things right” (pp. 154-155). Finally, Kouzes and Posner (2009) contended that “being forward-looking—envisioning exciting possibilities and enlisting others in a shared view of the future—is the competency that most distinguishes leaders from non-leaders” (p. 20).

Lissack and Roos (2001), however, argued that vision is less important now than it was in years past because the assumptions on which visions rest are no longer applicable. Lissack and Roos suggested that visioning relies on five unspoken
assumptions, that is, that the world is stable enough so that any changes are foreseeable; that prediction is possible; that boundaries are clearly defined; that identity is assumed (and that therefore there is no need for articulation); and that outcomes are more important than processes. These five assumptions, according to Lissack and Roos, are no longer applicable and companies can make significantly greater progress by focusing less on vision and more on coherence (p. 54). Coherence as defined by Lissack and Roos is the concept of holding together, the “glue which allows both the manager and the organization to reassert identity in the face of the continuous change” (p. 60). Where vision allows a focus on the future, coherence “demands a recognition of the present [and] where vision looks at where [an organization] wants to be, coherence demands that [it] deal with where [it is]” (p. 61).

Assessing how leaders are meeting or not meeting the vision competency is also apparent in the literature (Bennis, 1995; Collins & Porras, 1991; Ibarra & Obodaru, 2009; Kotter, 2008; Kouzes & Posner, 2007). In an article describing leadership as an art form, Bennis (1995), for example, took the position that leaders are meeting the competency requirement. Bennis noted that CEOs in his experience possess “the capacity to create and communicate a compelling vision of a desired state of affairs, a vision (or paradigm, context, frame) that induces the commitment and clarity to the vision” (p. 378).

Others disagreed. Collins and Porras (1991), for instance, lamented that, in their combined experience, the visions they have seen are of little value, having no mention of intended effort, not “grabbing people in the gut” (p. 31) and motivating them to work towards a common end, not focusing attention, not galvanizing people to put forth their best efforts towards a compelling goal, and they are not coherent.
Kouzes and Posner (2007) also contended that leaders are generally failing in meeting the vision competency. Using their leadership practices inventory, Kouzes and Posner scored leaders on five leadership competencies including inspiring a shared vision, on which leaders scored poorly; in fact, visioning was the factor on which leaders achieved the weakest scores. Kouzes and Posner suggested that the underlying reason for those poor scores is that leaders fail to communicate the vision, a topic that is discussed below.

Kotter (2008) agreed that leaders are failing in visioning. In his work assisting more than 100 companies make fundamental changes in how business is conducted in order to help them cope with a new, more challenging market environment, Kotter found that leaders make several critical visioning errors, among them: lacking a vision to help direct the change effort and developing strategies for achieving that vision; not establishing a great enough sense of urgency in the vision and therefore failing to drive people out of their comfort zones; and under-communicating the vision “by a factor of 10” (pp. 97-99).

In summary, the leadership literature suggests that leaders must be competent and need to have a vision. There are differing views, however, in the literature on how well leaders are meeting the visioning competency.

Vision Defined

This section examines the many definitions of vision in the literature and is organized around vision as movement towards a goal or a destination, vision as a depiction of dreams, and vision as an image. This section concludes with my own definition of vision.
Definitions of vision vary in the literature, but there is some alignment around the themes of vision describing a sense of forward movement, a guiding light, a passion or other strong emotional force, a goal or purpose, a map or journey to guide the way. As Kotter (2001) commented:

Most discussions of vision have a tendency to degenerate into the mystical. The implication is that a vision is something mysterious that mere mortals, even talented ones, could never hope to have. But developing good business direction isn’t magic. It is a tough, sometimes exhausting process of gathering and analyzing information. People who articulate such visions aren’t magicians but broad-based strategic thinkers who are willing to take risks. (p. 87)

Vision as forward movement was identified by Max DePree (1987), who, in his contention that “the only kind of leadership worth following is based on vision” (p. 133), referred to the momentum which “comes from a clear vision . . . from a well-thought-out strategy to achieve that vision, and from carefully conceived and communicated directions and plans that enable everyone to participate and be publicly accountable in achieving those plans” (p. 18).

Maxwell (2002) contributed to DePree’s (1987) contention of vision being crucial for forward movement in an organization, saying:

Vision is everything for a leader. It is utterly indispensable. Why? Because vision leads the leader. It paints a target. It sparks and fuels the fire within, and draws him forward. It is also the fire lighter for others who follow that leader. Show me a leader without vision and I’ll show you someone who isn’t going anywhere. At best, he is traveling in circles. (p. 53)

Kotter (2001), writing of breakthrough leadership, also argued that “the function of leadership is to produce change [and] setting the direction of that change is fundamental to leadership” (p. 67). Bennis (2003) agreed, describing vision as “[a] critical ingredient [for leading] . . . the capacity to engage followers in shared meaning—to align the stars around a common, meaningful goal” (p. 336).
Hunt (1999) added to the sense of vision as a destination or a journey when she noted that “vision provides the direction and the sustenance for change. Our vision helps us navigate through crises. It reminds us to look beyond the day-to-day minutiae. It helps us to live on purpose” (p. 12).

Hackman and Johnson (2004), writing on transformational leadership, noted that their definition of vision is “a concise statement or description of the direction in which an individual, group or organization is headed” (p. 101) and believe that a compelling vision provides people with a sense of purpose and encourages commitment.

Kouzes and Posner (1995) suggested that credible leaders develop a capacity to envision the future, to look ahead, imagining the ideal. “Vision” is the term used by Kouzes and Posner to refer to a leader’s foresightedness and as “an ideal and unique image of the future” (p. 95).

The idea of vision as image was taken up by Hunt (1999) who suggested that the most effective leaders are dream makers, people whose compelling vision and deeply held values inspire hope and make a difference. Hunt noted that “in changing times we need leaders with vision, rooted in deeply held values. In short, we need leaders who can dream and make those dreams real” (p. 13).

Snyder and Graves (1994) disagreed, suggesting that vision is less a dream than a reality that has not yet come into existence:

Vision is palpable to leaders; their confidence in it and dedication to vision are so strong they can devote long hours over many years to bring it into being. . . . The power of the vision and the leader’s devotion to it inspire others who, sensing purpose and commitment, respond. . . . When we say a leader has vision, we refer to the ability to see the present as it is and formulate a future that grows out of and improves upon [it]. . . . A vision is an idea of the future; it is an image, a strongly felt wish. (p. 1)
Conger (1989) defined a vision as a “mental image conjured up by a leader that portrays a highly desirable future state . . . an ideal or . . . far-reaching dream” (p. 38).

Senge (1990) added the element of emotion in the image as a key factor in vision, when he noted that a shared vision “is a force in people’s hearts, a force of impressive power . . . [with] few, if any, forces in human affairs [being] as powerful as shared visions” (p. 206).

Covey (2005) supported this idea, offering the following definition of vision:

[It is] seeing a future state with the mind’s eye. Vision is applied imagination. All things are created twice: first, a mental creation; second, a physical creation. The first creation, vision, is the beginning of the process of reinventing . . . an organization. . . . [A vision] is reality not yet brought into the physical sphere. (p. 70)

Yukl (2002) contributed to the literature by offering his own definition of a vision as image:

Vision should be simple and idealistic, a picture of a desirable future . . . [that] should appeal to the values, hopes and ideals of organization members and other stakeholders whose support is needed. The vision should: emphasize distant ideological objectives rather than immediate tangible benefits . . . not be a wishful fantasy but rather an attainable future grounded in the present reality . . . address basic assumptions about what is important for the organization, how it should relate to the environment and how people should be treated . . . and [should be] simple enough to be communicated clearly. (p. 283)

Nanus (1992) agreed that vision is a mental model of a future state of a process, a group or an organization . . . [that] deals only in the imagination, a world built upon plausible speculations, fabricated from what we hope are reasonable assumptions about the future and heavily influenced by our own judgments of what is possible and worthwhile . . . a world whose very existence requires an act of faith . . . a mental construct that we have within our power to transform into reality. (pp. 25-27)

Nanus added that a vision is a realistic, credible, attractive future for an organization, the articulation of which provides a destination towards which the organization should aim.
Bell (2007) contributed the idea of image as an energizing force in his definition of a vision:

A vision exercises a magnetic pull that irresistibly engages people in its pursuit. It captures the heart and the imagination. [While] the purpose or mission stimulates the mind as it pushes the organization forward . . . the vision warms the heart as it pulls the organization to its point on the horizon. [Vision] gives people the drive to cross even the most inhospitable terrain and face the most inclement weather; it provides the energy and passion that sustain the morale and maintain the momentum. (p. 18)

In summary, definitions of “vision” are apparent in the literature, and finding a single definition is problematic. As Collins and Porras (1996) noted, vision is perhaps one of the most overused and least understood words in the language.

Given this overuse and lack of understanding, I thought it would be useful to explore my own definition of vision and discovered that, for me, a vision is a statement of a compelling and desirable future towards which both the leader and the listener-followers can agree to move forward together. The key to me resides in the words compelling and desirable: If the listener-followers do not see themselves in the vision and if, as my experience would suggest, they suffer from “vision fatigue,” implementation of the vision is doomed to failure. In my experience, a vision needs to be realistic (Nanus, 1992); provide people with a sense of purpose (Hackman & Johnson, 2004); be rooted in shared values (Hunt, 1999); and become a force in people’s hearts (Senge, 1990) such that their commitment to it will overcome the daily frustrations and fear that change often brings to an organization.

Purpose of a Vision

This section explores how the purpose of a vision is reflected in literature, including how it appears in the literature on change management and strategic decision
making, and its role in capturing the hearts, minds, and energy of the organization.

The need for vision during change initiatives was explored by Yukl (2002) who suggested that “during the hectic and confusing process of implementing major change, a clear vision helps to guide and coordinate the decisions and actions of thousands of people working in widely dispersed locations” (p. 283). Hunt (1999) referred to vision as providing the direction and sustenance for change, something that helps navigate through crises, reminding people to look beyond the day-to-day minutiae and live on purpose. According to Hunt, the role of leaders in ensuring that their vision fulfills this purpose is to be the dream-makers, those whose compelling visions and deeply held values inspire hope and make a difference. These leaders take responsibility for the world they live in and are committed to making it better. Also, these leaders “clearly see the current reality and unflinchingly confront it, they have a deep faith that any challenge can be overcome” (p. 12).

Peters (1987) also wrote about change initiatives, especially about the late 1980s being a time of chaos, when corporate America declined in both productivity and service. Peters described a need for a management revolution to address the decline, contending that the term “excellence” must be redefined to denote constant improvement and constant change and that “excellent firms of tomorrow will cherish impermanence—and thrive on chaos” (p. 4), with vision being one of the factors that will help firms survive. Peters (1987) refined his definition of vision in a later article (2008) by noting that “to be effective, a vision must be crystal clear. While compromise is necessary to build a consensus for action, the best chiefs are insistent that the main theme not get so enlarged or diluted as to become insipid” (p. 10).
Addressing the role of vision in strategic decision making, Baum, Locke, and Kirkpatrick (1998) studied the role of vision in an organization’s success. Baum et al.’s study examined the effects of vision on the performance of the organization as a whole, asking whether vision significantly affected organizational performance and, if so, what features comprised an effective vision. This latter point, the features that comprise vision, will be discussed below. Regarding the former question, Baum et al. collected data from 183 entrepreneur-CEOs and evaluated their visions on the features they identified in the literature, concluding that both vision content and how it is communicated do significantly affect organizational performance and subsequent venture growth compared with other organizations that do not have defined visions (p. 43).

Sandstrom and Smith (2008) also addressed the role of vision in the success of an organization in their work on Legacy Leadership, advising that “every leader is responsible for knowing and holding [vision] vital to organizational success. . . . Vision is what defines success for that organization [and] each individual. Vision is how the leader operates. Great leaders live today the legacy they want to leave tomorrow” (p. 36).

Blanchard and Stoner (2004) agree on the important role of vision, noting that, in their 35 years of studying leadership and organizations, they found that a clear vision and direction championed by top management and implemented by others is one of the critical factors driving world-class organizations. “Vision is important for leaders because leadership is about going somewhere. . . . The greatest leaders have mobilized others by coalescing people around a shared vision” (p. 22). Similarly, Kotter and Heskett (1992, p. 40) related the results of their study of firms (using data collected up to 1990), finding that companies with a strong corporate culture based on a foundation of shared values
outperformed other firms by large margins (in speed of growth of revenue, higher job creation, rise in stock prices, and profit performance).

Snyder and Graves (1994) suggested that a vision provides a leader with strategic direction and is a target toward which a leader aims his or her energy and resources. The constant presence of the vision keeps a leader moving despite various forces of resistance such as fear of failure, emotional hardships, or practical difficulties (p. 1).

Bell (2007) took a different tack, suggesting that bold visions lead to bold goals that capture the hearts, minds, and energy of the organization. Bell suggested that both Ford’s vision of democratizing the automobile and Sony’s 50-year goal of becoming the Japanese company most associated with changing the worldwide image of poor Japanese quality defined a goal that focused the organizations’ considerable energies in the same direction. Bell also contributed the concept of visions having a unification purpose, saying that compelling visions get people’s attention and unify them in action (p. 20).

Walesh (2008) added his thoughts on the role of vision suggesting that the purpose of a vision is to ensure that people retain control of their futures, contending that “there are only two futures for individuals and/or organizations—the one we create for ourselves through proactive actions, including visioning; or, in the vacuum, the future others create for us” (p. 6).

Heifetz and Laurie (2001), writing of Jan Carlzon, the leader who turned SAS around, confirmed that a leader can use a vision for the purpose of developing collective self-confidence in others. Carlzon is quoted as having said, “People aren’t born with self-confidence. Even the most self-confident people can be broken. The leader’s most important role is to instill confidence in people” (p. 137).
Kouzes and Posner (1995) related that there are many positive results from a vision, among them significantly higher levels of: job satisfaction, motivation, commitment, loyalty, *esprit de corps*, clarity about the organization’s values, pride in the organization, and organizational productivity (p. 124).

To sum up, while mentions of a vision’s purpose vary in literature, there seems to be a general consensus that vision has an important role to play in leadership.

**Shared Vision**

There are two uses of the verb “to share” in the literature and this can cause some confusion for the researcher. In the first sense, “shared vision” (Senge, 1990, 2004, 2008) means the act of developing or creating a vision in collaboration with others such that the resulting vision can be deemed to be shared. In the second sense, “shared vision” in literature refers to a process that occurs after the creation of the vision, that is, the communication or sharing of it with others. The first of these, sharing in the sense of joint development of a vision, will be explored here; the literature on sharing a vision in the sense of communicating it will be explored below.

Senge (1990) introduced the idea of developing a shared vision in his landmark work on learning organizations in which he challenged leaders to develop an organizational vision based on the individual, personal visions of the people who work in the organization rather than imposing a vision from the top down. Senge was clear on the point of shared vision, saying that “few, if any, forces in human affairs are as powerful as shared vision” (p. 206). Senge noted that this shared approach to visioning requires that people first have their own individual vision; if not, all they can do is sign-up to implement someone else’s vision, an action of compliance rather than commitment.
Senge expanded on this latter point by commenting further on commitment, that is, having others buy into the vision, suggesting that there is a large difference between selling a vision and enrolling others in that vision. Selling, Senge suggested, generally means getting people to do something they might not do if they were in possession of all of the facts; enrolling, on the other hand, implies free choice, “placing one’s name on the roll,” becoming part of something by choice and therefore committed to making the vision happen (p. 218). While enrollment exceeded “being sold” in terms of commitment to the vision, Senge advocated that a vision that is developed together, a shared vision, is the ideal.

The need for vision may have been especially acute when Senge was studying the learning organization as the 1990s was a period in which decentralization and “flattening” of work units became organizational trends. Referring to this trend, Collins and Porras (1991) posed the question, “How can a company decentralize and at the same time have a coherent, coordinated effort?” (p. 30). Their response to the question involved the development of a shared organizational vision.

Kouzes and Posner (2006) agreed with shared organizational visions, refuting the idea that leaders’ individual visions are what inspire others, and suggesting that, while followers expect a leader to be forward-looking, they do not expect to hear “divinely inspired revelations” (p. 208). Instead, followers want to hear about their own aspirations, how their own dreams will come true and how their own hopes will be fulfilled. “They want to see themselves in the picture of the future the leader is painting. . . . The best leaders then understand that they must inspire a shared vision, one that emphasizes we vs. I” (p. 208).
In an earlier work, Kouzes and Posner (2004) had noted that, in more than 500 original cases they studied, they did not encounter “a single example of extraordinary achievements that occurred without the active involvement and support of many people. . . . It’s a team effort” that requires collaboration on shared goals (p. 151). Kouzes and Posner therefore suggested that leaders should inspire a shared vision, not their own idiosyncratic view of the world. Kouzes and Posner advocated that, to “stir the souls of constituents and lift them to higher performance, [leaders] need to know that it is not [their] vision but the people’s vision that matters most” (p. 18) and that exemplary leaders passionately believe that they can make a difference. They desire to make something happen, to change the way things are, to create something new. They have a sense of what the results will look like, even before they start working on a project. They are driven by this image of what the organization can become. Leaders inspire a shared vision. They envision the future, and they enlist others in a common vision. (p. 3)

The concept of enlisting others is amplified by Kouzes and Posner (2004) who suggested that exemplary leaders communicate the meaning of what people do so that they understand their own role in creating it, saying that “when leaders clearly communicate a shared vision, they ennoble those who work on its behalf . . . [and] they uplift people’s spirits” (p. 3). Kolzow (1999) added that sharing a vision does not mean that any one person has to give up his or her dream (p. 5). Rather, it means that each person will have an interest in the visions of others for the larger vision to emerge.

Senge (2008) referred to a shared vision using the metaphor of a hologram in which component pieces form the whole. In much the same fashion, says Senge, shared visions come into being in organizations:

When you add up the pieces of a hologram, the image becomes more intense, more lifelike. When people share a vision, the vision becomes a mental reality that people can truly imagine achieving. They now have partners, co-creators; the
vision no longer rests on their shoulders alone. Early on people say it is “my vision.” But, as the shared vision becomes developed, it becomes “our vision.” (p. 4)

Senge (2008) also offered leaders advice on the steps involved in building a shared vision, suggesting that leaders first encourage the expression of each individual’s personal vision because shared vision emerges from these and from personal value. Senge also recommended that leaders communicate and ask for support by sharing their vision and asking others if it is worth their commitment.

Block (1993) took exception to the concept of a shared vision by disagreeing with the patriarchal aspect of traditional organizations, especially when top leaders create a vision and then communicate it to others. While Block believed the intents of leaders are mostly sincere, this top-down visioning would likely fail for two reasons: ownership and implementation. “A statement created for a team to endorse is not owned by the team . . . and [that] statement is created for the rest of the organization to live out. . . . [This] is patriarchy in action” (p. 191). Block advocated instead that each person in the organization define his or her own personal values and intentions and those of their group. These people then come together to support one another in living out their values. Block contended that there is no need in this scenario for a common vision, especially not for one developed by leaders at the top—what is needed is a common mission, a common membership contract, not a process to induce common values (p. 205). Block suggested that, instead of leaders developing and imposing their vision and assigning each person a role to play, the organization’s vision should start with each individual defining his or her own intentions and values (p. 204).
Features of an Effective Vision

While there is general accord in the literature that leaders need a vision, there is less consistency when it comes to recommending the various elements or features that a leader should have in his or her vision. This section synthesizes the specific features that the literature suggests must be present in an effective vision; it is organized around the following themes, each of which has sub-themes and which will be discussed in full in the sections that follow:

1. Issue a challenge
2. Vision as a destination
3. Depict shared values
4. Depict shared hopes and dreams and evoke emotion
5. Span timelines
6. Contain imagery
7. Suggest the means to implement the vision
8. The need for vision to express urgency

Issue a Challenge

One recommendation that appears strongly in the literature is that of visions needing to contain a challenge or a goal that is issued from leaders to followers. Nanus (1990, p. 17), for instance, suggested that leaders incorporate a statement in their visions presenting a challenge or a worthwhile long-range target towards which people can direct their energies. The importance of issuing such a challenge in the vision is explained by Quigley (1994) who noted that leaders understand that life is a process of competition and selection—leaders must compete for attention in their followers who will (or will not)
then decide to engage on the leader’s vision. Leaders compete for the hearts and minds of those who follow them and therefore those who will (or, again because of competition and selection, will not) join in the vision. The leader’s vision provides a road map to the future, suggesting guidelines on how people are to act and interact to attain what they regard as desirable. Quigley (1994) concluded that “a leader’s vision . . . is the bedrock of success for meeting the twin tests of competition and selection” (p. 37).

Randall (2010, p. 12) related that vision and goals should be challenging to force managers and co-workers to think differently. The leader’s role is to set the tone, making it clear that being average is not good enough. In identifying the goals that are more than “good enough,” Collins and Porras (1991) coined the phrase “big, hairy, audacious goal” (or BHAG, pronounced Bee-hag) that became part of organizational vernacular of the time (p. 43). Collins and Porras suggested that one way leaders can issue a BHAG is to create a goal focused on defeating a common enemy; the authors cited Pepsi’s mission statement to “Beat Coke!” (p. 44), noting that having a common enemy taps into basic human motivation and can transform an organization that is concerned about its very survival. In a later work, Collins and Porras (1996) amplified their earlier thoughts by suggesting that a well-conceived vision consists of two major elements: a core ideology (the enduring character of an organization, its purpose or reason for being and its values) and its envisioned future. This latter element is defined as having two parts: a 10- to 30-year audacious goal plus vivid descriptions of what it will be like to achieve that goal (p. 73). The audacious goal (and again the authors use BHAG term) is “clear and compelling, serves as a unifying focal point of effort and acts as a catalyst” and contains elements of a vivid description identified as vibrant, engaging, containing emotion,
passion, and conviction as well as a specific description of what it will be like to achieve the BHAG (p. 73). Kouzes and Posner (2007) agreed that the challenge issued in a vision should be audacious but caution that it should also be achievable.

Senge (2008) suggested that leaders need to build both extrinsic and intrinsic motivators into their vision challenges (p. 4). Senge does not define these motivators; instead I turned to *Merriam-Webster’s Online Dictionary* to identify intrinsic as “belonging to the essential or constitution of a thing” and extrinsic as “originating from or on the outside” (“Intrinsic,” n.d.; “Extrinsic,” n.d.). Despite not defining the terms, Senge did offer some examples of both kinds of motivators when he suggested that extrinsic motivators, those that rely on an external force (for example, beating a competitor), can be ineffective because they are time-limited: Once the opponent is defeated the vision expires and will eventually weaken the organization. Intrinsic motivators, however, elicit more creativity and innovation. Visions that contain intrinsic motivators such as creating a new product, taking an old product to a new level, or setting a new standard for customer service are more likely to succeed (p. 4).

Finally, Sandstrom and Smith (2008, p. 51) gave an example of an effective challenge issued in a vision by John F. Kennedy in the 1960s. Kennedy challenged the United States’ space program to put a man on the moon within the decade and bring him home safely, a formidable task at the time when there was no knowledge or technology to support the vision.
Vision as Destination

The concept of a vision as a road map to a future destination was recommended by Toffler, Toffler, and Gibson (1998) who used the analogy of a journey in defining the vision needed by leaders:

Faced with an uncertain journey into a confusing world, organizations are going to find it increasingly difficult to make confident strategic decisions. The underlying message . . . is that we are going to need a vision, a destination, a point of view about the future, a direction in which to channel the efforts of the people we work with. We will not develop such a vision by looking at a map. There are no maps of terra incognita. Instead, leaders will have to look ahead and explore the horizon for themselves. They will have to create their own ideas about where they should be going and then point the way forward for their organization in a compelling way. (p. 5)

Lansberg (2003) also spoke of the need for a leader’s vision to be a positive image of what the organization could become and the path towards that destination when he suggested that leaders need to identify opportunities and then be “artistic enough to fashion these ideas into images and stories that are intriguing, meaningful and realizable” (p. 4).

Blanchard and Carey (2006, p. 156) described great leadership as being “about going somewhere. Great leadership that both leads and serves focuses first on developing a compelling vision . . . [one that] tells people in your organization who you are (your purpose), where you are going (your picture of the future), and what will guide your journey there (your values).”

Senge (1990) argued that the most effective visions, which he called positive visions, are those that challenge people to change and grow. Negative visions, less effective than positive ones, call for keeping the status quo, that is, addressing the question “What do we want to avoid?” Examples of negative visions include those
intended to ensure the survival of the company when failure is imminent and also campaigns along the lines of “don’t smoke” and “don’t do drugs.” These negative visions, according to Senge, are limiting because energy that could build something new is diverted to preventing something unwanted from happening; they carry a subtle message of powerlessness (implying that people can really only pull together when there is a threat); and they are short-term (in which case people are only motivated as long as the threat persists) (p. 4). Positive visions address instead the question “What do we want?” thereby avoiding negative visions that are likely to be short-term and carry a message of powerlessness. Senge suggested that two sources of energy motivate organizations: fear and aspirations. The first of these, fear, “can produce extraordinary changes in short periods, but the second, aspirations, endures as a source of learning and growth over time” (p. 4).

Heifetz and Laurie (2001), in their article taking issue with the traditional understanding of the leader-follower relationship, built on the idea of audacious goals in a vision but also challenged the idea that leaders are “shepherds [who] protect their flocks from harsh surroundings” (p. 131). Rather, Heifetz and Laurie suggest that leaders must expose others to the painful reality of their present condition and demand they fashion a response. Leaders must also inspire self-confidence in people that they can handle the harsh reality.

In summary, perhaps Kouzes and Posner (1995) best captured the idea of vision as destination best when they wrote, “If leaders are going to take us to places we’ve never been before, they [should] have a sense of direction” (p. 94).
Depict Shared Values

Another feature of an effective vision in the leadership literature is that of shared values. Collins and Porras (1991), for example, referred to a vision as having a guiding philosophy that serves as a system of motivating assumptions, principles, values, and tenets. Kolzow (1999), writing about vision in the context of strategic planning, agreed that a vision must contain a picture of the future that includes shared values. In this regard, Kolzow suggested that “a vision encompasses values that are worthwhile and important to people. They are abstract ideas that influence thinking and action.” Values, according to Kolzow, are “the deep-seated, pervasive standards that influence almost every aspect of our lives: our moral judgments, our responses to others, and our commitments to personal and organizational goals” (p. 5). Sandstrom and Smith (2008) concurred, referring to shared values as being a “navigational and behavioral beacon,” those core beliefs that allow people to do the right thing by knowing in advance what they stand for (p. 45).

Hamel and Prahalad (1994), writing of what organizations will need in order to compete in the future, suggested that visions that are “as grandiose as they are poorly conceived” deserve to be criticized because often the vision is “no more than window dressing for a CEO’s ego-driven acquisition binge,” not the shared values of others (p. 75). Hamel and Prahalad cite Chrysler’s purchase of an Italian maker of exotic sports cars and a jet aircraft manufacturer as being driven more by the ego and whim of the company’s chairman, Lee Iacocca, than by a solid and well-founded point of view on what it would take to succeed in the automobile industry in the following 10 years.
Hamel and Prahalad stated that “any vision that is simply an extension of the CEO’s ego is dangerous” (p. 75).

And, finally, Kirkpatrick and Locke (1996) offered the idea that vision is a “transcendental ideal that represents shared values [and that] it is ideological in nature” (p. 37).

I found only one source that took issue with shared values. Collins (2006, p. 6) stated that we spend too much time drafting and redrafting statements of vision and too little time aligning with the values that are already in place. Collins recommended instead that visions be crafted to identify the reason for existence (of the organization) and the shared and timeless core values that underlie it.

**Depict Shared Hopes and Dreams and Evoke Emotion**

Several sources (Kouzes & Posner, 2006, 2007; Reicher & Hopkins, 2001; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993; Willner, 1984) recommended that a key element of an effective vision is its appeal to the emotions of followers and its ability to reflect their hopes and dreams. As Blanchard and Stoner (2004) suggested, “a magnificent vision articulates peoples’ hopes and dreams, touches their spirits, and helps them see how they can contribute” (p. 28).

Kouzes and Posner (2006) stated that effective leaders who want to depict shared hopes and dreams in their visions understand that they must speak in terms of we not I. And to formulate the we, Kouzes and Posner (2007) suggested that leaders have to be “able to grasp hold of what others want and need. To appeal to others and to show them how their interests will be served, [leaders must] know their hopes, dreams, motives and
interests‖ (p. 211). Similarly, Reicher and Hopkins (2001) guided leaders to turn me and you into us and then to define a project that gives that sense of us-ness meaning and purpose.

Shamir et al. (1993) noted that current theories, especially those of charismatic leadership, claim that leadership behaviors transform followers from an “individual-oriented, hedonistic mode of operation to a collective, moral and value-oriented mode” (p. 579). These claims, according to Shamir et al., are not substantiated under current theories of motivation. Instead, Shamir et al. suggested that it is the ability of leaders to engage followers’ self-concepts, tapping into their motivations for self-expression, self-worth, self-esteem, and self-consistency that link leader behavior with follower effects. It is this effect that inspires followers to move from self-interest to the collective-interest that is necessary for the successful implementation of the vision.

Willner (1984) contributed several elements in an attempt to explain how political leaders are able to capture their followers’ hopes, dreams, and emotions. She suggested that “rhetorical spellbinding and the charismatic affect it can induce are produced less by logic and ideas than by emotional stimuli, by words that are symbols of more than their literal meaning [and that] use of figurative language, such as simile and metaphor, seems to be strongly conducive to charismatic affect” (pp. 151-152).

**Span Timelines**

Recommendations that leaders refer to the past, the present, and the future in their visions also appear in the literature (Bell, 2007; Finkelstein, Harvey, & Lawton, 2008; Kolzow, 1999; Peters, 1987; Yukl, 2002). In the early literature, Peters (1987, p. 404), for example, proposed that effective visions prepare for the future but also honor the past,
drawing upon enduring themes to make people feel more confident about stepping out in new directions to deal with a brave new world. This is especially important in situations in which effective visions serve as “beacons and controls when all else is up for grabs” (p. 403), times in which a vision can empower people and call forth their best efforts (p. 404).

Finkelstein et al. (2008) also endorsed an approach in which a vision encapsulates the ideology or guiding philosophy of a business, expressing its values, purpose, and direction. To exemplify their views on the role of vision in enterprise regeneration, Finkelstein et al. described the process followed by Harley-Davidson when the firm almost went out of business in the early 1980s. The company failed to do what the authors suggest is a key component of visioning, reflection, and, in particular, past-present-future thinking. Harley-Davidson’s success and business turnaround was the result of strategic initiatives and a vision that positioned the company as “a modern, stylish and efficient lifestyle company, with its roots in a glorious past and at the hub of a worldwide biker community” (p. 11). Yukl (2002) concurred with this argument, stating that vision should be grounded in the present reality and present an attainable future.

Bell (2007) added that to make a compelling vision reflect the past, the present, and the future, a leader must draw from the past, anchor the future in the present, and then sharpen the focus of the picture of the future with a clear long-term goal (p. 19). Bell gave the example of West Point where all cadets are reminded that they are part of the “long gray line” (p. 19)—a line that includes Grant, Patton, Schwartzkopf, and many other known leaders—that has marched through history ever since the inception of the institute in 1802. Bell suggested that every organization, like West Point, has a history
and that this history reflects the aspiration of those who founded it. Leaders are responsible for bringing the organization back to its history, its core, and to do this they must anchor the future in that core and also in the reality of the present. Bell adds that there is something about the past that gives confidence to followers for the future.

Similarly, Kolzow (1999, p. 5) also referred to the past, noting that “a realistic and credible vision focuses on the future but is grounded in the past and present. We have to know where we are (or who we are) before we can decide where we want to go and how to get there.”

I found that only Randall (2010) added a discordant note to the idea of a vision needing to be future-focused when he discussed his work in helping organizations develop their visions for a period of 3 years into the future. Randall quoted one manager as saying, “How should I know what is going to happen in three years?” (p. 12). Randall suggested that, in the competitive and evolving global economy that has excess capacity in almost every industry, leaders need goals to help their people think differently, not “to predict the future but to define it and create strategies and tactics to make it a reality” (p. 12). Leaders, according to Randall, must make their people aware that being average in an evolving economic climate is not good enough and that, with stretch goals based on a future defined as realistically and accurately as possible, the organization may thrive, not just survive.

**Contain Imagery**

A number of sources in the literature (Collins & Porras, 1991; Kouzes & Posner, 1995; Nanus, 1990; Welch & Welch, 2010) advocated the use of imagery as a feature of an effective vision. Although imagery will be discussed here as one of those features, it
will also be further explored in the section on communicating vision, so that those sources in the literature who offered additional information (including language examples) on how imagery can be realized in visions can be presented.

In the early literature Nanus (1990, p. 14) wrote that “a true vision must provide a clear image of a desirable future,” because a feature of the human brain is the ability to form mental images and to translate these images into reality through leadership and action. The notion of vision as image was taken up by Collins and Porras (1991) who suggested that a vision requires a “vibrant, engaging, and specific description of what it will be like when the mission is achieved” (pp. 46-47). Kouzes and Posner (1995, p. 102) also suggested that visions are conceptualizations, “images in the mind, impressions and representations [that] become real as leaders express these images in concrete terms to their constituents.”

Welch and Welch (2010) confirmed that one defining aspect of leadership is to invent the future, and that the future leaders must describe that future as being “exciting and promising to overcome fear and cynicism” (p. 3).

Suggest the Means to Implement the Vision

Providing details about how followers can implement the vision is recommended by a number of sources (Allen, 2006; Walsh, 2008) in leadership literature. Allen (2006), for instance, discussing the importance of executing a vision, noted that leaders make things happen by first framing a vision to define what done means and then making that vision operational—deciding what doing actually looks like (p. 5). Most leaders are more concerned with framing the vision and communicating it; getting things done is often left
to managers and front-line workers. Not all leaders, according to Allen, are comfortable or skilled in doing both roles, but effective leaders must learn how to “work both angles” (p. 5). Once a leader has identified the purpose of his or her organization—the direction and meaning of the enterprise, the “why” of its existence—he or she must then move on to identifying the “what” of the enterprise. This is the enterprise’s vision which must then be expressed, enhanced, and communicated. The vision, if sufficiently clear, is what will enable its successful implementation, without conflict, between the various groups who are charged with implementing it. Allen concluded that

leadership is often associated with vision—and rightly so. Someone who has and communicates vision will tend to rise to a leadership role. But true leadership also gets things done . . . having great ideas [and] also bringing them to fruition. A vision without a task is but a dream, a task without a vision is drudgery, a vision [with] a task is the hope of the world. (p. 6)

Writing for leaders in the field of engineering, Walesh (2008) suggested that a key condition for effective visioning is a plan for achieving it because without such a plan, “the vision is very likely to degenerate into a dream, a ‘pie-in-the-sky’” (p. 45). Walesh recommended that the plan include specific action items, timelines, and commitments by various groups and individuals to move forward with the action item (p. 45).

Express Urgency

Kotter (1995) introduced his thoughts about urgency being a feature of a vision in the mid-1990s in an article on why many transformation efforts fail. In the article, Kotter spoke of his experience witnessing over 100 companies trying to remake themselves into better competitors. In almost every case Kotter witnessed, the basic goal was the same: to make fundamental changes in how business was conducted in order to cope with a new, more challenging market environment (p. 96). Kotter suggested that one of the reasons
these efforts failed is that leaders did not establish a great enough sense of urgency.

Kotter therefore advocated that leaders

find ways to communicate [their vision] broadly and dramatically, especially with respect to crises, or great opportunities that are timely. This first step is essential because just getting a transformation program started requires the aggressive cooperation of many individuals. Without motivation, people won’t help, and the effort goes nowhere [and] leaders sometimes underestimate how hard it can be to drive people out of their comfort zones. (p. 97)

Years later Kotter (2008) expanded on his idea of urgency, encouraging leaders to help others see the need to change and to act immediately, noting that “the pull of the status quo is so strong as to derail transformation efforts if urgency is not clear” (p. 10).

Kotter (2008) related that leaders need to clarify how the future will be different from the past and how people can make that future a reality.

In summary, the leadership literature provided guidance on the features that an effective vision should contain. I have identified these eight features, and their sub-themes, as benchmark features of an effective vision (see Table 2). These eight benchmark features provide the standard against which each of the four speeches will be compared in my analyses.

The Role of Followers in Vision

Leaders need followers to implement their visions; without that implementation, the vision remains an elusive desire that never comes into being. Bennis (1996) commented on this need when he noted that leadership is never exerted in a vacuum. It is, instead, he suggested, always a transaction between the leader, his or her followers, and the goal or dream with a resonance existing between leaders and followers that make them allies in support of a common cause.
Table 2

**Benchmark Features of an Effective Vision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features of a Vision</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues a challenge</strong>: “big, hairy, audacious goal”; defines success; empowers people and calls forth their best efforts; is ambitious, often calling for sacrifice, change, and growth; extrinsic and intrinsic motivators.</td>
<td>Blanchard &amp; Stoner, 2004; Collins, 2006; Collins &amp; Porras, 1991; Conger, 1989; Toffler et al., 1998; Heifetz &amp; Laurie, 2001; Lansberg, 2003; Nanus, 1990, 1992; Nutt &amp; Backoff, 1997; Peters, 1987; Sandstrom &amp; Smith, 2008; Senge, 2008; Yukl, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision as destination</strong>: road map; paints a target; helps navigate through crises.</td>
<td>Blanchard &amp; Carey, 2006; Toffler et al. (1998); Heifetz &amp; Laurie, 2001; Lansberg, 2003; Maxwell, 2002; Senge, 1990, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depicts shared values</strong>: contains values/high ideals that are worthwhile and important to people; moral overtones.</td>
<td>Blanchard &amp; Stoner, 2004; Hunt, 1999; Kirkpatrick &amp; Locke, 1996; Kolzow, 1999; Kotter &amp; Heskett, 1992; Nanus, 1992; Peters, 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depicts shared hopes and dreams, evokes emotion</strong>: move others from self-interest to collective-interest; “us-ness”; “we” vs. “I”; inspires commitment/enthusiasm; identifies a common enemy.</td>
<td>Bass, 1990; A. Bell, 2007; Bennis &amp; Nanus, 2003; Blanchard &amp; Stoner, 2004; Collins &amp; Porras, 1991; Covey, 2005; Heifetz &amp; Laurie, 2001; Jones, 2010; Kouzes &amp; Posner, 2006; Nanus, 1992; Peters, 1987; Reich &amp; Hopkings, 2001; Senge, 1990, 2008; Shamir et al., 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spans timelines</strong>: draws from the past, the present, and the future; exposes others to the painful reality of their present condition and demands they fashion a response; interprets reality for followers.</td>
<td>Conger, 1991; Finkelstein et al., 2008; Heifetz &amp; Laurie, 2001; Hunt, 1999; Jones, 2010; Kotter, 2008; Nanus, 1992; Peters, 1987; Snyder &amp; Graves, 1994; Yukl, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contains imagery</strong>: Positive, not negative; crystal clear; vivid; highly desirable future state; tangible; makes abstractions concrete; avoids tentativeness and qualifiers.</td>
<td>Bennis &amp; Nanus, 2003; Collins &amp; Porras, 1991; Conger, 1989; Jones, 2010; Kouzes &amp; Posner, 1995, 2004; Lansberg, 2003; Nanus, 1990; Peters, 2008; Senge, 2008; Snyder &amp; Graves, 1994; Yukl, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggests means to implement</strong>: Contains strategies/plan for achieving the vision, audacious but achievable, has a destination.</td>
<td>Allen, 2006; Collins, 2006; De Pree, 1987; Toffler et al. (1998); Hunt, 1999; Kotter, 2008; Nanus, 1992; Walesh, 2008; Yukl, 2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This section briefly examines the role that followers play in supporting that common cause. Unfortunately, it is beyond the scope of this dissertation to delve too deeply into the relationship between a leader and his or her followers despite Yukl’s (2002) contention that leadership effectiveness cannot be understood unless we also examine how the leader and the follower influence one another over time. In chapters 4-7 I attempt to show how the four orators used language, and especially the resources of SFL, including Appraisal and Genre Theory, to create solidarity (Martin, 2000) between their visions and their followers in respect to this dyadic relationship, but here I only highlight some pertinent points from the literature on followers.

Burns (1978), for example, addressed the role of followers in a leader’s vision, noting that leadership “is exercised when persons with certain motives and purposes mobilize . . . resources so as to arouse, engage and satisfy the motives of followers” in order to realize the goals that are mutually held by both leaders and followers (p. 18). Burns contended that leadership is inseparable from followers’ needs and goals and that leadership is, therefore, relational, collective, and purposeful. It is this realization of goals, that is, the implementation of vision, which ensures the success of the enterprise.

Shamir et al. (1993) also addressed the role of followers in their study of the literature in the genre of leadership theory. Leaders were seen to transform the needs, values, preferences, and aspirations of followers from self-interests to collective interests, such that followers become committed to the leader’s mission, making significant personal sacrifices in the interest of that mission, performing above and beyond the call of duty (p. 577). Shamir et al. argued, however, that there is nothing in the literature to offer a motivational theory to account for the effect of these leaders on their followers.
Shamir et al. contributed their theory that the ability of leaders to develop self-concept in followers—that is, to allow them to see themselves participating in the mission—is instrumental in the followers moving beyond self-interest and into the collective-interest that is necessary for the successful implementation of the vision. As Quigley (1994) noted, leaders must compete for the minds and hearts of those who would join or follow them (p. 37) in order to have their vision implemented.

Haslam and Platow (2001) also addressed the role of followers in implementing a leader’s vision by exploring how the wishes of leaders get translated into the efforts of followers, suggesting that this is a problem in social and organizational psychology. Haslam and Platow asked, “How is it that the words and vision of an individual become the wishes and actions of a multitude? What makes workers ‘go the extra mile’ to enact the commands of their bosses?” (p. 1469). Reicher and Hopkins (2001, as cited in Haslam & Platow, 2001) suggested that one answer to the question, and indeed to the leader’s success, hinges on his or her ability to turn me and you into us and also in the ability then to define a project that gives that sense of us-ness meaning and purpose (p. 1471). Bennis and Nanus (2003) agreed, saying that “the leader may be the one who articulates the vision and gives it legitimacy . . . but if the organization is to be successful, the image must grow out of the needs of the entire organization and be ‘claimed’ or ‘owned’ by all the important actors” (p. 109).

And, finally, Willner (1984) also addressed the role of followers in her writing on charismatic leadership. Willner addressed the relationship between leaders and followers that is required for followers to be “spellbound.” Referring to great political orators as “spellbinders,” Willner noted that in order for people to be spellbound, there must be an
asymmetrical exercise of influence by one individual, the leader, over others, the
followers. The followers are crucial to the relationship for “a leader’s claim to mold the
views or direct the actions of others is not realized until the potential followers recognize
and act on that claim” (p. 5).

Summary

There are abundant resources in the literature on the features of an effective vision.
Yukl (2002) summed up the literature on the features of a vision when he suggested that a
vision should be simple yet idealistic, a picture of the desirable future that appeals to the
values, hopes, and ideals of an organization’s members whose support is needed by the
leader. The vision should emphasize ideological objectives rather than immediate
tangible benefits and it should be challenging but realistic.

The ability of leaders to hold their followers spellbound, or at the very least fully
engaged in the vision and committed to implementing it, will depend on how the leader
communicates his or her vision. Communicating vision is the subject of the next section
of this chapter.

Communicating Vision

It may seem intuitive that leaders need to communicate their visions, if, as
suggested above, for no other reason than to ensure that followers understand it, will
commit to it and, especially, that they will act to implement it. Yet, although references to
leaders needing to have a vision appear in profusion in the literature, I found that only a
subset of those references (Bennis, 1994, 2010; Bennis & Nanus, 2003; Blanchard &
Carey, 2006; Cartwright & Baldwin, 2007; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Toffler et al., 1998;
Kolzow, 1999; Kotter, 2005; Kouzes & Posner, 1995; Lansberg, 2003; Westley & Mintzberg, 1989; Yukl, 2002) also note that a vision must be communicated to be effective. This section outlines the sources in the literature that guide leaders to communicate their visions and also the few sources in the literature that provide recommendations on how leaders can use language to communicate their vision.

The relative lack of sources in the literature about communicating a vision is surprising because of the importance placed on communications in organizations and the advocacy of experts, among them Schokley-Zalabak (2005), who suggested that leadership takes place through communication. Leaders communicate about needed change, translate intentions into reality, propose new strategies, and help sustain action to support decisions. Leadership communication is a process of influence whereby leaders attempt to convince followers to attain specific goals or broad organizational outcomes. . . . People can be assigned the position of leaders, but leadership occurs not from the assignment itself but through communication behaviors in interaction with others. (p. 224)

Hackman and Johnson (2004) also wrote of the importance of communication to leaders, promoting their belief that leadership is best understood from a communications standpoint, noting that “leadership is human (symbolic) communication which modifies the attitudes and behaviors of others in order to meet group goals and needs” (p. 428). Hackman and Johnson identified three clusters of communication skills that are essential to leaders: linking (which includes monitoring the environment, creating a trusting climate, and team building); envisioning (which involves creating new agendas or visions); and regulating (meaning to influence others by developing credibility and power, using effective verbal and non-verbal communications, creating positive expectations, managing change, gaining compliance and negotiation) (p. 431). Hackman and Johnson
emphasized the use of symbols in leadership, noting that it is the transfer of symbols—for humans, language—that allows individuals to create and share meaning (p. 6).

The Need to Communicate Vision

There is general agreement in the literature—among those who address the need to communicate vision—that communicating a vision is a critical component of having one. Blanchard and Carey (2006), for instance, suggested that “clear vision and direction start with top management and must be communicated throughout the organization by the leadership” (p. 157). Conger and Kanungo (1987) supported the importance of a leader to communicate a compelling vision through personal communication, and Bennis (1999) noted that a leader must to be able to impart the vision to the whole organization and that he or she must have the capacity clearly to articulate his or her vision. Furthermore, Lansberg (2003, p. 60) noted that a major pitfall to leaders is to under-communicate the vision.

Others such as Kouzes and Posner (1995) also highlighted the need for communicating vision, indicating that it isn’t enough for a leader to have a vision; for an organization to approach its potential and successfully implement change, its members must understand, accept, and commit to the vision (p. 124). Toffler et al. (1998) concurred, noting that “leaders will have a vision, a passion, an exciting aspiration [which], once shared with everybody in the organization, will unleash tremendous human energy . . . and provide the fuel to push the organization out in front of its competitors” (p. 5). Yukl (2002) also indicated that leaders need to articulate a clear and appealing vision of what the organization could accomplish or become that helps people understand the purpose, objectives and priorities of the organization [and to] give the work meaning, [to] serve as a source of self-esteem
and foster a sense of common purpose . . . [and] help guide the actions and decisions of each member of the organization. (p. 263)

Kolzow (1999) confirmed the need for leaders to communicate their visions, speaking of a vision as being little more than an empty dream until widely shared and accepted. Only then will the vision acquire the force necessary to change an organization, and the only way for visions to become shared is if they are clearly articulated and communicated.

Kotter (2005), writing on leading change, suggested that there are four common mistakes that impede the successful transformation of a company. As noted above, stating urgency is important but “most leaders bungle [that] first step” (p. 5). Then, too often, leaders communicate the vision by circulating a report or writing a memo, assuming that these will rally people to the cause. Kotter suggested instead that leaders be proactive in their change efforts, brainstorming obstacles and developing an action plan to implement the transformation. In this way, leaders can build that sense of urgency and also build some momentum. Third, leaders may tend to declare victory before the war is over, celebrating results while there is still a long way to go in the change initiative. Instead, Kotter guided leaders to celebrate milestones in the project but also to communicate that there is more work to be done. And finally, Kotter advised leaders to stop “looking for villains in all the wrong places” (p. 6); middle managers are often blamed for lack of progress in change initiatives but these are the people who bring important issues to the table and they should be included in the initiative.

Bennis and Nanus (2003) suggested that being able to create meaning through communication is a key requirement of leaders and that “an essential factor in leadership is the capacity to influence and organize meaning for the members of the organization”
The authors noted that their research has indicated that one of the most critical elements of successful leadership is a clearly articulated vision, “or sense of direction, to focus the attention of everyone associated with the organization” (p. ii), concluding that the idea of vision is “widely embraced, not only in the corporate world but among leaders of educational institutions, churches, and other nonprofit organizations . . . [and that] today it is generally recognized that all successful organizations need not just a clear mission and purpose, but also a widely shared vision and that few leaders can succeed without both” (p. ii). However, Bennis and Nanus noted that, while there are “a lot of intoxicating visions and a lot of noble intentions … without communication nothing will be realized” (p. 31). Bennis (2010) re-confirmed the work he and Nanus had conducted when he contended that, while the first leadership competency is the management of attention, through a set of intentions or a vision, “the second leadership competency is the management of meaning. To make dreams apparent to others and to align people with them, leaders must communicate their visions” (p. 20).

One reason why leaders need to communicate their vision is so that those who will implement it will understand the vision and take action to make it happen, and a number of resources in the literature address this aspect of vision. As Westley and Mintzberg (1989) noted, “what distinguishes visionary leadership is that through words and actions, the leader gets the followers to ‘see’ his or her vision—to see a new way to think and act—and to join their leader in realizing it. How the vision is communicated thus becomes as important as what is communicated” (p. 19).

Kolzow (1999) agreed, speaking of vision as being little more than an empty dream until widely shared and accepted. Only then, Kolzow suggested, does vision
acquire the force necessary to change an organization or a community. As Kolzow indicated, “communication is the key. As people talk, the vision grows clearer and enthusiasm for its benefits builds. . . . When people truly share a vision they are connected and bound together by a common aspiration (p. 5).

Cartwright and Baldwin (2007) also concurred with the importance of communicating when they suggested that “a vision has to be shared in order to do what it is meant to do: inspire, clarify, and focus the work of the organization. One part of the leader’s job is to create commitment to the organization’s vision. To do this, leaders must communicate the vision effectively in ways that will help others understand it, remember it and share it” (p. 15). Farmer, Slater, and Wright (1998), discussing the role of communications in achieving shared vision in organizations, surveyed university administrators and faculty members in a midsize university in the southeast U.S. during a change of leadership, that is, a newly appointed Chancellor. Farmer et al. found a significant relationship between institutional members’ evaluations of how effectively the leader communicated the institution’s vision and their agreement that they shared the leader’s vision.

Quoting Walt Disney as having said “if you can dream it, you can do it,” Bennis and Nanus (2003) suggested that believing in dreams is not enough for a leader. There are lots of intoxicating visions,” said the authors, “and a lot of noble intentions. Many people have rich . . . agendas, but without communication nothing will be realized. Success requires the capacity to relate a compelling image that induces enthusiasm and commitment in others” (p. 31).
And, finally, Kotter (2008), speaking of the role of vision in change initiatives, confirmed that leaders need to communicate for understanding of and buy-in for the vision, stating that “change imposed is not change effected. A critical mass of people must understand the vision and strategy to bring about successful transformation” (p. 10).

Sustaining the Communications

Only a few sources in the literature (Blanchard & Stoner, 2004; Quigley, 1994; Walesh, 2008; Welch & Welch, 2010) addressed the need to continue communicating the vision beyond the initial revealing of it. Addressing the need to sustain communications, Quigley (1994), for example, suggested that “the work of the leadership group will be meaningless unless those leaders pass on their vision effectively to the people” (p. 40).

Welch and Welch (2010) also addressed the need to keep communicating when they suggested that communicating a vision involves more than a single instance of communication. Welch and Welch stated that communicating a vision requires that a leader make the case until his or her “throat bleeds, with a story that says ‘here’s how our destination will make life better for you personally and for all of us’” (p. 4). Cartwright and Baldwin (2007), summing up the work they did with the Center for Creative Leadership, were of the same mind: Leaders can never communicate too much. They remark that “having a vision and not communicating it isn’t much of a vision at all. A vision has to be shared in order to do the things it is meant to do . . . [be] a bright lantern leading [the] organization toward its future” (p. 24).

Blanchard and Stoner (2004, p. 26) concurred with the need to repeat the communications. They contended that visioning is an ongoing process, recommending that leaders keep it alive and keep talking about it and referring to it as much as possible.
In fact, Blanchard and Stoner noted that Blanchard practices what he preaches: Blanchard is in the practice of leaving an inspirational voice-mail message every morning, reminding the 250 people who work for the Ken Blanchard Companies what the company’s vision and values are. And, finally, Walesh (2008) added that, most importantly, the vision must include an ongoing communications and collaboration process that maintains the momentum (p. 46).

But some experts (Kouzes & Posner, 2007; Quigley, 1994) suggested that, despite the need to communicate their visions, some leaders may not be succeeding as well as they should at communicating their visions. As noted above, Kouzes and Posner (2007) identified visioning as a key leadership competency. In assessing how leaders are meeting this competency requirement, Kouzes and Posner believed that leaders are failing in this regard and that the underlying reason is that “leaders struggle with communicating an image of the future that draws others in. It’s not that leaders don’t have a personal conviction about the future; it’s just that they don’t effectively speak to what others see and feel about it” (p. 18). In an earlier work, Kouzes and Posner (1995) noted that respondents reported that inspiring a shared vision is the leadership practice with which they are the most uncomfortable and that only 10% of those they asked considered themselves to be inspiring (p. 125).

Quigley (1994) may have offered an explanation when he suggested that “little has been written on how to communicate vision, how to renew it, and how to sustain it over long periods” (p. 37). This sustaining phase of visioning Quigley referred to as “rollout” to denote “the leader’s responsibility to communicate their corporate vision and values throughout the organization” (p. 37). Quigley concluded that “the work of the
leadership group will be meaningless unless those leaders pass on their vision effectively to their people” (p. 37).

**Language Use to Communicate Vision**

In the literature review for this study, despite there being some resources in the literature expressing that visions need to be communicated in order to be effective, there are few sources who give specific advice to leaders on how to use language effectively to communicate their visions. And, in that meager body of literature, only a few (Baldoni, 2003; Bennis, 1994; Cartwright & Baldwin, 2007; Conger, 1991; Kouzes & Posner, 1995, 2007; Lansberg, 2003; Willner, 1984; Yukl, 2002) contribute specific language examples to guide leaders who want to communicate their own vision. These few contributions on how leaders can use language to communicate vision are discussed here.

Conger (1991) noted that, while many leaders know about the necessity of strategic vision and effective leadership, they may have overlooked the critical line between vision and the leader’s ability to communicate its essence.

Similarly, Bennis (1994) also gave specific language examples for communicating vision, referring to the ability of both Kennedy and Reagan to use metaphors with which people could identify, an ability that led to their exceptional communications skills. Kouzes and Posner (1995), in giving guidance to leaders on how to make their audience “hear, taste, smell, see and touch the vision,” recommended that leaders “make any abstractions—such as freedom, service, respect, quality, or innovation—concrete so that others can recognize what you imagine” (p. 143). As well, because enthusiasm and commitment can be aroused in followers by leaders who appeal to their needs, values, hopes, and ideals, Yukl (2002) suggested that the best way for a
leader to make that appeal is to utilize language that employs vivid imagery and metaphors and uses symbols.

The use of stories as a means to communicate vision also appears in the literature. Cartwright and Baldwin (2007) advocated the use of stories as “a story is a powerful tool for disseminating a vision: people share the story with others, creating a ripple effect” (p. 16), and Jones (2010) advocated communicating the vision in a compelling way, telling stories and using imagery to depict what the future will look like.

Conger (1991, p. 34) also recommended the use of stories based on the conclusion he had reached from his experience that, in future, leaders will not only have to be effective strategists but also rhetoricians who can energize through the words they choose. Conger offered guidance to leaders on how to communicate their vision, noting that stories that illustrate values are beneficial, as are intertextual references to other discourses that espouse values such as the Declaration of Independence. Conger advocated that a leader be proficient in the art of “framing,” that is, interpreting his or her organization’s purpose with accompanying values and beliefs, noting that “while the leader’s message is critical, the process by which it is communicated appears to be just as significant [and] . . . this is where the art of rhetoric enters the language of leadership” (p. 38). Conger also advocated the use of metaphors and analogies which draw a likeness between two things to portray a vision in a vivid manner, to clarify, to express certain emotions or interpret reality. Finally, Conger advocated the rhetorical device of repetition, such as Martin Luther King Jr.’s let freedom ring sequence, which can support the communicating of a vision by building an emotional commitment to a leader’s message and the listener’s ability to remember the message. Conger (1991) concluded that “we
have only just begun to appreciate the power of the spoken word and its role in transformational leadership” (p. 43).

Kouzes and Posner (1995) wrote of leaders needing to enlist others in the vision by bringing it to life. In their communications, according to Kouzes and Posner, “leaders [must] animate the vision and make manifest the purpose so that others can see it, hear it, taste it, touch it . . . make it tangible to ignite constituents’ flames of passion” (p. 133). The authors recommended that leaders use vivid and powerful language to ignite those flames and suggested that successful leaders use metaphors, figures of speech, stories, examples, and anecdotes as well as drawing word pictures, quotations, and slogans to convey their vision. Kouzes and Posner also suggested making any abstraction—such as freedom, service, respect, etc.—concrete so others can recognize the vision imagined by the leader and also advocated using positive language and avoiding the word “try,” suggesting instead the use of “will” or “are.” The authors contended that “there is no room for tentativeness or qualifiers in statements of visions” (p. 143).

In a later work, Kouzes and Posner (2007) suggested that leaders need to know who they are talking to and speak to them in language they will find engaging and talk about a future destination “in ways that others find appealing” (p. 18). However, Kouzes and Posner offered no further guidance on which discursive strategies or lexical items might be found to be engaging or appealing. In an earlier work, Kouzes and Posner (1995) had suggested that leaders know the language of their target audience, offering their advice that “to enlist people in a vision, leaders must know their constituents and speak their language [because] only through knowledge of their dreams, their hopes, their aspirations, their visions, their values is the leader able to enlist support” (p. 11).
Willner (1984) also contributed several elements in an attempt to explain how political leaders are able to hold their followers spellbound. She suggested that “rhetorical spellbinding and the charismatic affect it can induce are produced less by logic and ideas than by emotional stimuli, by words and symbols of more than their literal meaning [and that] use of figurative language, such as simile and metaphor, seems to be strongly conducive to charismatic effect” (pp. 151-152). Willner noted also that the invocation of meanings and symbols is effective in eliciting the emotions of followers and that rhetorical devices related to sound, such as rhythm, repetition, alliteration, and balance, should be considered for use by leaders (p. 152). These later devices “may not add much to meaning, but they do help to fix ideas in people’s minds [and] convey an emotional tone and play upon the emotions” (p. 159).

Lansberg (2003) suggested that the hallmarks of a compelling vision include: having a dynamic story (grounded in history and offering a better tomorrow); being impressionistically complete, that is, focused on specific changes needed to implement the vision; laden with meaning and appealing to higher values; and memorable (p. 29).

In the popular literature, Baldoni (2003), supported leaders being effective in their communications efforts, coming closest in my opinion to providing discursive strategies on how to communicate vision. Baldoni suggested three “big ideas” be part of a vision: developing the leadership message, delivering the leadership message, and sustaining the leadership message. Through an examination of the speeches of key leaders (among them Churchill, whose 1940 speech is analyzed in this dissertation), Baldoni attempted to uncover the “great secrets of great communicators.” While Baldoni’s intentions were excellent and his suggestions are appropriate for a leader who wants to improve his or her
leadership communications, his analysis of leaders’ speeches may, however, not be of sufficient profundity or at a sufficient level of delicacy to interest linguists or to contribute to the literature on leadership.

Summary

In summary, while there is literature on the critical importance of leaders having a vision and some resources on the leader’s need to communicate that vision, there is very little in the literature to guide leaders on how specifically to use language to communicate vision. Having established that vision is important to leaders, what seems to be missing in the literature is the need for vision to be communicated and, especially, how language can be used effectively to enable the communication of vision. It is this gap in the literature that this dissertation attempts to fill.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Undertaking this study depended on two critical factors: first, having a conceptual framework of how language works to convey visionary leadership messages and, second, locating texts that could be analyzed to demonstrate how language had been used to convey those visionary messages.

This chapter is organized to discuss those two elements, beginning with an examination of my methodology, applications of Systemic Functional Linguistics, including Genre Theory and Appraisal Theory. In discussing these conceptual frameworks for this study, I go into some detail in order to illustrate the analytic tools that each theory makes available for analysts to use when unpacking the meaning from texts. I then offer my rationale for selecting these theories as my methodology and offer an overview of several other discourse analytical studies conducted with SFL, Genre and Appraisal.

The second factor, texts that could be analyzed to demonstrate how language has been used to convey vision, is explored late in the chapter in the section on data selection.

I turn now to a detailed discussion of the analytic tools afforded by SFL, including Genre Theory and SFL’s extension, Appraisal Theory.
The Theory of Systemic Functional Linguistics

This section explores the Theory of Systemic Functional Linguistics, beginning with the origins of the Theory, then moving to the three tenets or principles of language as perceived by Systemicists (that is, language as system, language as function, and language as grammar) and then explore Genre Theory, noting its importance to this dissertation. This section ends with a discussion of the tools of SFL that enable the expression of attitudinal stances (Mood, modality, and evaluative language, this latter aspect being discussed in the section on Appraisal Theory).

Origins of Systemic Functional Linguistics

Systemic Functional Linguistics grew out of the work of Ferdinand de Saussure who, at the turn of the 19th century, introduced the idea of the word as sign, which he said was made up of the signifiants (sounds or written symbols) and signifiés (the meaning or concept signified by the signifiant). One of Saussure’s major contributions to the body of knowledge on language and linguistics, according to Cockcroft and Cockcroft (1992), is that language is not, as previously thought, a direct representation of reality; language is rather an arbitrary grouping of sounds and/or written signs that has culturally agreed meaning.

Another influence on the development of the theory of SFL was Malinowski (1923/1946), an anthropologist whose research with the Trobriand Islanders led him to believe that several dimensions of a situation appear to have a significant impact on the text that will be generated in that situation and that some dimensions of the situation seem to have no impact at all (Eggin's, 2004). In his attempts to capture and translate the meaning of the Islanders’ utterances, Malinowski found that the only way he could do so
in an intelligible manner was to provide ample commentary to position the translated text in its living environment (Halliday & Hasan, 1989, p. 6). From his work with the Islanders, Malinowski theorized that language only becomes intelligible when it is placed in its context of situation (Eggins, 2004), that is, that the “meaning of any single word is . . . dependent on its context” (Malinowski, 1923/1946, as cited in Eggins, 2004, p. 88). Malinowski (1923/1946, as cited in Halliday & Hasan, 1989, p. 6) coined the phrase context of situation to identify the environment in which the text had been produced and then introduced a second variable which he saw as critical to interpreting the meaning: the context of culture which is the sum of all meanings it is possible to mean in a particular culture (Butt et al., 2000, p. 4). According to Butt et al., context of situation means the things going on in the world outside the text that make the text what it is. . . . These extralinguistic features of a text . . . are given substance in the words and grammatical patterns that speakers and writers use consciously or subconsciously to construct texts of different varieties, and that their audience uses to classify and interpret. (p. 4)

Building on Malinowski’s work, J. R. Firth (1950/1957) and the London School of Linguistics examined and expanded on the context of situation and the context of culture, developing a theory that language use is largely predictable if the context in which the language is used is known. Firth suggested that, given a description of a context, we can predict what language will be used. Predictability also works in the other direction: Given an example of language use we can make predictions about what was taking place at the time it was produced (Eggins, 2004, p. 89).

Following Firth, the Prague School of Linguistics, notably Vachek (1972, as cited in Young, 1990), built on the idea that no element could be studied in isolation. The
linguists of the Prague School shared four aspects of Firth’s view of language: (a) it is a network of relations, (b) it is a system composed of sub-systems which consist of levels or strata, (c) it emphasizes the functional nature of language, and (d) form is derived from function (p. 5).

Halliday (1985/1994; see also Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) also expanded Firth’s theory of the context of situation by amplifying the meaning of context to include not only the actual text but also “what is said and written . . . [to include] other non-verbal goings-on . . . the total environment in which texts actually occur” (Halliday & Hasan, 1989, p. 5). As Halliday and Hasan note, “language comes to life only when functioning in some environment. We do not experience language in isolation . . . but always in relation to a scenario, some background of persons and actions and events from which the things which are said derive their meaning” (p. 29). The authors hastened to qualify the notion of situation by adding the word relevant; the context of situation refers only to those features which are relevant to the speech that is taking place.

Halliday and Hasan (1989, p. 12) outlined the three relevant dimensions in the context of situation that have a direct and significant impact on the type of language that will be produced (Eggin, 2004, p. 90). These dimensions were identified by Halliday (1985/1994; see also Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) as the three aspects in any situation (for illustration, a court of law) that generate linguistic choices that are made or discarded as options by the language-user and which therefore generate meaning:

1. The field of discourse—referring to the activity in which language is being used; that is, to the nature of the social interaction that is taking place or the activity in which people are engaging in which language plays a central role. In a courtroom, for example,
the field of discourse might be said to be *prosecuting criminals, law suits, bringing someone to justice*, etc.

2. The tenor of discourse—referring to who is taking part in the discourse; the nature of their status and roles; their relationship (both at the moment in which language is being used and in society in general); and the relation between the speaker-writer and his or her information. In the example, a discussion of tenor might include the omnipotence of the judge, the equal relationship of the two main lawyers (the prosecutor and the defense attorney), the very limited role of the defendant and the spectators and, especially, how these various roles influence the discursive strategies of each of the participants.

3. The mode of discourse, which refers to the part language is playing in the interaction, that is, what the participants are expecting language to do for them in the interaction, including the medium (usually written or spoken) through which language is making meaning (Halliday & Hasan, 1989, p. 12). In my example, both speech and written texts are in use in a courtroom setting: witnesses usually utter only spoken texts while statements by the lawyers, for example, their opening and concluding remarks, are usually written to be spoken.

**Tenets of the Theory**

From these beginnings, Systemic Functional Linguistics (also referred to as Systemic Functional Grammar) became a theory about what language is and how it operates in society to fulfill the purposes we require of it. The Theory requires that analysts examine language in use, that is, Systemicists “look at language from the outside and see it in terms of behavior” (Gregory & Carroll, 1978, p. 27).
The name of the theory is derived from three basic tenets about language:

1. That language is a system, a set of resources for organizing, describing, interpreting, and making meaning

2. That language contains a grammar that is defined not as a set of rules, but a set of resources for describing, interpreting, and making meaning, a means to organize a language so that language users can share understandings

3. That language is functional in that it functions to fulfill a number of roles and expectations (Butt et al., 2000).

These three tenets of language are explored further in the paragraphs that follow.

**Tenet 1: Language as System**

Systemic Functional Linguistics identifies language as being a system, that is, sets of options which are available to the speaker or writer (made up of the meanings that can be and are typically expressed in particular contexts) and the linguistic means of expressing them (Hunston & Thompson, 2000, p. 142). Leaders, for example, choose from the many linguistic options available to them to communicate their visions; whether these choices are consciously or unconsciously made, or indeed written by professional speechwriters and approved by the leader-orator, they support the conveyance of meaning to followers in order to seek their agreement and subsequent action to implement the vision.

Eggins (2004, p. 13) provided an elegant analogy of another system, traffic lights, to explain how language is a system that is used to make meaning. Eggins explained that language, like traffic lights, is a system of “arbitrary social conventions by which it is conventionally agreed that a particular meaning will be realized by a particular
representation” (p. 14). As any North American driver will know, we have ascribed agreed meaning to the different colors of the lights as follows: red means stop; amber or yellow means caution or slow down; and green means go. Eggins (p. 13) suggested that both systems, traffic lights and the much more complex system of language, have the following basic attributes:

1. They consist of a set of finite choices or oppositions: the traffic light system contains only three choices since the traffic lights can only be red, yellow, or green.

2. The choices in the system are discrete: The lights can only be one color at a time.

3. It is the oppositions, not the substance, in the system that are important: It does not matter exactly what shade of red, green, or yellow is used, only that each of the three colored lights is different from the others.

The important concept here is that the system of lights, like language, is a semiotic system, that is, a system that creates meaning through people’s use of the system having ascribed particular meaning to particular representations in the system, much as the meaning created by the semiotic system of the traffic lights is that each color triggers a prescribed understanding in drivers at intersections.

The colored lights are operating as part of a sign system in which the color of the lights expresses or, in linguistic terminology, encodes what action “from a set of possible ‘behaviors at traffic lights’ should be performed” (Eggins, 2004, p. 13). Sign systems, like language, create meanings by ordering the world in two ways:

1. By ordering content: Of all the possible behaviors that could be enacted at intersections, the system sets up only three that are meaningful (stop, slow down, go).
2. By ordering *expression*: Of all the possible colored lights that could be erected at intersections, the system sets up only three that are meaningful (red, green, yellow) (Eggins, 2004, p. 14).

In Systemic Functional Linguistics, this system is depicted as in Figure 2, with the downward slopping arrows depicting *realized by* or *expressed by*.
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*Figure 2. System of traffic lights. Adapted from An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics (p. 14), by S. Eggins, 2004, London: Printer.*

A simple example of how language is a system of choices also comes from Eggins (2004, p. 198). Although language is much more complex than the traffic light system Eggins describes, the example serves to illustrate how in the system of language we continue to make choices. Eggins describes the choices in the system of ordering dinner in a restaurant, from choosing between *steak* and *fish* and also between *salad* and *vegetables*. Once these initial choices have been made, the diner then has to choose other options. Each option is discrete; one cannot, for example, have both steak and fish. Eggins graphs the choices as depicted in Figure 3, moving from left to right across the system.
Tenet 2: Language as Grammar

The term *grammar* as used by Systemicists goes beyond the rules that we normally associate with, for example, learning the rules of a new language. As Butt et al. (2000) stated, grammar is a set of resources for describing, interpreting and making meaning, a means to organize a language so that language users can share understandings.

Eggins (2004) identified the rule-based grammar (that will be familiar to anyone who studied a language in school) as prescriptive, that is, a description of how one *should* use a language. Systemicists instead consider *descriptive* grammar, that is, how people have actually used language in text. This latter grammar “is an account of how speakers actually use the language, the patterns and structures they use. [It] makes no judgments about whether people should or shouldn’t use such [language] structures” (p. 139).

Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), speaking of the structure of English lexico-grammar, identified a hierarchy of units as a rank scale: Morphemes make up words; words make up phrases or groups; phrases or groups make up clauses; and several clauses together make up a clause complex. As they stated, “the clause is the central processing unit in the

---

*Figure 3. System of selecting dinner. Adapted from An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics (p. 198), by S. Eggins, 2004, London: Printer.*
lexico-grammar—in the specific sense that it is in the clause that meanings of different
kinds are mapped into an integrated grammatical structure” (p. 11).

According to registerial theory (Halliday, 1985/1994; see also Halliday &
Matthiessen, 2004), when texts share the same context of situation, they will share the
same or similar ideational, interpersonal, and textual meanings. In Systemic terms, this
means that they belong to the same register, that is, they also share patterns of lexico-
grammar. As Eggins and Martin (1997) suggested, texts appear to carry with them
some influences from the context in which [they] were produced. Context . . . gets
‘into’ the text by influencing the words and structures that text-producers use, and
. . . the linguistic differences between texts can be correlated with differences in
the contexts in which the texts were produced. (pp. 232-233).

Eggins and Martin (1997) stated that “the concept of register is a theoretical
explanation of the common-sense observation that we use language differently in
different situations” (p. 234), that is, the register in which we speak or write is influenced
by the context of situation.

Eggins (2004) described the theory of register as follows:

Register theory describes the impact of the dimensions of the immediate context
of situation on a language event on the way language is used. SFL identifies three
dimensions of the situation as having significant and predictable impacts on
language use. These three are the register variables of mode (amount of feedback
and role of language), tenor (role relations of power and solidarity) and field
(topic or focus of the activity). [These three dimensions] . . . explain our intuitive
understanding that we will not use language in the same way to write as to speak
(mode variation), to talk to our boss as to talk to our lover (tenor variations) and
to talk about linguistics as to talk about jogging (field variation). (p. 9)

To illustrate with the courtroom example again, when we know the context (law,
trial, etc.) and its field, tenor, and mode, we are able to predict the sort of language that
would be used in that context (such as Your Honor, lawyer, counsel, witness, objection).
And, because the ability to predict is bi-directional, if we were to hear Your Honor,
lawyer, counsel, witness, and objection being spoken, we might assume that the context in which the discourse was taking place was court-related.

Tenet 3: Language as Function

We require language to help us make meaning in our world via our interchanges with others. To assist us in making meaning, we need language to function in various ways and we have developed grammatical rules to ensure that language is able to serve those functions. There are, according to Gregory and Carroll (1978, p. 27), two important functions of language: Language is about something and it therefore has an ideational function, and it does something socially between people and therefore has an interpersonal function. A third function of language, the textual function, enables the other functions through providing the linguistic structure through which meaning can be made and shared. As Butt et al. (2000, p. 5) explained, language seems to have evolved for three main purposes:

1. To talk about what is happening, what will happen, and what has happened
2. To interact and/or to express a point of view
3. To turn the output of the previous two functions into a coherent whole.

Halliday (1978, 1985/1994; see also Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) maintained that language choices made by the speaker or writer function to express three purposes, labeled *metafunctions*, simultaneously: *ideational*, *interpersonal*, and *textual*. Following Halliday, Thompson (1996) described the three kinds of meanings that can be made by language thus:
1. We use language to talk about our experience of the world, including the worlds in our minds, to describe events and states and the entities involved in them (Halliday’s *ideational* meaning).

2. We also use language to interact with other people, to establish and maintain relations with them, to influence their behavior, to express our own viewpoint on things in the world, and to elicit or change theirs (*interpersonal*).

3. Finally, using language, we organize our messages in ways which indicate how they fit in with the other messages around them and with the wider context in which we are talking or writing (*textual*) (p. 28).

Figure 4 shows how each metafunction is expressed in the lexico-grammar of English, that is, in words and the way they are arranged (Butt et al., 2000, p. 6). The figure shows that field of discourse is realized in the ideational choices of processes, participants, and circumstances; the tenor is found in interpersonal meaning expressed through Mood, attitudinal, and modality choices; and, finally, mode, which accounts for whether the discourse is spoken or written, influences textual choices through cohesion, coherence, and theme/rheme patterns (Young & Fitzgerald, 2006).

Because a leader needs to communicate his or her vision in such a way that followers can commit to it and implement it (Yukl, 2002), the interpersonal metafunction is of special interest to this dissertation. Each of the leaders whose speech was analyzed in this study used language to advantage to generate a close interpersonal relationship with his listener-followers. This close tenor provided the frame in which the leader and his listener-followers could bond to the same vision, a necessary precursor to implementation of the vision by those who were committed to it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual/ Situational constructs</th>
<th>Language Choices Semantic Level</th>
<th>Language Choices Lexico-grammatical Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Ideational</td>
<td>Transitivity, processes, participants, and circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenor</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Mood, modality, and attitudinal elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Theme, cohesion, and coherence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4. Correspondence between context of situation and linguistic choices. Adapted from The Power of Language (p. 217), by L. Young and B. Fitzgerald, 2006, London: Equinox.*

Because the interpersonal metafunction and its extension into Appraisal Theory is vital to understanding how the four leaders studied for this dissertation related to others in order to communicate their visions, this metafunction will be explored next in some detail in its own section that follows.

**Realizing the Interpersonal Metafunction**

In the following paragraphs, I explore the interpersonal metafunction, identifying the discursive strategies in a text that realize the metafunction.

As noted above, we also use language to interact with other people, to establish and maintain relations with them, to influence their behavior, to express our own viewpoint on things in the world, and to elicit or change theirs (Thompson, 1996). The interpersonal metafunction of language enables a language user to communicate his or her positions, attitudes, beliefs, and values regarding the interaction or situation in which language plays a part. Because vision involves the sharing of values (Bennis, 2003;
Collins & Porras, 1991; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; Kotter & Heskett, 1992) and communication of a positive challenge or goal (Collins & Porras, 1991; Kouzes & Posner, 2007; Sandstrom & Smith, 2008; Senge, 2008; Yukl, 2002) leaders must be able to use language to communicate their own viewpoint, their “take” on things, to elicit desired change on the part of their listener-followers (Yukl, 2002). Leaders communicate these stances hoping to convince listener-followers to agree on their evaluation of the state of things and follow the leader towards his or her goal and a new future.

As is shown in Figure 5, the theory of Systemic Functional Linguistics identifies three elements that allow us to express interpersonal meaning to one another: Mood, modality, and evaluative language. Mood and modality will be discussed in the two sections that follow; evaluative language will be addressed at length below when I consider Appraisal Theory, a theory that further demonstrates how language enables us to share our viewpoints, emotions, tastes, and assessments to elicit a response from the addressees (Martin & White, 2005).

Mood and modality

Applications of the theory of SFL show how a language user expresses his or her viewpoints and stances by examining his or her choices in Mood (capitalized to avoid confusion with mood) and modalities (should, must, could, etc.) which depict interpersonal meanings. Each of these is explored below.

The first of these resources that enable us to indicate our viewpoints through language choices is Mood, which has to do with how we construct our clauses in our texts to communicate meaning. Three types of Mood (or speech functions) are available to language users in English: declarative (expressed by a statement, George is a happy
Choice of Mood depends on what is being exchanged and for what purpose. If, for example, we are in need of information, we obtain it by uttering a question (*where’s the coffee?*). If, however, we are in need of a good or service, we are more likely to get it by issuing a command (*please get me a cup of coffee*). Eggins (2004, p. 146) depicts the choices of Mood as shown in Table 3.

To construct the declarative Mood we most often start our clauses with the subject of the clause (*George is a student*) as compared to the interrogative, which often starts with a process (*is George a student?*). The Mood structure of a clause in linguistic terminology is the organization of a set of functional constituents including the subject (Eggins, 2004, p. 147).

Each of the Moods can be expressed both in the traditional manner as in the examples above and in ways that are different from the traditional but which convey the same meanings. Commands, for example, while typically expressed by the imperative (*read the book*), can also be expressed by declaratives (*I am hoping you will read the book*) and by modulated interrogatives (*would you mind reading the book, please*?). Questions, typically expressed by the interrogative, can also be conveyed by modulated
Table 3

*Choices of Mood*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech role</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Goods and services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giving</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Offer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demanding</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Command</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


declaratives (*I was wondering if you would like to borrow my book*). Statements, usually expressed in the declarative, can also be communicated via tagged declaratives (*that was a good book, wasn’t it?*) (Eggins, 2004, p. 148).

The second resource that enables us to express our viewpoints in language is modality. Modality is used because, when we exchange information (for example, *this coffee is good*), the clause takes the form of a proposition: the information can be affirmed (*yes, the coffee is good*) or denied (*no, the coffee is not good*) (Eggins, 2004, p. 172). But in between these positive and negative polarities, between *yes* and *no* (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 618), there is an intermediate zone of *is perhaps* or *is sometimes.*

In the intermediate ground of exchanging information, we use modality, “a complex area of English grammar which has to do with the different ways in which a language user can intrude on [his or her] message, expressing attitudes and judgments of various kinds” (Eggins, 2004, p. 172), allowing us to temper an exchange by expressing degrees of probability/usuality or obligation/inclination in our utterances. Halliday and
Matthiessen (2004) noted that modality is construed in more than one place in the grammar and that, therefore, the system of modality is more extensive than the modal features of any one grammatical unit would suggest (p. 592). Modality can, for example, be construed by clauses such as *I suppose* and *it is possible*, by verbal groups with finite modal operators such as *may*, and by adverbial groups with modal adverbs such as *perhaps*.

*Modality* proved to be a key factor in my analysis, interestingly because of its general absence from the speeches. By not modulating his text, each leader was able to state his vision without tempering with degrees of probability, usuality, obligation, and inclination (Ho, 2010). As Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) suggested, an absence of modality in a proposition conveys a more committed attitude of the speaker towards the proposition being made—that is, the absence of modality is an intent of the leader-orator to take responsibility for the information in his or her propositions and express it with confidence.

**Appraisal Theory**

I now turn to a discussion of the third SFL resource that, together with Mood and modality, allows us to realize interpersonal metafunction, evaluative language. It is through an extension of SFL, Appraisal Theory (Eggins, 2004; Eggins & Slade, 1997; Hunston & Sinclair, 2000; Martin, 1985, 2000, 2003a, 2003b; Martin & White, 2005), that we understand how we express our evaluation or appraisal of things and people. This part of chapter 3 begins with a short overview of the origins of Appraisal Theory and then provides detailed sections on how appraisal is expressed in language. This level of detail was important to the analysis of the four speeches because it allowed me to investigate
precisely how the resources of Appraisal were utilized by the four orators to communicate their visions.

The ability to express evaluative stance is critical for a leader. As suggested earlier, a leader, in order to develop mutual purposes and shared values (Bennis, 2003; Collins & Porras, 1991; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; Kotter & Heskett, 1992) with his or her followers, needs to be able to communicate his or her stance on what is good and what is bad. Eliciting agreement with those stances from followers is the purpose of communicating the vision; in fact, the leader’s vision will only be effective if communicated and put into action, and a leader’s effectiveness can be said to reside in the extent to which his or her organization attains its goals (Yukl, 2002).

Appraisal Theory explains how we elicit this desired response, that is, how we “operate rhetorically to construct relations of alignment and rapport between the writer-speaker and actual or potential respondents” (Martin & White, 2005, p. 2), and how the leader positions his or her own views in the contexts of others’ positions and stances. As I have noted, this creation of bonding or solidarity is a critical element in vision: Leaders and followers have a relationship, with followers being active participants in committing to the leader’s vision and by making the vision a reality (Rost, 1993).

Origins of Appraisal Theory

In the 1980s, a new method of analyzing discourse in the Hallidayan tradition arose in the Department of Linguistics at the University of Sydney (particularly Jim Martin, 2000, 2001, 2003a, 2003b) and the study of texts in use in the Australian education system (Martin, 2000). Called “Appraisal Theory,” Martin’s work examined the language of attitude, evaluation, and emotion (White, 2001) in the context of how
these enable the interpersonal metafunction of language. Martin (2000) noted that, “within Systemic Functional Linguistics, excursions into interpersonal discourse semantics [had] generally been grammatical in their foundation” while he and his colleagues wanted “to develop a complementary perspective, founded on evaluative lexis” (p. 143). Speaking of this early work Martin stated:

Working within the paradigm of SFL, we wanted a comprehensive map of appraisal resources that we could deploy systematically in discourse analysis, with a view both to understanding the rhetorical effect of evaluative lexis as texts unfold, and to better understanding the interplay of interpersonal meaning and social relations in the model of language we were developing, especially in the area of solidarity (i.e., resources for empathy and affiliation). (p. 148)

The initial work on Appraisal Theory arose because many of those who had approached language from formal grammar classes and SFL “had the sense that the criterion-based reasoning we had inherited from formal grammar classes . . . was not serving us so well when analyzing evaluative language” (Martin, 2003b, p. 172). The need for a new approach was especially critical in solving the problem of direct and implied evaluation: The group felt confident about analyzing the attitude when evaluation was explicitly realized, but “when evaluation is implied . . . [it] creates something of a coding nightmare” (Martin, 2003b, p. 173). Martin’s (2000) work centered around a belief that “the Systemic Functional Linguistics approach to data is the semantics of evaluation—how the interlocutors are feeling, the judgments they make, and the value they place on the various phenomena of their experience” (p. 143) and is a central function of language (Hunston & Sinclair, 2000).

Martin and his colleagues coined the term appraisal to identify the “semantic resources used to negotiate emotions, judgments, and valuations alongside resources for amplifying and engaging with these evaluations” (Martin, 2000, p. 144; see also Martin
& Rose, 2003; Martin & White, 2005). Thompson and Hunston (2000) preferred the term evaluation, calling it a “broad cover term for the expression of the speaker’s or writer’s attitude or stance towards, a viewpoint on, or feelings about the entities or propositions that he or she is talking about” (p. 5). They use evaluation because the term “allows us to talk about the values ascribed to the entities and the propositions that are evaluated” (p. 9).

In this dissertation I use the label appraisal, given its predominance in the literature.

Because Appraisal Theory is complex and sub-divided into numerous critical elements that enabled my analysis, the discussion below will be depicted in both figures (to assist readers to navigate through each of these elements) and tables that provide templates with which the analysis was undertaken.

Domains of Appraisal Theory

Appraisal can be divided into three domains: attitude, engagement, and amplification.

1. The first of these three appraisal domains, attitude, is concerned with the expression of feelings in text, including emotional reactions, judgments of behavior, and evaluation of things.

2. The second of the three domains, engagement, deals with how attitudes are sourced in the text and how the writer-speaker brings (or does not bring) other voices into his or her text (Martin & White, 2005, pp. 34-35).

3. The third domain, amplification, allows us to adjust the degree of our evaluation, either up or down, to denote how strong or weak our feelings are (Eggins & Slade, 1997).
Each of these domains can be further divided into sub-categories as depicted in Figure 6. The detail of these sub-categories proved to be critical to identifying how my leader-orators conveyed their visions to their listener-followers. Each of the sub-categories is discussed in detail in the paragraphs that follow the figure.

Attitude

The first domain of Appraisal, the resources of attitude, allows us to map feelings as they are construed in English texts. The system of attitude comprises three semantic regions (Martin & White, 2005, p. 42): emotion (affect), ethics (judgment), and aesthetics (appreciation) as depicted in Figure 7. Affect deals with those linguistic resources that allow us to construe emotional reactions (examples include words such as worry, anger, shock). Judgment resources are those which enable us to assess someone’s behavior against our norms (e.g., he is miserly, she is greedy). Appreciation resources enable us to construe how we value things (a beautiful vase) (Martin & White, 2005, pp. 35-36).

Each of these three sub-categories of attitude is detailed next.

Affect

The linguistic resources of *affect* enable us to express emotional states. People can have good feelings or bad feelings about someone or something so affect can be *positive* (*happy, interested*) or *negative* (*sad, bored*). Also, because people can express their feelings directly or by inference, *affect* can be expressed directly or implied (Martin & Rose, 2003, p. 25). The resources of *affect* are the linguistic tools used by the leaders orators to communicate their feelings about someone or something for the purpose of expressing their visionary stance to their listener-followers. Leaders express their emotions towards those people or things that contribute to and are in keeping with the vision in *positive affect* terms; those which do not contribute or are not in keeping with the vision are expressed in *negative affect* terms.

Affect can be sub-divided into happiness/unhappiness, security/insecurity, and satisfaction/dissatisfaction as depicted in Figure 8.

![Affect Diagram](image)

*Figure 7. Attitude. Adapted from The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English (pp. 35-40), by J. R. Martin and P. White, 2005, New York: Palmgrave MacMillan.*

![Affect Diagram](image)

*Figure 8. Affect. Adapted from Analysing Casual Conversation (pp. 129-130), by S. Eggins and D. Slade, 1997, London, UK: Cassell; and The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English (pp. 45-52), by J. R. Martin and P. White, 2005, New York: Palmgrave MacMillan.*
Each of these sub-categories can be explained as follows:

1. Happiness/unhappiness resources allow us to encode feelings to do with sadness, anger, happiness, or love (I love chocolate; he’s angry).

2. Security/insecurity resources convey feelings that have to do with anxiety or confidence (worry, scared, fearful, anxious, secure).

3. Satisfaction/dissatisfaction resources encode feelings to do with interest or exasperation (bored, fed up, absorbed) (Eggins & Slade, 1997, pp. 129-130).

The realizations of affect are often lexical (particularly adjectival) and can occur with mental process verbs of affection such as to like, to fear, to enjoy and also as nouns, adverbs, and processes (Eggins & Slade, 1997). Affect can also occur in attributive relationals of affect (she’s proud of her work), and through metaphoric nominalizations (his fear was visible to all). Meaning can also be derived from a sliding scale of intensity (e.g., like, love, adore) (White, 2001). More examples of how affect is expressed are shown in Table 4.

Judgment

The linguistic resources of judgment enable us to relate our attitudes toward people and the way in which they behave—their character and how they measure up in reference to a set of institutionalized norms or expectations. As with affect, judgment of people’s characters can be positive or negative and they can be judged both explicitly and implicitly. The resources of judgment allow us to express our attitude towards someone’s behavior (he is honest, she is kind) and are deployed for construing moral evaluations of behavior, how people should and should not behave (brave, deceptive) (White, 2001)
according to some norm. *Judgment* can be divided into two sub-categories, *social esteem* and *social sanction* (Martin & White, 2005) as depicted in Figure 9.

### Table 4

*Resources of Affect* (Encodes our feelings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happiness/unhappiness (encodes feelings of sadness, anger, love)</td>
<td>Happy, joyful, to like (something or someone), love, cheer</td>
<td>Unhappy, sad, dislike, hate, misery, that book is rubbish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/insecurity (encodes feelings associated with well-being: fear, confidence, trust)</td>
<td>Confident, sure, assured</td>
<td>Tremble (with fear), disquiet, restless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction/dissatisfaction (encodes interest or exasperation)</td>
<td>Attentive, busy, industrious, compliment, reward, involved, engrossed</td>
<td>Fidget, yawn, tune out, caution, scold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The first sub-category of *judgment, social esteem*, allows us to encode whether someone's behavior lives up to or, alternatively, does not live up to socially acceptable standards. Three kinds of *judgment: social esteem* are possible. The first, called *tenacity*, enables us to sanction or approve the behavior of a person or a group in relation to the moral strength or weaknesses displayed by the behavior. For example, someone can be judged as being *self-reliant, brave, energetic*, all of which are in keeping with socially acceptable standards. The second kind of *judgment: social esteem—normality*—occurs when behavior is assessed in terms of its adherence to or departure from usuality (*insane,*
remarkable, odd, unexpected, unfortunate). The third kind of judgment: social esteem resources—capacity—enables us to express our evaluation of how ably or competently someone has accomplished something (skillful, incompetent, stupid, clever) (Eggins & Slade, 1997; Martin & White, 2005). These three sub-categories are depicted in Table 5.

![Diagram of judgment categories]

Figure 9. Judgment.

The second sub-category of judgment, social sanction, comprises those resources that enable us to evaluate the behavior of a person or group of people as ethical or truthful. This is the domain of “right and wrong” (Eggins & Slade, 1997, p. 131). Social sanction resources come in two kinds: propriety and veracity. The resources of propriety enable us to judge a person’s ethical morality, evaluating it as complying with or deviating from our own point of view (Martin & White, 2005). Citing Idema et al., Eggins and Slade (1997) note that when that behavior complies with our view of the world, we judge it positively (she is responsible, obedient, wholesome, modest) and when the behavior does not comply, we judge it negatively (she is cruel, selfish, insensitive, irresponsible, jealous). The second kind of social sanction resources allow us to convey our views on a person’s truthfulness or veracity (Eggins & Slade, 1997; Martin & White,
2005) through such lexical items as *honest, credible, frank, deceitful, hypocritical*. Both kinds of social *sanction resources* are summarized in Table 6.

Table 5

*Resources of Social Esteem*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive (admire)</th>
<th>Negative (criticize)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenacity</strong> (how dependable?)</td>
<td><strong>Brave, reliable, faithful, flexible</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cowardly, unreliable, unfaithful, stubborn</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normality</strong> (how special? How unusual?)</td>
<td><strong>Lucky, normal, cool, stable, predictable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Unlucky, abnormal, odd, erratic, unpredictable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity</strong> (how capable?)</td>
<td><strong>Powerful, healthy, educated</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weak, sick, illiterate</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 6

*Social Sanction Resources*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive (praise)</th>
<th>Negative (condemn)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Propriety</strong> (how ethical/beyond reproach?)</td>
<td><strong>Moral, law abiding, polite, generous</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Corrupt, criminal, rude, greedy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Veracity</strong> (how truthful?)</td>
<td><strong>Honest, candid, tactful</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Deceitful, devious, blunt</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Judgment can be realized by: adverbials (justly, cleverly); attributes and epithets (a cruel decision); nominals (a cheat and a liar); and verbs (to triumph, to chicken out). Judgment can be expressed explicitly (students should be bright) or it can be indirectly evoked or implied. These latter expressions are termed “tokens of judgment” (White, 2001) and are superficially neutral meanings which, despite their neutrality, have the capacity to trigger judgmental responses; for example, the statement, The government has not laid the foundations for long-term growth (Martin, 2001), evokes a judgment of government incompetence without actually saying so. Judgment can also have positive or negative status (brave vs. cowardly) and can be located on a sliding scale (an OK student, a bright student, a brilliant student).

Appreciation

Appreciation resources allow us to express our evaluation of the aesthetic quality of semiotic and natural phenomena (that is a valuable vase, he got a prize)—how we like or dislike something. The linguistic resources of appreciation—depicted in Figure 9—enable us to convey our evaluations of things including natural phenomena (e.g., the weather, a lovely day) and say what those things are worth to us or how we value them. Appreciation resources evaluate products and objects (as opposed to human behavior which is expressed through the resources of judgment) by reference to aesthetic principles and other systems of assigning social value (a key figure). Appreciation can be expressed either positively (a beautiful flower) or negatively (an ugly flower), and this expression can be located along a sliding scale of intensity (pretty, beautiful, exquisite vase).

Appreciation resources can be sub-divided into our reactions to things (how they please us or catch our attention), their composition (how they are balanced and how
complex they are) and, finally, their value to us (how innovative, authentic, timely, etc.) (Martin & White, 2005, p. 56). These resources are depicted in Figure 10.

*Appreciation* is often expressed through nominalizations (*loveliness, elegance*), through adverbs (*elegantly, simplistically*) and through verbs (*attracted, challenged*) (Eggins & Slade, 1997, p. 126). More examples of *appreciation* resources are indicated in Table 7.

---

**Figure 10.** Appreciation. Adapted from *Analysing Casual Conversation* (pp. 126-129), by S. Eggins and D. Slade, 1997, London, UK: Cassell; and *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English* (pp. 56-61), by J. R. Martin and P. White, 2005, New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

---

Engagement

The second of the three domains of appraisal, *engagement*, deals with “sourcing attitudes and the play of voices around opinions in discourse” (Martin & White, 2005, p. 35). The resources of *engagement*, depicted in Figure 11, enable us to position our voice with respect to other voices and alternative positions, thus to engage with those other voices and positions (p. 94) in our discourse if we choose to do so.

Following Bakhtin (1981), these other voices and positions provide a “heteroglossic backdrop of prior utterances, alternative viewpoints and anticipated responses” (Martin & White, 2005, p. 95). Consider, for example, the opening sentence
of King’s speech: *Five score years ago, a great American, in whose symbolic shadow we stand signed the Emancipation Proclamation.* The first several words, *Five score years ago,* resembles a prior utterance, that of Lincoln in his *Gettysburg Address* (*Four score and seven years ago . . .*) and will have been recognized by King’s audience as a reference to Lincoln. Similarly, by saying *in whose symbolic shadow we stand,* King refers to the Lincoln Memorial, the location of the speech, again invoking Lincoln and

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources of Appreciation</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reaction</strong> (Did I like it? Did it grab me? What did you think of it?)</td>
<td><em>Arresting, captivating,</em> exciting, dramatic, intense, okay, fine, splendid</td>
<td><em>Dull, boring, tedious,</em> monotonous, pedestrian, yuk, repulsive, plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Composition</strong> (Concerned with the texture of a text or process; how did it hang together? Was it complex/hard to follow?)</td>
<td><em>Balanced, proportioned,</em> shapely, logical, easy to follow, precise</td>
<td><em>Discordant,</em> disorganized, shapeless, distorted, flawed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valuation</strong> (Was it worthwhile? How do you judge it?)</td>
<td><em>Profound, innovative, real,</em> helpful, effective</td>
<td><em>Shallow, untimely,</em> everyday, fake, shoddy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

those things for which he stands. By invoking Lincoln’s memory, King invites Lincoln’s voice to join his own in calling for civil rights. By allowing the other voice into his discourse, King positions himself in agreement with Lincoln’s policies, anticipates and receives a positive response from his audience, and thereby strengthens the solidarity between himself and them. This solidarity is necessary for the listener-followers to “buy into” King’s vision.

Alternatively, bare assertions (Martin & White, 2005, p. 99) are those which the speaker-writer believes have no alternatives which need to be expressed, that is, the utterance is capable of being declared categorically as in King’s subsequent sentence so we have come here today to dramatize an appalling condition. Utterances of this kind assume that the stance (African Americans live in an appalling condition) can be taken as given and is not up for discussion (Martin & White, 2005, p. 101). These statements that are proclaimed as fact are another linguistic vehicle through which an orator can establish solidarity with his audience.

Engagement can be divided into four sub-sections: proclaim, disclaim, entertain, and attribute as follows (Martin & White, 2005, pp. 97-99):
1. Resources that proclaim allow the textual voice to suppress or rule out other alternative positions by proclaiming a proposition as highly warrantable (compelling, valid, plausible, well-founded)—these resources can concur (naturally, of course, obviously), pronounce (I contend, the truth is, indubitably), or endorse (the research has demonstrated that . . .).

2. Resources that disclaim enable the orator to position him- or herself at odds with or rejecting a contrary position by denying it (you don’t look ill) or countering it (although you look ill, you do not look terrible).

3. With entertainment, the text presents a proposition as being one of several potential alternatives, thereby entertaining other positions (it seems, the evidence suggests, apparently, and some types of rhetorical questions).

4. With attribution, the text entertains other voices by acknowledging them (Jones believes, according to Smith) or distancing from them (Ron claims, it is rumored).

It is also possible for us to “hedge” or express “fuzzy boundaries” when speaking or writing (Lakoff, 1972, as cited in Martin & White, 2005, p. 39). Following Hyland (1998, as cited in Martin & White, 2005) hedging refers to “linguistic resources which indicate either a lack of commitment to the truth value of an accompanying proposition or a desire not to express that commitment categorically” (these are sort of appalling conditions) (p. 39). When Kouzes and Posner (1995) recommended that leaders avoid tentativeness in their visions, they were likely referring to the linguistic resource of hedging.

The resources of engagement are depicted in Table 8.
Table 8

Resources of Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proclaim/ Disclaim</td>
<td>Highly warrantable position</td>
<td>Deny or counter a position (no way, absolutely not, I disbelieve, the researchers disavow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(naturally, of course, I contend, the researchers say)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertain</td>
<td>It would seem that</td>
<td>The evidence fails to show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribute</td>
<td>Entertains other voices</td>
<td>Distances proposition from others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(according to Smith)</td>
<td>(the gossips say)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Amplification

Appraisal Theory also identifies language resources that provide us with a means to scale meaning (White, 2001). This scaling of meaning, up or down, was labeled graduation by Martin and White (2005) who identified two ways of grading: force, referring to adjusting the degree of an evaluation by either raising or lowering it (somewhat upset), and focus, referring to the ability to adjust the strength of boundaries between categories, either sharpening or softening them.

Eggins and Slade (1997), however, refer to this scaling ability as amplification, which unlike affect, judgment, and appreciation does not occur in positive and negative pairs. Instead, amplification occurs in the resources of enrichment, augmentation, and mitigation as shown in Figure 12.
Figure 12. Amplification. Adapted from *Analysing Casual Conversation* (pp. 133-137), by S. Eggins and D. Slade, 1997, London, UK: Cassell.

The first of these, *enrichment*, involves a speaker or writer adding an attitudinal coloring to a meaning when a core, neutral word could have been used (*he killed at cards* vs. *he won at cards* or *she yapped all day* vs. *she spoke all day*) (Eggins & Slade, 1997, p. 134) or by adding a comparative element which makes explicit the attitudinal meaning (*run like a bat out of hell*). The second set of amplification resources, *augmentation*, involves amplifying an attitudinal meaning, often through repetition (*he won and won and won at cards*), intensifiers (*she’s really amazingly beautiful*), using lexis, which quantifies the degree of amplification being encoded (*heaps of work, much, a lot*), and pronominal expressions (*all, everyone*). Adverbs such as *totally, completely, entirely, utterly*, or *absolutely* can also be used to amplify and quantify the extent of the evaluation (Eggins & Slade, 1997, p. 136). The third set of amplification resources, *mitigation*, allows us to downplay our personal expression using, for example, adverbs such as *just, only, merely, quite*, and *hardly*.

In this dissertation I have used the Eggins and Slade (1997) term, *amplification*, instead of the Martin and White (2005) *graduation* because the analytic tools of *augmentation* and *enrichment* rather than *force* and *focus* contribute best to my findings, especially in how the leaders used language to communicate imagery (Collins & Porras, 1991; Kouzes & Posner, 1995; Nanus, 1990; Welch & Welch, 2010) in their speeches.
Also, the use of *amplification* as identified by Eggins and Slade (1997) allowed me to investigate and locate those very few instances in the four speeches in which the orators diluted their stance through the use of *mitigation*. The tools of *amplification* are shown in Table 9.

**Genre Theory**

This section of the chapter explores Genre Theory (Christie & Martin, 1997; Eggins, 2004; Eggins & Martin, 1997; Eggins & Slade, 1997; Hyland, 2002; Martin, 2000, 2001, 2009; Martin & Plum, 1997; Martin & Rose, 2003, 2008; Martin & White, 2005; Nunan, 2008), another SFL lens through which I examined the four speeches in my data set.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 9</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Amplification</strong></th>
<th><strong>Meaning</strong></th>
<th><strong>Examples</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrichment</td>
<td>Fusing an evaluative lexical item with the process; adding a comparative element</td>
<td><em>Whining, yapping; run like a bat out of hell</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augmentation</td>
<td>Intensifying the amplification; quantifying the degree of amplification</td>
<td>Repetition (<em>she ran and ran and ran</em>); grading (<em>very, really, incredibly</em>); adverbs (<em>heaps, tons, much</em>); pronominal (<em>everyone, all</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>Playing down the force of an evaluation</td>
<td>“Vague talk” (<em>sort of, kinda, anything, just, only, not much, actually</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Encodes grading the effect of surrounding appraisal. Adapted from *Analysing Casual Conversation* (pp. 133-137), by S. Eggins and D. Slade, 1997, London, UK: Cassell.
Genre theory has provided the lens through which a number of scholars (Christie & Martin, 1997; Eggins, 2004; Eggins & Martin, 1997; Eggins & Slade, 1997; Hyland, 2002; Martin, 1985, 2000, 2001, 2009; Martin & Plum, 1997; Martin & Rose, 2003, 2008; Martin & White, 2005; Nunan, 2008) have analyzed discourse. Yet, in an overview to the approaches being taken by genre analysts, Hyland (2002) noted that “despite general agreement on the nature of genre, analysts differ in the emphasis they give to either content or text; whether they focus on the roles of texts in social communities, or the ways that texts are organized to reflect and construct these communities” (p. 114).

Hyland (2002) cites three broad schools of thought on Genre Theory. First, the New Rhetoric group consists mainly of North American scholars who view genre within rhetorical traditions and who are influenced by their work in universities and first-language composition (among them Freedman & Medway, 1994). Second are those analysts who are often referred to as taking the ESP approach, where ESP stands for English for Specific Purposes (Swales, 2000). And third are those analysts who base their genre work on Systemic Functional Linguistics and are generally known as the Sydney School. These scholars see genre as a staged, goal-oriented process (Martin, 1992), “emphasizing the purposeful, interactive and sequential character of different genres and the way that language is systematically linked to context” (Hyland, 2002, p. 115). It is this latter tradition, the Sydney School, which provides the most useful genre conceptual framework for this dissertation.

According to Martin (2009) of the Sydney School, genre is part of a general model of language and social context that is informed by SFL.

As part of this functional paradigm, genre theory is developed as an outline of how we use language to live; it tries to describe the ways in which we mobilize
language—how out of all the things we might do with language, each culture chooses just a few and enacts them over and over again—slowly adding to the repertoire as needs arise and slowly dropping things that are not much in use. Genre theory is thus a theory of the borders of our social world and our familiarity with what to expect. (p. 13)

Genre is a critical way through which we make meaning via language. Genre Theory suggests that “when texts share the same general purpose in the culture, they will often share the same obligatory and optional structural elements and [are then said to] belong to the same genre” (Butt et al., 2000, p. 9). For instance, every English speaker will instantly recognize Once upon a time as the beginning of a fairy tale and Dearly beloved, we are gathered here today as the beginning of a wedding ceremony. These two genres, fairy tales and wedding ceremonies, proceed through various predictable stages typical of fairy tales and wedding ceremonies: For the former, there is usually a description of a situation and the characters involved in the tale, a problem (usually frightening), a resolution and a moral lesson; for the latter, vows of commitments, blessings, and culminating in I now pronounce you husband and wife.

Martin and Rose (2003) suggested that in Western cultures there are many such genres, whose patterns of meaning are more or less predictable, among them greetings, service encounters, casual conversations, arguments, telephone inquiries, instructions, lectures, jokes, etc. As Martin (2009) suggested, genre’s job is to coordinate resources, “to specify just how a given culture organizes this meaning potential into recurrent configurations of meaning, and phases meaning through stages in each genre” (p. 12).

Analyzing genre is another way, in addition to examining the register which is impacted by the context of situation, to discover how texts are able to function as semantic units. This ability, according to Eggins and Martin (1997), “suggests that texts
which are doing different jobs in the culture will unfold in different ways, working through different states or steps . . . [such that] an interactant setting out to achieve a particular goal is most likely to initiate a text of a particular genre, and that text is most likely to unfold in a particular way” (p. 237).

Martin (2001, 2009) defines genre as being concerned with coordinating field, mode, and tenor selections and organizing them into “staged, goal oriented social processes” (Martin, 2001, p. 288). Martin offers the rationale for the elements of his definition of genre as follows:

1. *Staged*, because it usually takes us several stages to work through a genre (in the fairy tale example there are stages for identifying the problem, resolving it, and issuing a moral lesson).

2. *Goal-oriented*, because unfolding stages are designed to accomplish something (in the genre of wedding ceremonies the goal is to bless the union and marry the two participants).


The need for stages in a genre is further explained by Martin (2009) who contended that “we cannot achieve all our social purposes all at once, but have to move in steps, assembling meaning as we go, so that by the end of a text or spoken interaction we have ended up more or less where we wanted to be” (p. 12). The role of genre then is to “coordinate resources, to specify just how a given culture organizes meaning potential into recurrent configurations of meaning and phases meaning through stages in each genre” (p. 12).
According to Eggins (2004), “a genre comes about as particular values for field, tenor and mode regularly co-occur and eventually become stabilized in the culture as ‘typical’ situations . . . [with] the most overt expression of genres [being] their tendency to develop into staged or structured linguistic events” (p. 58). Martin (1985) referred to these stages as schematic structure, a way of getting from A to B in the way a given culture accomplishes whatever the genre in question is functioning to do in that culture” (p. 251). Eggins (2004, pp. 64-65) suggested that, within the schematic structure, there are defining or obligatory elements and also optional elements that we could leave out and still have an understandable text; it is the defining or obligatory elements that are the ones that help us define a particular genre.

Eggins (2004) also suggested that each stage of a genre’s schematic structure is clearly associated with a number of grammatical and lexical features. Eggins explored an example of this phenomenon in the genre of recipes, noting that the schematic structure has stages of ingredients, method (how to prepare the ingredients), and serving quantity information (pp. 68-69). Each of these stages has its own lexical-grammatical features: The ingredients stage is a list of nominal groups (6 eggs, 1 c flour, ½ c sugar), the method stage is expressed by clauses usually in the imperative (beat the eggs), and the quantity size stage is in the declarative Mood (serves four).

In summary, applications of Systemic Functional Linguistics, Appraisal Theory, and Genre Theory provide ample resources and tools with which to conduct detailed and precise linguistic analysis to discover how language was used to advantage to communicate vision.
Rationale for the Methodology

This section offers the rationale for my choice of methodology and then provides an overview of some other linguistic studies that have used the same methodology to analyze discourse. The choice of a linguistic methodology for this study derived from the need to study how the four orators were able to communicate their visions through language. Linguistics is a field of study that provides analytic tools with which one can gain a profound understanding of how language generates meanings (Fromkin et al., 2001). When, for example, we listen to a great speech, we understand its intent at an instinctual level—we understand intuitively what the orator has intended for us to receive and understand. But it is only through a careful, linguistic examination of the text that we discover how language was used to transmit those understandings. Linguistic analysis can confirm or reshape our instinctual understanding of texts and much can be learned about the speaker, his or her values, the context in which he or she spoke, and his or her vision through a linguistic analysis of the text of his or her speech. And, as Fairclough (2005) noted, political and government processes are “substantially linguistic processes [and that] there is a clear rationale for using the resources of language . . . in researching politics and government” (p. 167).

Following research into the various linguistic methodologies through which discourse had been analyzed, an application of Systemic Functional Linguistics, including Genre Theory and Appraisal Theory, was chosen for this dissertation. SFL was the logical choice because, as Eggins (2004) contends, “what is distinctive to Systemic [Functional] Linguistics is that it seeks to develop both a theory about language as social process and an analytical methodology which permits the detailed and systematic
description of language patterns” (p. 21). This distinction is nowhere more apparent than in the detailed tools SFL provides to linguists to aid in their profound analysis of texts. These tools allow the linguist to examine at a deep level of delicacy the specific language and specific discursive strategies used to communicate meaning.

Within SFL, Genre Theory provided the lens and the tools through which I could examine all four speeches to discover if a genre of visionary speech might exist. Genre is important to linguists because analyses using the tools of the theory can contribute to our understanding of why some texts, in this case visionary speeches, are successful and appropriate while others are not (Eggins, 2004, p. 70). Also, from the discovery of common stages and linguistic features in a genre, others who want to re-create that genre in their own discourses can do so; this proved to be especially important in my recommendations to how leaders can use the findings of this dissertation in communicating their own visions.

Similarly, the tools afforded by Appraisal Theory allow a linguist to conduct the same detailed analysis, using the lens of appraisal resources to discover how someone communicates his or her stance and evaluation of behavior, people, and things. Appraisal Theory (Eggins & Slade, 1997; Martin, 2000, Martin & White, 2005) enabled me to investigate and arrive at an understanding of how each of my chosen leaders used language to express the interpersonal metafunction (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) to create a relationship and develop mutual purposes (Rost, 1993) with his listener-followers. This relationship, conveyed and established through language, enables the bonding and solidarity (Martin, 2000) necessary for the leader’s vision and those mutual purposes to be shared and implemented by followers.
Studies Using the Methodology

I thought it might be useful to illustrate how these theories have been applied to discourse; this section, therefore, provides some examples of studies that have analyzed discourse through SFL and Appraisal Theory.

Studies Using Applications of SFL

SFL has been used widely to analyze discourse, including leadership texts in the corporate world, in government, in education, and in politics (Augustinos, Lecouteur, & Soyland, 2002; Dunmire, 2005; Eggins, 2004; Firth, 1950/1957; Halliday, 1985/1994; Halliday & Hasan, 1989; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004; Harrison & Young, 2004; Harvey, 2004; Ho, 2010; Lee, 2004; Olson, 2006; Ortu, 2009; Vachek, 1972).

Harrison and Young (2004), for example, examined a Canadian federal government leader’s spoken and written discourse from the perspective of SFL. Harrison and Young found that, despite the fact that the leader tried “to the best of his ability to provide good information, raise employee enthusiasm, offer staff different ways to participate in change and attempt a more egalitarian management style” (p. 241), in his written communications he fell into the “comfort zone of bureaucratsese” which the researchers identified in terms of linguistic choices that allowed the leader to use “strategic wordings that allowed him to camouflage managerial decisions and activities that would alarm his new employees, potentially cause dissension and challenge the hierarchy” (p. 232). Embedded in the written text were linguistic clues to a hidden agenda such as: the use of the exclusive we which reinforced the hierarchy of the organization (we are management, they are staff); nominalizations (working groups, meetings) to conceal agency and avoid personalizing those activities and decisions with which he was
uncomfortable; and use of the “in order to + infinitive format” (p. 240) to distance himself.

The response to the leader’s written communication revealed that the employees did not feel heard, valued, or respected because the hierarchy and the hidden agenda were evident in the writing.

In another study in an organization, Harvey (2004) used SFL to examine the discourse interaction in a dialogue between Steve Jobs of Apple Computer and his employees, finding that Jobs used his rhetorical skills to evoke employees’ sense of their own self-worth and efficacy to inspire them to perform beyond expectations. In particular, Jobs responded to concrete transactional questions (“how do we . . . ?”) from his staff by constructing answers that were more transformational, inspirational, and abstract; Jobs would, for example, use metaphor to shape his responses and “construct action as an organizational responsibility [through] the inclusive personal pronoun we” (p. 253).

More recently, Ho (2010) employed SFL to explore how leaders of a group of professional educators of a public education institute in Hong Kong used language to construct desirable identities (such as rational leader, understanding and supportive leader, etc.) for themselves in their emails when asking those who reported to them to take various actions without arousing negative feelings towards the leader or the request.

SFL has also been used to analyze political texts. Dunmire (2005) studied President Bush Sr.’s speech of October 7, 2002, in which the former President offers his rationale for war against Iraq. In another study, this one on the speech of President Bush Jr., Dunmire used SFL to analyze how the rationale for war against Iraq in 2002 was justified. Dunmire found that President Bush Jr. spoke of his vision of the future as if it
already existed and that, by using the nominalization threat (instead of the process, to threaten), he pre-empted the future, construing as imminent a perceived threat that might, in reality, only happen in the distant future. In doing so, Bush advanced his “policy of pre-emption,” his administration’s vision of world affairs in the context of their National Security Strategy.

Augustinos, Lecouteur, and Soyland (2002) studied the discourse in which Australian leaders apologized to Aboriginal Australians known as the Stolen Generations, and Olson (2006) studied President Clinton’s speeches addressing the attacks on American embassies in Africa.

Fenton-Smith (2007) studied diplomatic condolence messages from 12 countries and the United Nations on the death of Yasser Arafat in 2004. The condolence messages, seen through the lens of SFL, “showed great linguistic dexterity and ideological subtlety . . . [becoming] a conversation within the international community in which each contributor commented on the loss of a fellow member and formulated their own assessment of the significance of the event for the world” (pp. 697-698).

In another study, Olson (2006) used SFL to analyze President Clinton’s radio addresses in which he spoke about the terrorist attacks on the U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, noting that Mr. Clinton’s use of process types depicted Americans as more human than their enemies. Finally, Lee (2004) used SFL to analyze political campaign discourse in the 2002 Korean presidential elections as depicted through the media, and Ortu (2009) used SFL to study a speech by Gordon Brown to the annual conference of the Trade Union Congress in 2007.
Another approach in the SFL tradition, critical discourse analysis (De Cillia, Reisigl, & Wodak, 2009; Fairclough, 2000, 2005; Ferrari, 2007; Graham, Keenan, & Dowd, 2004; Petersoo, 2007; Reyes-Rodriguez, 2008; Van Dijk, 2006), has also been used to study texts. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) researchers examine texts to “highlight the inequality that is expressed, produced, and reproduced through language . . . [focusing] on linguistic analysis to expose misrepresentations, discrimination, or particular positions of power in all kinds of public discourse such as political speeches, newspapers, and advertisements” (Young & Fitzgerald, 2006, p. 8).

Reyes-Rodriguez (2008) used CDA approaches to examine the rhetoric of Venezuela’s President Chavez in his speech to the United Nations General Assembly in 2005. Reyes-Rodriguez traced a number of different personas in Chavez’s text as the President changed voices during his speech. Reyes-Rodriguez also noted linguistic and stylistic shifts and discursive strategies such as Chavez’s use of indexicals (his references, for example, to the revolutionary Bolívar to whom Chavez and the people of Venezuela have philosophical and ideological connections).

Van Dijk (2006) also used critical discourse analysis to examine political manipulation in a speech by Tony Blair in the House of Commons in which he legitimized the participation of the United Kingdom in the U.S.-led war against Iraq in 2003. Van Dijk found that Blair used some “classic examples of manipulative strategies, such as emphasizing one’s own power and moral superiority, discrediting one’s opponents, providing details of the ‘facts,’ polarization between Us and Them, negative Other-presentation, ideological alignment (democracy, nationalism), emotional appeals and so on” (p. 379). Blair’s contribution to elaborating a new “doctrine of international
community” was also studied using critical discourse analysis methods (Fairclough, 2005) as was the discourse of welfare reform in the U.K. (Fairclough, 2000) following the election of Tony Blair in 1997. In another study, De Cillia, Reisigl, and Wodak (2009) took Austria as a case study to illustrate some of the linguistic strategies employed to construct nations and national identities. The authors studied speeches of politicians and newspaper articles, and conducted focus groups and qualitative interviews to demonstrate how language constructs national identities.

Analyzing George W. Bush’s discourse after 9/11, in particular the President’s corpus of texts in the period between January 2001 and January 2004, Ferrari (2007) presented a framework for a metaphor-based critical analysis of persuasion in political discourse. Ferrari suggested that metaphor might contribute to emotive appeal in the reader or listener-followers and therefore metaphorical expressions may directly produce emotions in the audience. Instances of metaphor in Bush’s discourse, for example, thousands of dangerous killers . . . are now spread throughout the world like ticking time bombs (from his speech of January 29, 2002), contributed to the emotion of fear and helped him persuade the country that a preventive war with Iraq was justified.

Another CDA approach, Discourse-Historical, attempts “to integrate all available information on the historical background and the original sources in which discursive ‘events’ are embedded” (De Cillia, Reisigl, & Wodak, 2009, p. 156). This theory was applied by Graham et al. (2004) to analyze four speeches, including President Bush’s 2001 war on terror speech from the point of view mainly of genre. Graham et al. found that these speeches shared generic features that included appeals to the following: a legitimate power source that was external to the orator and which was presented as
inherently good; the historical importance of the culture in which the discourse was situated; the construction of a thoroughly evil Other; and a unification behind the legitimating external power source. Discourse-historical methodology was also used by Petersoo (2007) to examine the role of the personal pronoun we in the discursive construction of national identities in the media. Petersoo collected texts from two Scottish newspapers for examination, finding instances of what she terms a “wandering we,” that is, shifting reference points of deictic expressions, which, by nature of their lack of specificity, are particularly useful to politicians who are not sure of who their audiences are.

Studies Using Applications of Appraisal Theory

An extension of SFL, Appraisal Theory (Channell, 2000; Conrad & Biber, 2000; Hoey, 2000; Hunston, 2000; Lazar & Lazar, 2004; Martin & White, 2005; Otrieza, 2009; Thompson & Zhou, 2000), has been used to analyze a number of discourses in various genres. Channell (2000), for example, conducted a corpus-based analysis of evaluative meaning, using the 200 million words of spoken and written English in the Bank of English corpus, to examine how some words (e.g., fat, regime, par for the course, self-important) take on certain connotations in common use. Channell suggested that these connotations (which she calls pragmatic meanings) are intuitive to the listener/reader and have developed because of the word’s frequent association in the context of other words that are positive or (more likely) negative in their evaluation.

Narrative was the genre examined by Cortazzi and Jin (2000) who contributed the idea that narratives can be not only a means of making a point, but also a basis for an
evaluation of the teller and the situation in which the teller and the audience find themselves. The authors used Labov’s (1972) model of narrative structure to note that the assessment of a stretch of text as narrative depends on the narrator’s use of evaluation. The authors held that “evaluation . . . is the key to narrative; through evaluation, speakers show how they intend the narrative to be understood and what the point is” (p. 102). They contended, however, that Labov’s model “leaves out the relationship between teller and listener, that it does not fully consider features of narrative performance or culture, and that in general it does not pay sufficient attention to context” (p. 103).

In another study using Appraisal Theory, Conrad and Biber (2000) conducted a statistical examination of three collections of texts (conversations, academic writing, and news reports) to identify adverbials that express meanings associated with the speaker/writer’s attitude or stance towards what she is saying.

Hunston (2000), also using Appraisal Theory, explored status and value in persuasive texts in newspapers and news articles studying how credibility about the information presented is constructed in language. Hunston noted that a piece of language—spoken, written, or thought—can be presented as being original to the person speaking/writing/thinking or can be presented as having been derived from someone other than that person. Hunston calls the first averral and the latter attribution. This distinction “is important to the study of evaluation because it can be used to position the reader to attach more or less credence to the various pieces of information” (p. 178).

Thompson and Zhou (2000) studied the use of disjuncts, adverbials such as unfortunately and obviously which “are traditionally seen as expressing the writer’s comments on the content or style of the sentence in which they appear” (p. 123). The
authors found that the function of disjuncts is not only textual, performing a cohesive function, but that they also have an interpersonal function. The authors call these “conjuncts with attitude” (p. 124) and cite examples such as *plainly*, *admittedly*, *surprisingly*, etc.

Texts involving leaders have also been studied using Appraisal Theory. Texts by an early leader in linguistics, Noam Chomsky, for example, provided the data for a study by Hoey (2000) who demonstrated that Chomsky, a skilled rhetorician, was adept at using a rhetorical device “to make it difficult for a reader to support an alternative or opposing view . . . without looking foolish” (p. 30). Chomsky’s use of evaluative statements (such as something being *rather obvious*, or referring to *this serious issue*, etc.) left little room for disagreement with his stance and were intended for “the purpose of cowing opposition” (p. 37).

Otrieza (2009) used Appraisal Theory to analyze the grammatical and lexical resources employed in a report issued by the Chilean Rettig Commission that was investigating the truth about human rights violations during the dictatorship of Pinochet. Otieza explored how the Commission used language “to generate mitigation, justification, self and other representation and ideological solidarity” (p. 612).

Political leadership discourse has also been studied through applications of Appraisal Theory. Lazar and Lazar (2004) for instance analyzed a corpus of speeches and written statements made by three American presidents (Bush Sr., Clinton, and Bush) seeking how these leaders define in language the new world order in the context of three key historical moments (the Gulf War, the American military action in Afghanistan and Sudan, and the events of 9/11, respectively). Of particular interest to this dissertation is
the authors’ finding of how the three presidents utilize the resources of language to define the moral order they wished to uphold and how they identify the enemy, “the one who violates ‘our’ values . . . the key value at stake [being] freedom” (p. 227). Lazar and Lazar also found that all three presidents continued presenting the Other as out-cast by criminalizing the political actions of the enemy (using such words as criminals, murderers, and killers to describe them and describing their actions as for example, brutalizing, raped, pillaged, plundered). Another discursive strategy involved depicting the Other as having a “depraved value system that has no reverence for human life; ‘they’ are aligned with death and ‘we’ with life” (p. 232).

Of particular relevance to this dissertation was Lazar and Lazar’s (2004) focus on the use of religious references to indicate that we are on the side of the good. This alignment with God and the good is rarely stated explicitly in the corpus of speeches Lazar and Lazar studied; instead, the invocation is worked into the text by means of interdiscursivity (incorporating religious discourse) and intertextuality (including spiritual expressions in the text). The indirect introduction of religious discourse enabled the speaker to refer to religion without being explicit about it and perhaps risking offending a portion of his audience.

Ponton (2010) through Appraisal Theory studied how Margaret Thatcher’s gender-identity was developed following her taking the lead of the Conservative Party in 1975. Mrs. Thatcher, who was slated to become the U.K.’s first female Prime Minister “was marked by intense media speculation . . . as if the press were trying to pinpoint more precisely the kind of woman who might one day hold this crucial office” (p. 195). Ponton suggested that identity, rather than being an attribute of an individual, is actually
something that is constructed, “a product that emerges, by degrees, during discursive interaction” (p. 126). Mrs. Thatcher’s identity as a woman emerged in media interviews as she responded to (or in some cases deflected or ignored) questions regarding managing a household and holding a senior political post.

**Studies Using Genre Theory**

Applications of Genre Theory have also been used to effect in analyzing discourse in various sectors (Bilbow, 1998; Eggins & Slade, 1997; Hyon, 1996; Orlikowski & Yates, 1994; Swales & Rogers, 1995; Willyard & Ritter, 2005; Yates & Orlikowski, 2002). Hyon (1996), for example, studied genre theory and its implications for instructors of English as a Second Language (ESL). By examining genre scholarship and interviewing researchers in the field, Hyon concluded that the Australian, SFL-inspired genre research provided ESL instructors with “insights into the linguistic features of written texts as well as useful guidelines for presenting these features in classrooms” (p. 693).

In the realm of business, Swales and Rogers (1995), Bilbow (1998), and Schryer and Spoel (2005) have studied discourse through Genre Theory. Swales and Rogers (1995) explored how corporations project their corporate philosophy through the genre of mission statements and found that the texts they studied, some 100 individual mission statements, “possessed similarities sufficient to characterize them as a single genre” (p. 226). The authors closely studied 30 of the mission statements to identify how the texts were “rhetorically designed in order to ensure maximum employee ‘buy-in’” (p. 223), finding that there were common verb forms (the present, the imperative, and the purposive infinitive), common and frequent use of the same nouns (goals, principles,
values), and the use of adjectives to add color to the text and to characterize activities in a positive light.

In another study, Bilbow (1998) examined managers' spoken discourse in a range of speech events common in organizations such as meetings, negotiations, and presentations through videos of business meetings conducted in a large Hong Kong airline. Bilbow identifies aspects of what he labeled “chair-talk” and how it differs from the speech acts of participants at the meetings in terms of quantity, content, and form.

Orlikowski and Yates (1994) studied genres of organizational communication which they defined as “socially recognized types of communicative actions—such as memos, meetings, expense forms, training seminars—that are habitually enacted by members of a community to realize particular social purposes” (p. 542). Orlikowski and Yates labeled this set of genres that are routinely enacted by members of a community as a “repertoire of genres” (p. 542), a concept that emerged from their study of communicative practices of “geographically dispersed knowledge workers participating in a multiyear, inter-organizational project conducted primarily through electronic mail” (p. 543). Through examining over 2,000 electronic mail messages, the scholars identified the genres the workers enacted over time to accomplish their collaborative work and analyzed the characteristics of these genres. Orlikowski and Yates found that the emails “exhibited a rich and varied array of communicative practices that changed over time . . . [in response to] changes in context, task, membership, and media capabilities” (p. 572).

In a later work, Yates and Orlikowski (2002) analyzed data from three teams who were using a collaborative electronic technology, Team Room, to illustrate that genre systems play an important role in structuring the six dimensions of communicative
interaction: the purpose (why), the content (what), the participants (who/m), the form (how), time (when), and place (where) of communicative interaction among members of a community (p. 31). Yates and Orlikowski noted that the team enacted three new genre systems (for meetings, collaborative authoring, and collaborative repository) within the new system, an enactment which both changed and reinforced the team’s communicative practices. Arrangements for meetings in Team Room, for example, reinforced the same aspects of meetings as email or paper discourse (logistics, agenda, minutes, etc.), yet the new capability of collaborative authorship enhanced communicative practices by enabling the members of the community to co-create content.

Egging and Slade (1997) drew on SFL and conversation analysis to analyze the informal interactions of casual conversation, examining several genres that occur within casual conversation such as narrative, anecdote, and opinion. Egging and Slade argued that despite its sometimes aimless appearance and apparently trivial content, casual conversation is, in fact, a highly structured, functionally motivated, semantic activity . . . [and] a critical linguistic site for the negotiation of such important dimensions of our social identity as gender, generational location, sexuality, social class membership, ethnicity, and sub-cultural and group affiliations . . . [that is] the joint construction of social reality. (p. 6)

Willyard and Ritter (2005) studied victory and concession speeches that occurred in the context of the U.S. 2004 election. Studying the “drama of a presidential election in the United States” (p. 488), and, in particular, the ritual of concession and victory speeches that are televised on election night, the researchers found that the 2004 concession speeches varied from the norm. The genre of concession speeches requires some established ritual such as the loser conceding before the victor announces, the losing candidate appears before the public surrounded by his or her family, he or she
offers gratitude, and offers to support the winning candidate. In the 2004 speeches, Bush and Kerry conformed to some aspects of the genre and diverged from others. Particularly striking was the concession speech by Democratic Vice-President candidate John Edwards in 2004, however, who was found to divert significantly from the normal genre: whereas Vice-Presidential candidates’ speeches usually follow the concession speech of the defeated Presidential candidate, Edwards spoke before Kerry acknowledged defeat and spoke more in terms of defiance than concession, changing the dynamics of the concession ritual from the norm.

This dissertation follows a long tradition of the use of SFL, Genre Theory, and Appraisal Theory to analyze discourse to discover how language enabled the expression of meaning. I now turn to a rationale for selecting the four speeches that were analyzed in this study.

**Data Selection**

The selection of my data set was guided by their being “instrumentally useful in furthering understanding of a particular problem” (Stake, as cited in Schwandt, 2001, p. 23), that is, in the discovery of how language is used to communicate vision in great and memorable speeches. In addition to their furthering our understanding of how language can be used to communicate vision, these speeches were chosen for three reasons as follows.

First, a conscious choice was made to delimit the discourse to be analyzed to those delivered in the English language. This delimitation (as described in chapter 1 of this study) was based on the belief that meaning could be lost in the process of translation from the language of delivery into English and that, therefore, the accuracy, utility, and
application of the findings of the analysis could not be validated. Furthermore, for the findings of this study to be useful to a North American audience of leaders, it was important to limit the study to only English-language speeches.

The second reason for choosing these speeches, given this intended audience, was to locate speeches of sufficient gravitas and “recognizability,” delivered by very well-known leader-orators who would be instantly credible as trusted sources on communicating vision, such that any findings from my analysis would appeal to and command the respect of a readership of other leaders. If leaders are to embrace my findings on how to use language to communicate vision, I felt it was critical that the sources of those findings be not only familiar, but trusted leaders with reputations for visions that helped people prevail in troubled times.

Third and finally, the speeches share the element of having been delivered in times of crisis in which great vision was needed: Lincoln and Churchill needed compelling visions to lead their people to victory in wars; Martin Luther King Jr. led a race of people in their quest for equality in a land where equality had been promised in law but not yet delivered in reality; and, finally, Kennedy, the youngest person ever to assume the position of President of the United States, needed a vision that would appeal to a whole, post-war generation in “an hour of national peril” (Kennedy, 1961b) in the midst of the Cold War.

These crisis speeches are relevant to modern times. As Bennis (1996) suggests, “around the globe, humanity currently faces three extraordinary threats: the threat of annihilation as a result of nuclear accident or war; the threat of a worldwide plague or ecological catastrophe; and a deepening leadership crisis in most of our institutions”
In 2011, at the time of this writing, Bennis’s words continue to ring true. The world is recovering from H1N1, there are wars on all continents (direct conflicts or drug wars), fears of terrorism keep many of us awake at night, and we are recovering at great expense from the real possibility of financial collapse due perhaps to greedy and faulty leadership. In much the same way as my four orators faced crises in their times, so too do leaders of today face crises of their own.

Summary

As suggested at the beginning of this chapter, this study depended on having both a conceptual framework of how language works to convey visionary leadership messages and also texts that could be analyzed to demonstrate how language had been used to convey those visionary messages.

This chapter has explored in some detail the conceptual framework of Systemic Functional Linguistics, Genre Theory, and Appraisal Theory that provided the methodology for the analyses. In addition, I have provided my rationale for the selection of the texts that were analyzed. I now turn to a discussion of the results of those analyses. In chapters 4-7 I offer my findings that resulted from the four individual analyses of the four speeches in the data set.
CHAPTER IV

LINCOLN’S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

Background

Abraham Lincoln was born in Kentucky in 1809 but spent his youth in Indiana where he was educated in a one-teacher school. At the age of 21 he moved to Illinois where he was a storekeeper, a militia captain in the Black Hawk War, and postmaster (“Abraham Lincoln,” 2003).

Lincoln privately studied law with borrowed books from a local attorney, was licensed to practice in 1836, and married Mary Todd in 1842. He served in the Illinois General Assembly for 8 years and in the U.S. House of Representatives for one term (1847-49) before his election as the nation's first Republican president in 1860. Lincoln was nominated for the presidency by the Republican Party with Hannibal Hamlin as his running mate. He ran on a platform denouncing disunion and calling for an end to slavery in the territories (Kelly, n.d.[b]).

Lincoln was the serving President during the U.S. Civil War, 1861-1865, a confrontation started when South Carolina seceded from the Union and was followed within 2 months by Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas. While there were many political and economic causes for the war, primary among them was disagreement on slavery. Slavery had been prevalent in the United States since 1619 but, by the end of the American Revolution, most Northern states had abandoned it. Slavery continued to be an important part of the plantation economy of the South and Southern
politicians sought to retain slavery by maintaining control of the federal government. As new states were added to the Union, a series of compromises were arrived at to maintain an equal number of "free" and "slave" states (Hickman, 2010). In an 1862 letter to Horace Greeley, editor of the New York Tribune, Lincoln explained that his “official duty” in the war was to “save the Union” (“Abraham Lincoln,” 2011).

Lincoln served as the 16th American President, serving from 1861 until his death in 1865 when he was assassinated by John Wilkes Booth at Ford’s Theater in Washington, DC (Kelly, n.d.[b]). Lincoln is considered by many scholars to have been the best President. He is credited with holding the Union together and leading the North to victory in the Civil War. Further, his actions and beliefs led to the emancipation of African Americans from slavery (Kelly, n.d.[b]).

It is said of Lincoln that “a leader of weaker will or fainter vision might well have failed either to win the Civil War or end the institution of slavery. With good reason, he is viewed as the savior of the American Union and the Great Emancipator (“Abraham Lincoln,” 2003).

One of the most famous and most important Civil War battles occurred over 3 days, July 1 to July 3, 1863, around the small town of Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. It began as a skirmish, but by its end involved 160,000 Americans. Confederate forces under Robert E. Lee had moved north in an effort to win a dramatic victory for the South. They fought in Gettysburg against the Union army under the command of George C. Meade and, before the fighting had ended, the two sides had suffered more than 45,000 casualties. Lee, having lost more than a third of his men, retreated, causing the Battle of Gettysburg to become a turning point in the American Civil War (Basler, 1946).
On November 19, 1863, President Abraham Lincoln (1946) delivered a short address to commemorate a new cemetery in Gettysburg. He had been invited to give a “few appropriate remarks” (Appleman, 1942) commemorating the opening of part of the battlefield in Gettysburg as a cemetery for the “champions of Slavery and Freedom who [had] met there in deadly strife” (New York Times, 1863, as cited in Braden, 1988) 4 months previously. The President’s speech was one of several events of the day, including the performance of the funeral dirge by the military band, an “eloquent prayer” by the Rev. Mr. Stockton, and the delivery of a speech by Edward Everett (the then-President of Harvard University, whom some considered the greatest living American orator) who spoke for 2 hours (Braden, 1988)—and whose remarks were “listened to with marked attention throughout” by the approximately 15,000-person audience (New York Times, 1863, as cited in Braden, 1988).

Lincoln’s 10-sentence, 269-word commemoration speech was over almost before it started, with at least one listener complaining that the President had barely commenced when he stopped (Basler, 1946). In fact, Lincoln concluded his remarks even before the official photographer could get his equipment into place; the only photograph of the event shows a forest of stovepipe hats with the President somewhere in their midst (Braden, 1988). Many didn’t “get” the speech: The journalist from the Harrisburg Patriot and Union referred to Lincoln’s “silly remarks” noting how they were “dull and commonplace” (p. 82).

Despite its brevity and the confusion it caused at the time, the Gettysburg Address has endured as perhaps the most memorable of all American political speeches; from my experiences with school children in the United States, many can recite it and, I believe,
any English-speaking person who hears the opening of the Address (*Four score and seven years ago*) would likely be able to identify it. Rudy Giuliani (2001), former Mayor of New York, in his farewell speech on December 27, 2001, quoted verbatim the full *Gettysburg Address*, a fact which Baldoni (2003) suggested was an attempt “to place the suffering of New York into the panorama of the American people’s enduring legacy of sacrifice for ideals larger than themselves” (p. 22).

Why has the Gettysburg Address endured to be quoted a century and a half since it was spoken? Lincoln might better be remembered for the Emancipation Proclamation of 1863 in which he set free the slaves over whom the U.S. Civil War was fought. Or, alternatively, he might be remembered for the 13th Amendment to the Constitution that banned slavery and involuntary service (other than military service) anywhere in the U.S. It is hoped that the analysis that follows will shed some light on how the Address has become so closely associated with visionary speech.

**Analysis**

This section begins with an examination of the context of situation (field, tenor, and mode) of the Address, followed by the findings of my linguistic analysis on how language use enabled Lincoln’s text to be memorably visionary and how it engaged his listener-followers in that vision; this latter section is organized around the benchmark features of a vision as recommended in the leadership literature.

**Context of Situation**

At first examination, Lincoln’s remarks could be seen to be in the **field** of “cemetery dedication” or perhaps “mournful acknowledgement of heroic death”—such is,
however, not the case for long, as the text quickly shifts into the field of political
discourse, starting with the conjunction but (6). That is, ideationally, the speech shifts
from one of dedication to political discourse at line 6.

There is nothing at the beginning of the President’s address even to indicate that
his remarks will be commemorative in nature. The funeral dirge (Braden, 1988) will have
been a familiar and appropriate piece of music to play at a cemetery commemoration.
Similarly, the prayer offered by Rev. T. Stockton, chaplain of the U.S. Senate, was
appropriate for a cemetery commemoration, described as being “a soulful entreaty for the
nation to remember that ‘in the freshness of their young and manly life, with such sweet
memories of father and mother, brother and sister, wife and children, maiden and friends,
they died for us’” (LaFantasie, 1995, p. 79). Even Edward Everett’s 2-hour speech, which
“soared in rhetorical flourish as he reviewed the history of the Battle of Gettysburg within
the context of the great battles of the ages” (LaFantasie, 1995, p. 79), was recognizable as
a cemetery commemoration.

Lincoln, however, starts with his now-famous Four score and seven years ago (1)
which, despite its biblical language, is not recognizably the beginning of an appropriate
speech with which to dedicate a cemetery (if such a template does indeed exist). It is only
in the second (great battlefield of that war) and third sentences (we have come to
dedicate) that Lincoln indicates the purpose of his speech. However, despite having
identified the purpose of the speech as a cemetery dedication, Lincoln stops mid-way (6)
and diverts to saying that while we cannot do so in a fashion that in any way meets the
devotion shown by the fallen, yet we (the living, 9) can still contribute to preserving the
Union by being dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced (9).

From this point in the speech until its conclusion, the tenor of the discourse dramatically changes; Lincoln is demanding action from his audience—he wants them/us to continue the soldiers’ work and, in doing so, to implement his vision of preserving the Union. Lincoln’s attitude towards that work, and our obligation to continue it, is made clear by the lack of marked modals in the text, that is, no intermediate zone (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) between yes and no, just yes to his vision. There is also no hesitation evident in Lincoln’s remarks—no I think or in my view—to dilute his attitudes. This is a man in power, who holds the floor and who wants to convince his audience of something. Lincoln needs to persuade the Union to keep up the fight—and does so through the conviction of his position and through his language choices at Gettysburg.

According to Lincoln’s remarks, the men who had fought at Gettysburg had done their work for democracy; it was now time for the living (9) to take up their task of preserving the Union. Lincoln needed both to memorialize the dead and revitalize the meaning of democracy for the living. While the Declaration of Independence referred to the proposition that all men are created equal, the drafters of the document were thought not to have included slaves in their definition. Lincoln disagreed with that interpretation and read into the Constitution’s promise of equality the proposition that all men are created equal, including slaves. Testing that understanding was the reason men lost their lives at Gettysburg (Basler, 1946).

Lincoln’s objective was then to do two things in his remarks: to commemorate the past and to envision the future by enlisting his audience in the ongoing cause of
democracy. In that he had only his words with which to achieve his objectives, language was constituitive of the social activity and the only tool at hand for Lincoln to use to make his meanings clear. To achieve his objectives, Lincoln took the theme dearest to his audience at the dedication of the cemetery, honor for their heroic dead sons and fathers, and combined it with the theme nearest his own heart, the preservation of democracy. Out of this double theme grew his poetic metaphor of birth, death, and spiritual rebirth, of the life of man and the life of the nation (Basler, 1946).

To convey his political message of rebirth and rededication to democracy, Lincoln changes fields, moving elegantly from dedicating a portion of the battlefield as a cemetery for fallen heroes to saying that he/we cannot (4) do so. The turning point in the text occurs at sentence 6 in which Lincoln uses the textual choices of parallelism and repetition (we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground) to reinforce his point about the need for the work of freedom that has thus far been so nobly advanced (9) by those who fought at Gettysburg to continue. From this point on, the rest of the speech is pure political discourse, a call to arms for the living to be dedicated . . . to the unfinished work by fighting for the cause for which they gave their last full measure of devotion (8), freedom. Lincoln utilizes the social activity of dedicating a cemetery to generate a renewed fervor in the fight against slavery.

Looking in more detail at the tenor of the discourse, in the absence of appropriate vocatives (Ladies and gentlemen . . . or Distinguished members . . .), there are no clear signals to tell us who Lincoln is addressing at Gettysburg—we might reasonably assume that the President was addressing only those present onsite. Lincoln will, however, have been aware that there were journalists in the audience covering the event and reporting it
in their respective newspapers. In a number of cases, the newspapers reported Lincoln’s comments verbatim (Braden, 1988). We cannot know whether the President deliberately kept his remarks short to allow verbatim reporting—in contrast to the norm of the day for the genre of public speeches to be of very long duration—we can only note that his speech in its entirety reached audiences far beyond the 15,000 people assembled at Gettysburg (Braden, 1988).

Among this larger audience will certainly have been Americans of all geographic regions of the country, including, and perhaps especially, those in the South against whom the North was fighting. The tenor relationship of a leader speaking to listener-followers is also appropriate for this larger, extended audience because Lincoln uses the Gettysburg dedication ceremony to persuade the immediate audience and, via the print media, others, that *the proposition that all men are created equal* (1) is worth fighting for. By 1863, the country was no doubt weary of the divisive war; Lincoln knew that he must dispel the gloom and feelings of hopelessness and restore the belief in the federal government expressed by the forefathers. At Gettysburg, Lincoln hoped to stir the resolves of the Unionists to continue the struggle to save the nation, free the slaves, and prove that a nation *so conceived and so dedicated can long endure* (2) (Basler, 1946, p. 87).

Looking at the mode of the text, we know from others who worked with Lincoln that the Gettysburg Address was written in advance of its delivery (Basler, 1946). There is, however, considerable controversy over which version of the speech is the original; two of the five hand-written “original” copies of the Address compete for that honor. Other hand-written copies were created by Lincoln in response to requests for “originals.”
In these, Lincoln added and subtracted text in each subsequent “original,” thereby continuing to craft the Address long after it was delivered (Basler, 1946).

There are, in all, five manuscript copies of Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address in his handwriting (Appleman, 1942). The first speech was written in Washington or en route on the train to Gettysburg. Certain revisions in the wording were made by Lincoln at Gettysburg on the evening of his arrival there. These were incorporated into a second copy which was written out by him the following morning. In the spoken version, which seems to have been delivered from memory, Lincoln added the words *under God* (8) and they were incorporated by him in subsequent manuscript copies of the speech (Appleman, 1942).

Although the text was written to be spoken, Lincoln most likely would have written it while also speaking it aloud. We know from his contemporaries that the President was in the habit of reading aloud; asked why, he said: “I catch the idea by two senses, for when I read aloud I hear what is read and I see it; and hence two senses get it and I remember it better” (Basler, 1946, p. 47). Lincoln probably both wrote and spoke his speech as it was being created, punctuating for pause and emphasis as one accustomed to speaking rather than writing for print. He breaks sentences into clauses and phrases sometimes to the point of fragmentation, creating the rhythm and cadence of this “prose poem” (Basler, 1946).

**Features of an Effective Vision**

As suggested above, Lincoln used the occasion of a cemetery commemoration to express his political vision. The following outlines how the speech meets the benchmark features of an effective vision; the chapter is organized under benchmark features which
head each section, and there is a summary of my analysis and the full text of the speech in Appendix A. For each benchmark feature, I explain how Lincoln’s language—that is, linguistic resources—realizes the benchmark feature; these linguistic analyses are also in Appendix A.

The Gettysburg Address is distinct from the other speeches that were analyzed for this study in a number of ways, not the least of which is its short length. The text is an elegant and poetic metaphor of birth, death, and spiritual rebirth, of the life of man and the life of the nation (Basler, 1946) in which, because it contains only 269 words, each of these words must perform several duties in the making of meaning and in the expression of Lincoln’s vision.

Given its elegance and recognizability, it was surprising to find that the Gettysburg Address does not contain all the elements that the literature suggests be present for a vision to be effective. There are, in fact, a number of sub-themes of the benchmark features that do not appear in the Gettysburg Address or are weak in their representation. For example, despite the literature recommending that a common enemy be defined in the vision, Lincoln makes no such explicit mention for reasons that are hypothesized below. Lincoln uses only intrinsic motivators to compel his listener-followers to commit to and implement his vision; there are no extrinsic motivators, those that originate from outside the listener-followers in the text. Lincoln also does not explicitly express the urgency of his vision, although I will argue that urgency is alluded to in Lincoln’s use of a nominalization as discussed below. And, finally and perhaps most surprisingly, Lincoln makes no references to how the audience can participate in
implementing the *unfinished work* (9) or *the great task* (10), save that the audience should (10) *take increased devotion* to it.

**Benchmark: Issuing a Challenge**

Lincoln’s *goal* was to ensure that the Union was victorious in the Civil War and that the principles for which the Union stood (*liberty . . . proposition that all men are created equal*) (1) were preserved. Lincoln had told a Chicago audience in 1858 that the *proposition that all men are created equal* was “the electric cord that links the hearts of patriotic and liberty loving men together, that will link those patriotic hearts as long as love of freedom exists in the minds of men throughout the world” (Braden, 1988, p. 86).

He makes this goal clear when he refers to the endurance of that nation (*can long endure*, 2) and the continuing life of the nation (*that that nation might live*, 2). He calls on his audience to embrace his goal, to *be dedicated to the unfinished work . . . they so nobly advanced* (9) and to *take increased devotion to that cause* (10) so that the nation can have *a new birth of freedom* (10).

Lincoln uses the textual resources of parallelism, repetition, alliteration, and juxtaposition to convey his goal in a way that will be memorable. Repetition of sounds and words is a marked characteristic of his style; one associate noted that Lincoln used to bore him “terribly by his . . . [explaining] things that needed no explanation [because] he wanted to be understood by the common people” (Basler, 1946, p. 44). In deliberately seeking the emphasis and simplicity that would prove effective with the common man, Lincoln played with memorable phrases, turning them over and over in his mind, and resorted to repetition to drive them home to his audiences (Basler, 1946). In all, there were many repetitions of three words: *we* (10 instances in the text), 3 instances of *they*,
and 3 of here. I assume that these repetitions are not only to ease memorization; Lincoln wanted to make the distinction of what we say here compared to what they did here to convince his audience to carry on with more “doing.”

Lincoln also uses alliteration, another linguistic device that makes a poem appeal to the ear. For example, the “l” sound in the world will little note nor long remember (6) and the “p” sound in our poor power (5) are both evident. He also uses several instances of the poetic device of juxtaposition, positioning two opposing thoughts in the same clause as follows: what we say here . . . they did here, 8; we cannot consecrate . . . they [already] consecrated, 6; final resting place, 4, vs. we the living . . . (continue) the unfinished work, 9 (that is, they rest, we work); our devotion (to continue) . . . their last full measure of devotion already given, 10; shall not have died in vain . . . nation shall have a new birth, 10. This juxtaposition serves at least two purposes: It points out how unworthy our contribution to date is compared to that of the fallen soldiers and it increases the ease of memorization of the text—we can predict what might follow one thought by assuming what might be juxtaposed to it.

Through the act of commemorating the Gettysburg cemetery for the fallen soldiers who gave their lives that that nation might live (4), Lincoln refers to the sacrifices that have already been made to preserve the Union and its principles. He notes that it is altogether fitting and proper (5) that the audience should commemorate the cemetery but hastens to note that the living cannot dedicate, cannot consecrate, cannot hallow this ground (6) to the same extent as those honored dead (10) who gave the last full measure of devotion (10), giving their lives that that nation might live (4). The mention of what the soldiers did—died for the cause—juxtaposed with the limits of what
the audience is able in their turn to do—being dedicated to the great task remaining before (10) them—is compelling evidence for a commitment on the part of the living to do what they can to participate in the vision, that is, act to ensure that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth (10).

I was interested to note that in issuing his challenge to his listener-followers Lincoln does not call for change or growth or movement to a different future—he calls only for the maintenance of that which already exists, that is, the Union and the founding principles of liberty, freedom, and all men are created equal. In calling for a new birth of freedom (10), Lincoln asks his listener-followers to re-commit to those founding principles despite the fact that, by the time of the Gettysburg Address, a number of Southern states had already seceded from the Union (“Ordinances of Secession,” 2009).

Despite the recommendations in the literature that an effective vision contain both intrinsic and extrinsic motivators, there are also only intrinsic motivators, those that come from within a person, in the speech. These intrinsic motivators are realized through the communication of values that the audience would recognize intuitively as being shared, values that will motivate them to implement the vision. I will only touch on these shared values here but will discuss how language is used to realize them below.

One such shared value Lincoln mentions, for example, refers to our fathers (1), an intertextual reference to the founding fathers of the nation and the revered values that are foundational to the creation of the United States. Other shared values provide similar intrinsic motivation: liberty (1) all men are created equal (1)—a key value from the Declaration of Independence with which the audience would have been familiar. Similarly Lincoln refers to freedom (10) and God (10), this latter reference suggesting
that God sanctions the preservation of the Union, a reference that should also motivate the audience to participate in the great task (10). Lincoln’s final motivator is his reference to government of the people, by the people, for the people (10). This phrase which is a now famous reference to the U.S. system of government was coined by Lincoln; it does not appear in either the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution although it reflects both these foundational documents and will be understood by the listener-followers—both those who were contemporaries of Lincoln and subsequent generations—as a motivating force.

These intrinsic motivators are all in the appraisal theory category of judgment: positive, that is, they enable Lincoln to convey his approbation of the shared values to his listeners-followers. While his audience will not have been privy to the resources of appraisal theory, they will know instinctively that liberty and freedom are good and worthy of being maintained; sharing this stance will encourage action of their part to implement the vision. Lincoln’s use of appraisal resources to realize shared values is discussed in the section below on the benchmark feature of shared values.

**Benchmark: Vision as Destination**

No new destination is presented in Lincoln’s vision; instead, Lincoln reminds his audience of the nation’s intended and existing destination—the foundational principles of the Union such as freedom, liberty, and all men are created equal—that are in jeopardy if the Union is not preserved (that is, if the North does not persevere in its dedication—to the great task, the unfinished work, the new birth of freedom—and if it allows the South to win the Civil War). Lincoln calls on his listener-followers, not to undertake a journey
to a new destination, but to return—with resolve (10)—to the destination on which the
nation embarked in the hands of the founding fathers (10).

**Benchmark: Shared Values**

Lincoln’s speech is replete with shared values and is rich in moral overtones.

The following shared values would have been instantly recognized by Lincoln’s
audience as the nation’s founding principles, the same principles that may be in jeopardy
unless all are dedicated to the unfinished work (9) of preserving the Union: liberty;
proposition that all men are created equal, 1; that nation so conceived, 1; endurance
(endure, 2); the continuing of that nation (that that nation might live, 4); dedicat[ion],
consecrate[ion], hallow[ing], 6; devotion, 10; and freedom, 10. The vision that Lincoln
communicates to his audience is the preservation of these principles which the audience
will recognize as being worthwhile and important.

Lincoln draws on the resources of appraisal to communicate his stance that these
values are good and worthy. As noted briefly above, Lincoln utilizes the resources of
judgment: positive to realize shared values and thereby communicate his stance of what is
good and worthy to his listener-followers. Examples of positive judgment conveying a
favorable stance include: all men are created equal, 1; that nation might live, 4; brave
men, living and dead, 7; what they did here, 8; and these honored dead, 10. Another
example of positive judgment occurs in sentence 5: it is altogether fitting and proper.
This phrase is reminiscent of the phrase It is very meet right and our bounden duty from
the Common Book of Prayer, a text that would have been familiar to Lincoln and his
audiences.
In addition to judging behavior and thereby conveying his stance on it, Lincoln also utilizes the appraisal resources of appreciation to judge things; the resources of appreciation used by Lincoln are always in the positive: He does not refer negatively to anything in the text. Our fathers, a new nation, equal (1) battlefield (2), dedication (to dedicate (4), ask (10), and new birth of freedom (10) are all appreciation: positive. Through using only these in the positive resources of appreciation, Lincoln conveys how strongly he favors these shared values.

Additionally, the things Lincoln refers to (nation, 1; battlefield, 3, etc.) are often amplified using augmentation resources. Nation (1), for example, is amplified to a new nation, perhaps to denote that the nation is special and unequaled in the world. Battlefield is depicted as a great battlefield (2), denoting its importance as a Northern victory over those who would break up the Union. Never (8) is an amplification that provides a juxtaposition to little note nor long remember to reinforce the point of the difference between what the dead so nobly (9) did at Gettysburg and what the living have yet to do.

There are also moral overtones in the Address, including: gave their lives, 4; nobly, 9; these honored dead, 10; shall not have died in vain, 10; and this nation under God, 10. This latter reference, according to Lazar and Lazar (2004), is a particularly appropriate statement. Given Lincoln’s intent to rally support to his vision, including spiritual expressions in the text “to indicate that ‘we’ are on the side of the good” (Lazar & Lazar, 2004, p. 232) is an effective way of expressing morality.

Another phrase, Four score and seven years ago (1), seems also to be another means of introducing spirituality as moral overtone; it could be seen as a potential, although indirect, reference to a biblical passage from Ps 90: “the days of our lives are
three score and 10,” a reference intended to be understood as a shared value by the Christians in the audience.

The resources of appraisal are also utilized to realize moral overtones, especially judgment: positive. These positive judgment statements in the text—including the brave men, 7; so nobly advanced, 9, and these honored dead, 10—allow Lincoln to present the stance that he judges in a positive light what the soldiers who struggled (7) at Gettysburg, both the living and dead (7), did and do communicate that those who are still living (9) should continue their work.

**Benchmark: Shared Hopes and Dreams**

Lincoln’s text also contains rich examples of the hopes and dreams he and his listener-followers share.

Regarding the feature of communicating some emotion in a vision, Lincoln’s text is not blatantly emotional in nature and no appraisal resources of affect are present in the text. This may be because Lincoln suffered from depression throughout his life (Shenk, 2005) and may not have been able or used to using the resources of affect because of the apathy that depression can cause. However, Lincoln’s emotional involvement in the remarks is not in question: The country and its President were well aware the battle resulted in the tragic loss of 45,000 American lives and that brother continued to fight brother over the proposition that all men are created equal (1). The audience, both present at Gettysburg and the larger audience of listener-followers, will know instinctively that the commemoration of a war cemetery is an emotion-filled event without Lincoln having to utilize the appraisal resources of affect. Furthermore, as
suggested by Ferrari (2007), the metaphor of birth, death, and re-birth may generate emotion in Lincoln’s audiences.

Lincoln does however convey emotion when he implies that the U.S. is being tested (*testing whether . . . can endure*, 2) and when he speaks of the dead, saying that we are unworthy of their sacrifice (*we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground*, 6). Similarly, Lincoln conjures up emotion when he refers to the work of preserving the Union as being noble (*they so nobly advanced*, 9). His audiences will recognize *noble* as a statement of positive stance in which Lincoln claims the work of the fallen and the ongoing work of the living is worthy. Lincoln also adds emotional elements to his speech when he speaks of our need for *increased devotion* (10) to finish their work (*the great task remaining before us*, 10) so that *they shall not have died in vain* (10). These instances of *amplification: augmentation* allow Lincoln to inject positive evaluation of the work being done and yet to be completed by the living.

Emotion is also realized in many of the processes Lincoln uses as he draws on the resources of *amplification: enrichment*, words enriched with an attitudinal coloring when a core, neutral word could have been used (Eggins & Slade, 1997). Lincoln speaks, for example, of the brave men who *struggled* (7) at Gettysburg. In a clause in which *men who fought* or *men who did battle* would have sufficed, Lincoln adds enriched interpersonal meaning and emotion to the soldiers’ efforts. In similar fashion, Lincoln speaks of a nation that *can long endure* (2), a process that denotes struggle (as opposed to, for instance, how he might have stated it without emotion, saying *a nation that can long exist*).
Finally, in speaking of the civil war as testing (2) whether the U.S. can survive, Lincoln enriches the process by adding an element of competition to what otherwise would have been a bland process, for example, determining, deciding, etc. The Declaration refers to all men are created equal as a self-evident truth, not a proposition that is still in doubt and which hangs in the balance at the time of the commemoration of the Gettysburg cemetery. The addition of an element of competition through the use of testing suggests that one side will win, one will lose. Raising this possibility of failure is a way for Lincoln to reinforce his message of what the living must continue to do or risk losing all the values, those self-evident truths that are shared by Northerners.

Lincoln also builds inclusiveness in this text, creating an us-ness with his listener-followers and distinguishing that us from them, those who gave the last full measure of devotion (10) and are buried at Gettysburg. Lincoln also builds his concept of us-ness by not separating himself from his audience, eschewing the first-person singular pronoun (I) in his speech. Instead Lincoln speaks only in terms of we and our to refer to himself and his audience, we the living (9). There are numerous instances of we and our as follows in the text: we are engaged, 2; we are met, 3; we have come, 4; we should do so, 5; we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground, 6; our poor power, 7; what we say here, 8; us the living, 9; us, us, we, we, this nation under God, 10.

From an ideational point of view, Lincoln also uses processes and participants to distinguish between them and us. But Lincoln’s categorization of us and them is unusual. Instead of categorizing them as the Other (Lazar & Lazar, 2004) or as a common enemy who must be defeated, Lincoln positions us as the living (9) and them as those who here gave their lives that that nation might live (4). The division of us and them is, however,
no less deliberate than it would be if Lincoln were identifying a common enemy. He
wants the living to be motivated to do what they can to continue the unfinished work that
they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced (9). By distinguishing between the
living and the dead, and by noting the difference in their level of contribution, Lincoln is
almost shaming his listener-followers into implementing his vision.

Regarding participants, Lincoln speaks to both the assembled guests and
audiences beyond those present at the cemetery to hear his speech and speaks of four
main sets of participants: we (i.e., the audience who has assembled at Gettysburg to
dedicate the cemetery), a group of participants who engage mostly in material/behavioral
and projecting processes, such as are met, 3; have come to dedicate, 4; and resolve, 10;
we (those who believe in the proposition that all men are created equal), a group that
performs projecting processes such as is engaged, 2; and testing (2); and they (the
soldiers who fought and those who died), who were engaged in mostly material processes
such as are struggling, 7; have consecrated, 7; and gave their lives, 4.

The fourth main group of participants is less easily identified in the text but has a
very important role to play; this group becomes evident in Lincoln’s personification of
the nation (1)—the United States—and the world (8). To the personified nation and
world, Lincoln attributes projecting/verbal, projecting/mental, and material abilities
which are usually available only to humans. He speaks of the nation as having been
conceived, 1, and dedicated, 2, and refers to how it might live, 4; have a new birth of
freedom, 10; and endure, 2.

In making this distinction between us, the nation, and the world engaging in
projecting processes and them engaging in material processes, Lincoln differentiates
between what we can say or think and what they can and did do (8). Nowhere is this
distinction more apparent than in sentence 4 in which Lincoln notes that, despite the fact
that he and the audiences have assembled to dedicate—a material/behavioral or
projecting process—a portion of the Gettysburg field as a cemetery, we (6) cannot
dedicate, cannot consecrate, and cannot hallow—all projecting and material processes in
this context—this ground; the men who fought and died—both material processes—have
already done so far above our poor power (7). Here Lincoln juxtaposes what we say here
with what they did here and, clearly, the soldiers who gave their lives have made a much
greater contribution. The use of material processes to depict the soldiers’ extreme
contribution is the platform from which Lincoln’s call to arms (to continue their work)
springs in the subsequent sentences. The soldiers (they) have done their (mostly material)
work—notably giving their lives—on behalf of democracy; it is now the time for us to
continue their work by dedicating ourselves to the principles of democracy. Lincoln may
use the largely mental processes in the latter part of the Address with a slightly different
meaning being conveyed; one can dedicate a cemetery in a behavioral or mental fashion
(via perhaps a speech or sod-turning ceremony) but we must dedicate ourselves (in a
strictly material sense via our future doings) to fighting for democracy to match the
contributions of the fallen soldiers.

Given Lincoln’s clear depiction of us-ness, one might expect a similarly clear
expression of them in the text. While Lincoln does refer to them as the brave men, living
and dead, who struggled here (7) and who gave the last full measure of devotion (10), he
makes no explicit reference to a common enemy. The only mentions of an enemy are
imPLICIT in the text: Lincoln speaks of great battlefield and war (3), both of which imply
an enemy, one who need not be named as the opponents in the war would be easily understood and identifiable by the audience.

It is difficult to assess whether the feature of commitment and enthusiasm is part of the text. In fact, there is some doubt whether Lincoln himself felt he had conveyed enthusiasm for his vision: In a letter to speaker Edward Everett, in response to the latter’s congratulatory note following the address, Lincoln wrote that he was pleased to know that, in Everett’s judgment, “the little I did say was not entirely a failure” (Basler, 1946, p. 737). Lincoln was not happy with his remarks; he is reported to have said to his friend Ward Lamon, who was the Marshall for the day’s events, that the speech was “a flat failure” and that it “fell upon the audience like a wet blanket” (Braden, 1988, p. 81).

But another way in which Lincoln uses language to realize his commitment to his vision is through the appraisal resources of engagement: proclaim with which he excludes voices and stances other than his own from the text. The only other voice to enter the Gettysburg Address is that of the fathers who brought forth a new nation (1):

This intertextual reference to the Declaration of Independence allows Lincoln to allude to those values on which the nation was founded. Far from being an intrusion into the text, the intertextual reference enables Lincoln to reinforce his stance that those founding values—to which he and, he hopes, his listener-followers are still strongly committed—are still worthy of increased devotion (10). Lincoln’s commitment is also expressed via Mood: the Address is delivered in the declarative Mood only, with minor variation to include the infinitive (to be dedicated here, 9) serving as an implied imperative (you, be dedicated). In addition to Mood realizing Lincoln’s commitment, the absence of modality as discussed above ensures that the listener-followers understand that there is no
intermediate zone in Lincoln’s vision (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004), that he is very sure of his stance.

Two other linguistic features enable Lincoln to realize his commitment to his vision: repetition and amplification: augmentation. The first of these, repetition, occurs most predominantly in line 6 in which Lincoln states that we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. Lincoln uses this resource to reinforce his point that what the soldiers at Gettysburg gave their lives for, that is, that that nation might live (4), is surely worth the increased devotion (10) of his listener-follower. The second of these linguistic features, amplification: augmentation, enables Lincoln to modify and qualify his statements, thereby adding reinforcement to his message. Examples of amplification: augmentation in the text include: a great civil war (2), in which great is denoting wide scope rather than positive appreciation for the war; the brave men, living and dead (7), in which living and dead enables Lincoln to honor all the soldiers who struggled (7) at Gettysburg rather than noting only those who gave the last full measure of devotion (10) for whom the cemetery is being dedicated; and the world will little note nor long remember (8) what is said at the commemoration, to augment the worthiness of the next part of the sentence, what they did here (8). A final example, we here highly resolve (10), serves to show how amplification: augmentation reinforces Lincoln’s commitment to his vision.

Another linguistic resource used by Lincoln to communicate his commitment is his use of shall instead of will in his final sentence: these dead shall not have died in vain, that this nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish (10). Both shall and will are
modal auxiliaries used to construct the future tense, yet *shall* is the less common of the two and used only in the first-person singular and plural to denote intention (Quirk & Greenbaum, 1990, p. 54). *Shall* also conveys an exhortation (Fowler, 1984) when *will* could just as easily have been used; by using *shall* Lincoln’s statements take on a sense of insistence and need for pressing action.

One further note on commitment and enthusiasm in the Gettysburg Address: In commenting on this feature of an effective vision I am limited by not being able to analyze audio recordings of the four speeches (despite having access to three out of the four speeches) from which perhaps to judge enthusiasm by the tone of the speaker’s voice or audience reaction and can rely only on the outcome of the speech to judge commitment, that is, Did the vision as expressed in the speech get implemented? To answer this question, we have to look at the speech from the perspective of history and judge it as having sufficient commitment and enthusiasm that the Union was indeed preserved and the North was victorious. And, despite Lincoln’s contention that *the world will little note nor long remember what we say here* (8), the text has become a memorable icon of visionary speeches. The Gettysburg Address “has become one of the most widely known recitations in the English language and has gained the reputation as the most recognized American speech” (Braden, 1988, p. 85).

**Benchmark: Spans Timelines**

Despite the brevity of the speech Lincoln manages to make reference to *timelines*, elegantly incorporating mention of the past, the present, and the future in the text.

The **past** is represented as two time periods: the far past and the recent past through the mention of two generations in the speech; for the far past, the generation of
the American Revolution (our fathers and four score and seven years ago, 1); and, for the more recent past, the battle at Gettysburg (the brave men . . . who struggled . . . have consecrated, 7; they gave, 10; and they nobly advanced, 10.

The present is constructed by now we are engaged, 2; we [are] testing, 2; we are met, 3; we have come to dedicate, 4; it is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this, 5; and we here highly resolve, 10.

The future is expressed as follows: the world will little note nor long remember . . . it can never forget, 8; through an ellipsis: we [will] take increased devotion, 10; these dead shall not have died in vain, 10; through the use of the infinitive denoting the future, to be dedicated, 10; and, finally, government . . . shall not perish, 10. Lincoln also may also be referring to future generations in parts of the world other than the United States when he refers to any nation so conceived and so dedicated, 2.

Benchmark: Contains Imagery

Lincoln is able to weave imagery into his text, again despite the few words he uses to express his vision. He speaks, for example, in picture words of the Gettysburg cemetery being the final resting place (4) of those who died there and, when speaking of those dead soldiers, he says that they struggled (7) and gave their last full measure of devotion (10). On the issue of his vision, preserving the Union, Lincoln refers to the great task (10) yet to be accomplished and calls for participation of all in ensuring new birth of freedom (10). Nowhere does Lincoln refer to the Union or the North by name; instead he conjures up images of a nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal (1), a nation in which government of the people, by the people and for the people (10) is a cherished value worthy of being maintained. Lincoln also
refers to a symbol, the capstone of his political philosophy (Braden, 1988), when he makes reference to the Declaration of Independence in his allusion to *four score and seven years ago* (1). Lincoln uses two categories of resources from appraisal theory to create imagery in his text: *amplification: augmentation* (amplifying an attitudinal meaning; Eggins & Slade, 1997) and *amplification: enrichment* (the addition of attitudinal coloring to a word; Eggins & Slade, 1997).

In the first case, that of the use of *amplification: augmentation*, Lincoln enhances his nouns with qualifiers and modifiers that add imagery to the text. Examples of *amplification: augmentation* include the following: *a great civil war, 2; great battlefield, 3; brave men, living and dead, 7; far above, 8; great task, 10; increased devotion, 10; and last full measure, 10*. Lincoln also uses the resources of *amplification: augmentation* in adverbs that add imagery such as: *can long endure, 2; highly resolve, 10; little note nor long remember, 8; and some of his processes including shall, shall, shall, 10*. This use of *shall* (rather than *will*) amplifies Lincoln’s conveyance of his vision that the North shall be victorious, that the Union shall be preserved, and that, therefore, *the dead shall not have died in vain* (10).

Lincoln’s use of the resources of *amplification: enrichment* further enable him to communicate his vision in vivid imagery in such examples as: *struggled, 7; this nation under God, 10; and perish, 10*, instances of lexical choices that are colored with meaning where more neutral words (perhaps *fought, this nation*—without the religious reference—and *died*) could have also been used. Again, this *amplification* further conveys Lincoln’s vision to his listener-followers.
Circumstances also play a role in creating imagery in the Address. Using Butt et al.’s (2000) categorization of circumstances, I identified the following in the text: on this continent, 1 (circumstance of location); on a great battlefield, 3 (location); here, 4 (location); here, 7 (location); far above our power, 7 (extent); here, 8, and here, 8 (location); here, 9 (location); thus far, 9 (extent); and here, 10 (location). Lincoln’s use of circumstances of location and extent enable him to situate his vision in the here and now. In doing so, and doing so with such an economy of words, Lincoln engages his listener-followers in the present and the present need for continuing action to preserve the Union and the principles of the founding fathers (1).

There are, in my mind, two more noteworthy usages of circumstances in the Address. The first, under God (10), would normally be construed as a circumstance of location, but this is an unusual usage, with the meaning residing more along the lines of governed by God than a circumstance of location. These two words were of sufficient importance to Lincoln that they were added either in a revised, written draft of the Address on the day of its delivery, or he added them on the spot and wrote the words into the text at some point following the delivery of his speech (Appleman, 1942). Lincoln’s use of under in this phrase may indicate his profound religious beliefs and may speak less of location than of the assumption that “doing democracy” is God’s work. The second noteworthy use of circumstances occurs in sentence 10 in which Lincoln speaks of government of the people, by the people and for the people. In using these circumstances—all three of which are of Butt et al.’s (2000) cause type (which answer the questions why? And what for? p. 65)—Lincoln defines democracy. This short burst
of circumstances then becomes, not only one of the most defining phrases of the speech, but also a memorable definition of a democratic system of government.

There is furthermore no tentativeness and no hedging in the Address to dilute the imagery. All the sentences are in the declarative Mood, although some appear to be implied imperatives (which are stronger conveyances of Lincoln’s vision than the declaratives they seem to be). Examples of implied imperatives include: *It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this* (that is, implying *you, do this, 5*); *we cannot dedicate* (implying *you, do not dedicate*), *we cannot consecrate* (you must not consecrate), *we cannot hallow* (you must not hallow) this ground (6); the world . . . can (must) never forget what they did here (8) and, *It is for us the living rather to be dedicated here* (must be dedicated, 9).

Additionally, in his use of only the resources of *engagement: proclamation*, Lincoln does not entertain any other voices or alternate stances in his Address. Lincoln speaks with singular authority when he says *we have come* (4), *we should do this* (5), and *this nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom* (10). Lincoln does not, for example, say that *some might suggest it is for us the living rather to be dedicated here* (9); doing so would permit some doubt to penetrate Lincoln’s remarks which would then “water down” his vision, a possibility Lincoln will not entertain.

Finally, there is only one instance of the appraisal resources of *amplification: mitigation* in the text when Lincoln refers to those who fought at Gettysburg *have consecrated* the land for the cemetery *far above our poor power to add or detract* (7). By saying *our poor power* (7), Lincoln downplays the role of the audience and himself compared to the role of *those brave men, living and dead, who struggled here* (7).
mitigating the role of himself and his audience, Lincoln augments the role of those who
struggled and, in doing so, suggests strongly that the audience—and indeed the audiences
beyond the immediate commemoration ceremony—must carry on the soldiers’ unfinished
work (9). Lincoln’s vision is rock solid; he does not weaken it with words that will
mitigate the strength of his message to his listener-followers.

**Benchmark: Suggests Means to Implement**

Lincoln makes no specific references to how the audience can participate in
implementing his vision, referring only to unfinished work (9) and the great task (10).
The only suggestion of a request to support Lincoln’s vision by implementing it occurs in
line 10 in which Lincoln suggests that all be here dedicated to the great task remaining
before us and that all take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last
full measure of devotion (10). By making these statements with the resources of
engagement: proclaim, Lincoln allows no other voices or opinions to enter his text. In
this way he presents only one option to his listener-followers: take increased devotion (10)
to act on the vision to preserve the Union.

**Benchmark: Expresses Urgency**

Similarly, Lincoln does not explicitly express the urgency of his vision. He does,
however, speak of a new birth of freedom (10), the re-birth part of his metaphor of life
(our fathers brought forth, 1), death (at Gettysburg) and new birth (10). Lincoln’s use of
the nominalization birth in this regard may imply immediacy in much the same way as
Dunmire (2005) found that President George Bush Sr.’s use of the nominalization threat
implied an immediacy to the need to defend the United States, thereby providing Bush Sr.
with justification for his Gulf War of 1991. When one thinks of either a threat or a birth (10), there is an assumption of imminence: A threat conjures up the idea of an immediate attack or danger and birth suggests the final point in a pregnancy that happens in its own time but with some considerable urgency.

**Summary**

As suggested above, the Gettysburg Address stands out as an anomaly in the data set because of its short length and the fact that it does not meet some of the recommended sub-themes of the features of an effective vision. However, despite its brevity and despite the lack of some of the recommended features, the Address remains notable as an exemplary visionary speech as I have suggested in the analysis.

Lincoln was able to communicate his vision of preserving the Union in just 269 words through strategic use of linguistic resources including establishing the tenor of leader speaking to his listener-followers through engagement: proclaim which permits no other opinions to intrude on the text, through the absence of the first-person singular, and through consistent use of the declarative Mood. The resources of positive appreciation and process types allow Lincoln to express his approval of shared values and to create the us-ness solidarity that is necessary for the listener-followers to commit to and implement the vision. And, finally, despite the brevity of the speech, the Gettysburg Address is memorable for its imagery. Lincoln uses the few words of the Address to generate picture words that leave an indelible mark on the reader or listener-follower.
CHAPTER V

CHURCHILL’S “WE SHALL FIGHT ON THE BEACHES” SPEECH

Background

The Right Honorable Sir Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill was born in 1874 to prominent Tory politician, Lord Randolph Churchill, and an American mother. Churchill was educated at Harrow and the Royal Military College at Sandhurst and served in the army in India and the Sudan. He was a journalist during the Boer war, winning early fame as a war correspondent in the Cuban revolt against Spain, the British campaigns in India and the Sudan, and in South Africa during the Boer war. His escape from a Boer prison camp in 1899 “made him a national hero and ushered him into the House of Commons where his career spanned 60 years” (“Biography Introduction,” n.d., para 1).

During World War I, Churchill was blamed for the disastrous Dardanelles expedition and he resigned from the House, returning in 1917.

On September 1st 1939, Germany invaded Poland without warning and, by September 3rd, Britain and France were at war with Germany. The following week, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and South Africa had also joined the war (“World War 2 Timelines,” 2006).

At the outbreak of what became known as the Second World War, Churchill was appointed First Lord of the Admiralty, but his warnings about the rise of Nazi Germany and the need for British rearmament were ignored. In the period from 1938 leading up to
World War II, people began to take more notice of his message. Elected Prime Minister in 1940, he “appeared to be the right man for the time, and was finally able to use his remarkable powers of oratory to rally and uplift the whole British nation in its struggle against the Nazi threat” (Montefiore, 2005, p. 91).

Three days after becoming Prime Minister on May 10, 1940 (“World War II Chronology,” 2004), Churchill addressed the House of Commons to request passage of a resolution to form a new government. The resolution noted that “this House welcomes the formation of a government representing the united and inflexible resolve of the nation to prosecute the war with Germany to a victorious conclusion” (Montefiore, 2005, p. 93).

In this same speech, Churchill noted that he had nothing to offer but “blood, toil, tears, and sweat” (Churchill, 1940a, para 5).

In his address to the House on May 10th, Churchill told his listener-followers that Britain would “wage war by land, sea, and air. War with all our might and with all the strength that God can give us; to wage war against a monstrous tyranny never surpassed in the dark and lamentable catalogue of human crime” (Churchill, 1940a, para 6). In his speech, Churchill identifies his vision as follows:

You ask what is our aim. I can answer in one word: it is victory. Victory at any cost—victory in spite of all terrors—victory, however long and hard the road may be, for without victory there is no survival. (Churchill, 1940a, para 6)

In identifying his vision, Churchill was speaking to a British audience who had endured almost a year of casualties; months of blackouts, shortages, and rationing of food products; the use of identity cards; and the evacuation of children to the countryside (“Operation Pied Piper,” n.d.). By this time Germany occupied Poland, Denmark,
Norway, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg ("World War II Chronology," 2004). The future must have looked bleak indeed to the people of Great Britain.

In May 1940, the German Army trapped the British and French armies on the beaches around Dunkirk. Over 330,000 men were cornered on the beach, a sitting target for the Germans ("Dunkirk," 2011). Operation Dynamo was put in place to get as many men as possible off the beaches and back to Britain. The stranded British troops, led by Lord John Gort, were professional soldiers from the British Expeditionary Force, trained men whom Britain could not afford to lose. From May 26th, small ships manned by volunteers transferred soldiers to larger ships which then brought them to a port in southern Britain. On May 27, 1940, Belgium surrendered to Germany.

Churchill’s June 4, 1940, speech to the House of Commons that is the subject of this analysis tells the story of the Dunkirk miracle and reconfirms his vision: to go on to the end, to never surrender (139), and to be victorious over Nazi tyranny (133).

Churchill again addressed the House on June 14th when the Germans entered Paris ("World War 2 Timelines," 2006). Britain was suddenly isolated, facing occupied Europe and the threat of invasion. There was much riding on victory:

Hitler knows that he will have to break us in this island or lose the war. If we can stand up to him, all Europe may be free and the life of the world may move forward into broad, sunlit uplands. But, if we fail, then the whole world, including the United States, including all that we have known and cared for, will sink into the abyss of a new Dark Age. . . . Let us therefore brace ourselves to our duties, and so bear ourselves that if the British Empire and its Commonwealth last for a thousand years, men will still say “this was their finest hour.” (Churchill, 1940c)

Churchill’s vision of broad, sunlit uplands was realized in 1945 when the Allies defeated Hitler and won the Second World War.
Churchill was an accomplished writer, producing 43 books in 72 volumes published during his life time, 5 of which he had authored by the age of 26 (“Biography Introduction,” n.d., para 1). He won the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1953 and was made an honorary U.S. citizen by President Kennedy in 1963 (Plumpton, 1988; Stromberg, n.d.).

Analysis

Churchill’s (1940b) speech to his nation on June 4, 1940, is very long: 3,497 words in total. It begins with a narrative (in the sense of the telling of a story) of the miraculous evacuation at Dunkirk and concludes with the now famous we shall fight on the beaches (139) sequence. In the speech Churchill speaks as a story-teller, as a fellow sufferer, a historian, a moral patriarch, and as an authoritative Prime Minister who is communicating his vision to his listener-followers to engage them and seek their commitment.

These various voices in the speech will be discussed below in the section on tenor. They serve here only as a backdrop to offer my rationale for analyzing only portions of Churchill’s long speech. The first reason is that there is simply too much text to be able to do it justice at the level of analysis I wanted to accomplish in this dissertation. Secondly, a large portion of the speech is taken up with the narrative of the Dunkirk evacuation; there are no narratives in the other speeches to analyze for comparison purposes and, for consistency, I therefore elected not to analyze Churchill’s narrative. Accordingly, for the purpose of this analysis, I chose to look only at the non-narrative text, that is, at the following selections of the speech: lines 25-30, 60-62, 78-82, 85-87, 111-139. This sample of the whole proved sufficient data to compare to the other speeches and also
proved more than sufficient to generate significant findings. For the full speech, please see Appendix B.

I will begin with an examination of the context of situation (field, tenor, and mode) of the speech, followed by an assessment of the speech against each of the benchmark features of an effective vision. This chapter is organized around those benchmark features with the section exploring each feature identified in the leadership literature comprising also an explanation of the linguistic strategies that enable the feature’s realization, that is, how language use enabled Churchill’s text to be memorably visionary and to engage his listener-followers in his vision. Both the analysis of the speech against the benchmark features of an effective vision and the full linguistic analysis are attached in Appendix B.

Context of Situation

Compared to the other speeches that make up my data set, the field of discourse, that is, the activity in which language is playing a part (Halliday & Hasan, 1989) in Churchill’s speech is political discourse, particularly the genre of rallying people in times of crisis (Lazar & Lazar, 2004).

However, Churchill’s speech is also deceptively non-political at the start, beginning with the story of the evacuation at Dunkirk, during which Churchill speaks in glowing terms that would suggest the operation had been a major victory. This first part of the speech takes up approximately 3,000 words or approximately five-sixths of Churchill’s address to the nation. This portion of the speech could be deemed to be in the field of story-telling because it is rich with lexical choices and process types evoking actions in war (cut off all communications, 6; pressed on every side, 24; the enemy attacked on all sides, 41) and language that is typical of a suspenseful narrative
(advanced across the Somme, 4; the German eruption swept like a sharp scythe, 5; thus it was, 19; they were pressed on every side, 24).

This narrative continues to line 111, with only minor divergences from the story of Dunkirk. In one such divergence Churchill gives a hint that he will depart from the field of story-telling and begin his vision when he says we must be very careful not to assign to this deliverance the attributes of a victory. Wars are not won by evacuations (60-61). But it is only in lines 111 and 112 (but this will not continue. We shall not be content with a defensive war) when the field changes to and continues to the rousing finish as political speech. Following Labov and Waletzky (1967), Martin (1997) found that it is common for the evaluation section of the narrative to be placed at the end of the narrative, a finding with which the Churchill speech conforms.

As suggested above, the tenor of the speech changes throughout the text. The tenor of discourse—referring to who is taking part in the discourse, the nature of their status and roles, and their relationships, both at the moment in which language is being used and in society in general (Halliday & Hasan, 1989)—is at first examination one in which Churchill speaks from a position of authority to his people: He addresses the House of Commons and, via radio, speaks to the people of the United Kingdom as their leader, their Prime Minister, in the register of educated politician. Also, given Churchill’s references to the French Republic (137), our Empire beyond the seas (139), and the New World (139), one can conjecture that Churchill knows that his speech will be heard or read by these other populations and therefore also addresses his remarks to them. Similarly, one can assume that the people of Germany and especially the Nazi leadership will be listening to every speech made by Churchill or his colleagues during this difficult
time, looking for signs of weakness in their enemy’s resolve. It was therefore most vital that Churchill convey his vision with strength and full commitment to convince his enemies that he would never surrender (139).

Churchill chooses to address each of these various audiences in the one speech, moving from the register and obvious tenor relations implied by leader-follower and leader-to-other-leader to the less predictable tenor relation of patriarch to his children, an “average Joe,” and fellow sufferer. I have identified each of these voices and the applicable portions of the text in which they are used in Appendix B.

Why Churchill chose to modify his voice by changing registers in various parts of the speech is unknown. I can, however, offer a hypothesis for this choice. Churchill was a well-educated scholar, an author whose command of English was magnificent and whose vocabulary was extremely large (Montefiore, 2005). In the speech preceding the awarding of the Nobel Prize for Literature to Lady Churchill who was attending on her husband’s behalf, for example, Mr. Liljestrand of the Royal Academy of Sciences made the following remarks:

Sir Winston Churchill is a recognized master of the English language, that wonderful and flexible instrument of human thought. . . . To Sir Winston the English language has . . . provided an important tool, with the aid of which part of his job has been finished. His works, accompanied by corresponding deed, have inspired hope and confidence in millions from all parts of the world during times of darkness. (“Winston Churchill—Banquet Speech,” 2011)

Given his education and his mastery of English, Churchill would likely be well-versed and most comfortable using language in the register of upper class English (capitulate, 27; ignominious, 29; befooled, 128). Churchill would, however, have wanted his speech to appeal to his various audiences, both those who, like Churchill, had been educated in Britain’s finest schools and also those less educated; both audiences would
need to be inspired to carry on fighting to victory. By changing registers—from educated leader to storyteller and “average Joe”—Churchill may have wanted to adapt his voice to appeal to those various audiences and not lose the commitment of those who otherwise might perceive him to be too “posh” to be compelling. As noted in chapter 3, Gregory and Carroll (1978) suggest that “verbal changes frequently signal an overt attempt to alter the relationship” (p. 51) and Churchill’s lexico-grammatical choices would have been an overt attempt to reach all members of all his audiences.

Churchill would certainly have known how to change voices; Gregory and Carroll (1978) suggest that there is a direct relationship between personal experience and the ability to control and switch tenors, from formal (such as an old-style grammarian) to informal (a sailor’s renowned profanity), and Churchill had the capacity to cover both ends of the scale. He would have gained this capacity, which is “determined by what the speaker has learned as being appropriate to the situation” (p. 55), through his varied life experiences including, at the informal end of the range, his stint as a war correspondent mingling with uneducated soldiers and, at the upper end, his highly educated relatives and friends.

Tenor relations also include an analysis of those in the relationship. A discussion of how Churchill constructs a distinction between us (the people of the UK, the Allies, the New World, the Empire beyond the seas) and them (the Nazis, Hitler, the Fifth Column, the enemy) follows in the section on the benchmark feature of shared hopes and dreams.

The mode of discourse, that is, the medium (usually written or spoken) through which language makes meaning (Halliday & Hasan, 1989), in this case is written to be
spoken. Churchill paid a great deal of attention to his speeches, writing them so as to avoid words beginning and ending with the ‘s’ sound because of a slight lisp (Mather, n.d.). The speech reverted to the written mode after its spoken delivery: It was reported verbatim in the newsprint media of the day (The Times, 1940) and would have been recorded in writing in the records of the British House of Commons (Hansard).

Other leaders (both Allied and enemy) would have received the speech by radio or in written form, perhaps via a telegram. The people of the United Kingdom would have received Churchill’s visionary speech both by radio (as a spoken text) and also via news coverage of it (that is, as a written text). The Times of June 5, 1940, for example, reported the speech in great detail, calling it the work of “a leader behind whom a resolute nation may face the heaviest blows of fortune unafraid” (The Times, 1940).

Features of an Effective Vision

Churchill’s speech of June 4, 1940, is a masterpiece of visionary discourse. The text, even when reduced to those portions that were analyzed in this study, meets, in every aspect, the features of a vision as benchmarked in the leadership literature, and it is easy to see why the speech has become an easily recognizable icon of visionary leadership discourse.

The following offers a discussion of how the speech meets those benchmarks of an effective vision, with an explanation for each of them of how language realizes the feature. Summaries of my analyses are in Appendix B.
Benchmark: Issuing a Challenge

Churchill’s (1940a) “big, hairy, audacious goal,” the ambitious future that will call for sacrifice, already enunciated in his earlier speech to the House of Commons on May 10, 1940, is clear: *victory at all costs*. Churchill communicates his goal by saying to the people of Britain that *we shall prove ourselves once again able to defend our Island . . . ride out the storm of war, and outlive the menace of tyranny* (133-137).

Churchill issues his challenge, not only to the people of Great Britain, but also to our *Empire beyond the seas and the New World* (139) who will be counted upon to carry on the fight to victory if the Island is overtaken. Collins and Porras (1996, p. 74), referring to this speech, describe Churchill’s vision, his “big, hairy audacious goal,” not as “beat Hitler” but as the survival of Great Britain and the rest of the free world. As Churchill (1940a) communicated to his audiences on May 10, 1940, *without victory there is no survival* and that *civilization itself* (80) hung in the balance between victory and defeat.

As he would say in a speech 2 weeks later, Churchill (1940c) needed his people to “brace ourselves to our duties, and so bear ourselves that if the British Empire and its Commonwealth last for a thousand years, men will still say ‘this was their finest hour.’”

To reinforce his goal, Churchill draws on historical references to other situations in which courage was needed to succeed, including the *Knights of the Round Table* and the *Crusaders* (82) and references to *Napoleon* (127), who was defeated by the British. Churchill also draws on the appraisal resources of *appreciation* and *judgment* to express his stance on what is good and worth fighting for.

The *appreciation* resources Churchill uses allow him to communicate his stance on those things that he perceives as good and what he perceives as bad, with maintenance
of those things that are good being his goal for the British people. Among those things that are good and goal-worthy, according to Churchill, are expressed using positive appreciation resources including the following: our long history (25), a good way of life that warrants being even longer; the great French army (79) with whom the British Expeditionary Force was battling the Germans at Dunkirk; our native land (82), the United Kingdom which is in jeopardy unless the listener-followers support Churchill in achieving his goal of never surrender[ing] (139) the British way of life to the enemy; noble knight[s] (82), an image that communicates the notion that fighting for what one believes in is a good thing to do; effective security (115) to defend Britain if parachute landings were attempted (123); and having discussions that are free (118) from those who would report war secrets to the media.

Things that are bad are also communicated by Churchill using negative appreciation resources to give his listener-followers his stance on the disastrous situation that would result if his goal was not achieved. Among those things on which Churchill communicates his negative stance are: the malice (130) of the Germans, their aggression (130), and their tyranny (133). All these are the antithesis of life as it was known in Britain and would have resonated with the listener-followers as outcomes to resist to the death (133). Similarly, life under the grip of the Gestapo (138) would have been an unthinkable alternative, making never surrender[ing] the better option despite the hardships that would have to be borne to win the war.

With the resources of judgment, Churchill conveys his evaluation of behaviors that are worthy of defending and behaviors that are not in keeping with all that we stand for (82). Those behaviors that he approves of and advocates include: being ready to give
life and all for [our] native land (82); having the skill and devotion (80) to continue fighting; guarding all that we stand for (82); bravery (82); our duty (113); and proving ourselves (128). These are all expressed with the resources of judgment: positive and would have been recognized by the listener-followers as goals that warrant preserving. Similarly, the resources of judgment, but this time in the negative, are used to communicate those behaviors that are not in keeping with the goal of preserving the British way of life by winning the war. Churchill speaks of the potential defeat at Dunkirk as having to capitulate (27) to the enemy, a behavior that would have been understood as shameful to the proud British people. Being led into an ignominious and starving captivity (29) would have been equally perceived as humiliation as would being cast back and disturbed (79) by enemy forces. Also not goal-worthy are the potential continuing evacuations (61) that would subject the British people to the domination of Continental tyrants (128).

Churchill is equally clear on what achieving this goal will require: a sacrifice of nothing less than defending to the death [our] native soil (136), not failing or flagging, going on to the end, fighting on the beaches, up to and including fighting in the fields and streets of Britain (139), even if it means being subjugated and starving (138). Achieving the goal will require the population to accept and put up with measures of increasing stringency (120), including the stamping out of Fifth Column activities (120), an act that will require a great many people in the United Kingdom being affected by the orders (121). Churchill told his people on May 10, 1940, that they must act in spite of all terrors (Churchill, 1940a), that is, to continue to make the effort although afraid; to
make that effort, the British people would have to sacrifice well-being of the moment to ensure long-lasting well-being and security in the future.

To express that sacrifice is good and non-sacrifice would be bad, Churchill uses the appraisal resources of *judgment*, resources that enable us to relate our attitudes toward people and the way in which they behave—their character and how they measure up in reference to a set of institutionalized norms or expectations (Martin & White, 2005). Churchill consistently speaks of behaviors in which sacrifice was or is required in positive judgment terms and of non-sacrifice in the negative. Positive judgments include: *to guard our native land*, 82; *all that we stand for*, 82; *and noble*, 82. Churchill takes his idea of sacrifice being needed to win the war to its utmost heights when he says the British will *never surrender . . . even if [they] were subjugated and starving* (139).

Negative judgments on the enemy’s behavior include: encouraging the *malignancy*, 125, of Fifth Column activities; using *every kind of novel stratagem and every kind of brutal and treacherous maneuver*, 130, against the British; condoning *tyranny*, 133; and accepting as good being *under the grip of the Gestapo and all the odious apparatus of Nazi rule*, 138. Any behavior on the part of the British and the Allies that results in similar outcomes are cast in a negative light by Churchill, implying that any sacrifice would be better than these situations being visited on them.

Despite the many changes suffered by the British since the war began, in his speech Churchill tells his listener-followers that he requires yet more effort from them. This is not in order to have the kind of transformative *change and growth* that Senge (1990) suggests is a benchmark of an effective vision. Instead, Churchill wants to return to the values and principles that existed before the war started. To retain those values
(and *all that we stand for*, 82) is worth any effort as *without victory there is no survival* of life as the British people know it (Churchill, 1940a).

To communicate the need for continuing efforts to be victorious and to be able to live that desired life that includes *all that we stand for* (82), Churchill uses the appraisal resources of *amplification: augmentation* and *amplification: enrichment*. He *augments* his text, for example, when he says that the British people have to be prepared for *every kind of novel stratagem and every kind of brutal and treacherous maneuver* (130) the Germans may throw at them. By *augmenting* his text (when *be prepared for more war* may have sufficed) Churchill is alerting his people that the coming months will be very difficult. The listener-followers can also prepare for *measures of increasing stringency* (120) in addition to those measures that the government has already had to take. The increasing measures of which Churchill warns include measures against *British subjects* (120), an act that may not be popular with the British people but which their leader feels is necessary at this juncture of the war. Finally, another example of Churchill’s use of *amplification: augmentation* occurs in line 133 in which he says *we shall prove ourselves once again able to defend our Island home, to ride out the storm of war . . . years, if necessary alone*. In this line Churchill *augments* his resolve by giving the British people (and the enemy who would have been listening in) examples of how he will *never surrender* (139) no matter how long the war lasts nor how few Allies remain in the fight. There would have been no doubt in the minds of the listener-followers about the level of effort and upcoming changes to their way of life that will be required of them to implement Churchill’s vision.
The appraisal resources of amplification: enrichment are also used by Churchill to communicate the effort that will be needed to carry on. For example, Churchill speaks of the young soldiers going forth (82) when going would have sufficed; the enrichment allows Churchill to enoble the young men and cast them in the same league as the Knights of the Round Table and the Crusaders. In another instance, Churchill states that that is the resolve (135) of the British government, an enriched, stronger, and more compelling version of another potential lexical choice such as the un-colored decision.

In addition to these instances of amplification: enrichment, there is one other very noteworthy example in the text: When Churchill speaks of put[ing] down Fifth Column activities (125) the enriched material process (to put down) brings to mind the euthanizing of a dog, an enrichment which allows Churchill to communicate his stance (without actually saying so) that those who participate in Fifth Column activities (125) are animals.

These two amplification resources enable Churchill to speak in words that will resonate with the British people more than un-enhanced lexical choices might and, because the words resonate, will prepare his listener-followers for what will be required of them in implementing the vision of never surrender[ing] (139).

Churchill also foreshadows the need for additional effort from his listener-followers when he hints of the hardships the British people will face in the upcoming offensive war, saying that we must not be content with a defensive war (112) and when he outlines the offensive effort be[ing] realized (115) to get ready for the anticipated invasion. There is no time to waste rejoicing in the miracle of Dunkirk when the Germans are poised to invade. One example of the additional efforts Churchill will call on his
people to make is referenced in his statement that he will be *reconstitut*[ing] the British Expeditionary Force (114) after Dunkirk. This effort will require changes in the production of goods on the Island; on June 6th Churchill announced a ban on the production of hundreds of household goods in Britain (“War in Britain,” 2006) to support the war effort. In line 133 Churchill sums up the challenges the British people must yet face when he states that *they shall ride out the storm of war, and . . . outlive the menace of tyranny, if necessary for years, if necessary alone* (133).

In addition to challenging the people of the United Kingdom to carry on to victory, Churchill offers them both extrinsic and intrinsic *motivators* to do so. For *extrinsic motivators*, Churchill uses both positive and negative inspirations (in the form of *positive* and *negative appreciation*) to move his people to continue the war efforts. On the positive side, Churchill refers *positively* to the Island having *effective security* (115), something that will resonate with his listener-followers who have been at war for many months and who are understandably *still anxious* (85). On the *negative* side, Churchill refers to the need for the people to be prepared *for every kind of novel stratagem and every kind of brutal and treacherous maneuver* (130)—ample incentive to communicate the seriousness of the need to carry on the *struggle* (139)—and the possible consequences of not carrying on: *subjugat*[ion] and *starv[ation]* (139).

*Intrinsic motivators* are more subtle in the text. Churchill uses *affect* to express *the sympathy of the House to all who have suffered bereavement or who are still anxious* (85), acknowledging that anxiety is present even in those who are not bereaved and, in that acknowledgment, gives permission to his listener-followers to be anxious and yet also be motivated to carry on. Churchill may even offer his own anxiety in empathy with
the listeners, saying *at any rate, that is what we are going to try to do* (134). Churchill also uses *judgment* to motivate his listener-followers to accept the need for measures *against British subjects who may become a danger or a nuisance* (120), perhaps referring to the prohibition, in March 1940, of all aliens and stateless persons living in Britain to leave their homes between 10:30 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. (“War in Britain,” 2006). Churchill provides motivation for his people to accept these actions when he suggests that the times require the putting aside of normal polite manners including *draw[ing] all the distinctions which we should like to do* (122). While the British would normally be motivated by politeness, the situation *at the present time and under the present stress* (122) requires draconian action that might exclude the mannerly norm. Churchill also provides a sense of comfort as motivator to his audience when he assures them that others have tried to invade the Island without success—notably *Napoleon* (127)—and that the audience can be assured of the strength of *sea power and . . . air power* (132) to aid in the struggle.

Shared values also serve as intrinsic motivators in the speech. By stating them, Churchill is reminding his people of *all that we stand for* (82), that all is in jeopardy if the Germans invade and are not met and defeated by a strong resistance by the British. Shared values are discussed in the section of that name below.

**Benchmark: Vision as Destination**

There are no explicit road map references in the Churchill text, but the *destination* he envisages is clear: a victory that will ensure *the survival of all that we stand for* (82). To convey this destination Churchill communicates about the values that the British people are fighting for, including: nobility (*knights*, 82); religion (the
Crusaders, 82); our native land (82); and our duty (113). These shared values are discussed below in the section on shared values as a benchmark feature of an effective vision.

To identify the destination of his vision, Churchill also draws from the appraisal resources of affect. While there is only one instance of positive affect (happiness, security, and satisfaction) in the speech, there are many instances of negative affect (unhappiness, insecurity, and dissatisfaction). This propensity for the resources of negative affect will be discussed below.

The single use of positive affect (satisfaction) occurs when Churchill states that he will put down Fifth Column activities until he and the members of the House are satisfied and more than satisfied (125). Among the many instances of negative affect are the following: Churchill feared (25) it would be his hard lot (25) to announce a defeat at Dunkirk, casting the situation as an undesirable great military disaster (25) when the British Expeditionary Force would have to capitulate (25) to the Germans. These were hard and heavy tidings (28) he anticipated having to relate to his people. Similarly, again using affect: unhappiness, Churchill conveys the sympathy (85) of the House to all those who have suffered bereavement (85) or the pangs of affliction in its sharpest form (85) and affect: insecurity when he mentions all those who are still anxious (85). By casting hard and heavy tidings, bereavement, and anxiety (anxious) in a negative light, Churchill implies that the opposite of all these (perhaps happy tidings, no more deaths of loved ones, and contentment) are the destination of his vision.

The appraisal resources of appreciation (reaction, valuation), again both positive and negative, are also used to communicate the destination of the vision to the listener-
followers, with those things that are evaluated as positive being the sort of things we appreciate and the ones that are appraised as negative being the sort of things the enemy appreciates. This usage of language is subtle and astute: Churchill does not need to convey his stance of our destination as good, and theirs as bad, in explicit terms. Instead, he communicates this opinion through appreciation. Examples of positive things we appreciate include: our long history (25) which is worthy of being sustained to the end (139); gallantry (gallant Commander-in-Chief, 114); continuing effective security (115) of the Island; freedom of speech (have our discussions free, 115); steadfastness (a steady eye, 131); a homeland (native soil, 137); and fellowship (like good comrades, 137). Those things assessed as being a bad destination are all realized in appreciation: negative and include: a life in which malice (130), aggression (130), and tyranny (menace of tyranny, 133) are the norm and in which the British people would be subject to authoritarian dictatorship in the grip of the Gestapo (138).

**Benchmark: Shared Values**

Churchill’s speech is filled with shared values and high ideals, and it is rich in moral overtones.

The moral overtones of the speech are realized primarily through use of the appraisal resources of judgment, both social esteem and social sanction. These resources allow us to sanction or approve the behavior of a person or group in relation to the moral strength or weakness displayed by the behavior and also to assess behavior in terms of adherence to or departure from usuality (Martin & White, 2005). Using these resources enables Churchill to convey his stance that we are good and moral and they are immoral and bad. By communicating this stance, Churchill is strongly encouraging his listener-
followers to endorse his vision by continuing to fight for that which is good and moral despite the anticipated hardships.

To communicate that we are good, Churchill speaks of his people and the Allies using the resources of judgment: social esteem and judgment: social sanction in only the positive sense. Through use of these resources Churchill communicates that we are noble (82), we stand for something (and all that we stand for, 82), and that we are dutiful (we have our duty, 113), gallant (114), and tenacious (we shall go on to the end, 139). These all express Churchill’s stance that his listener-followers behave in moral and good ways, behaviors that are worth fighting for.

The enemy, however, as one might expect, is not described in positive moral terms. For them Churchill consistently uses judgment: social esteem and judgment: social sanction in only the negative sense. Churchill includes a number of populations in his them (as will be explored further in the section on shared hopes and dreams below). For example, he speaks of enemy aliens and other suspicious characters (120), a category in which he includes British subjects who may become a danger or a nuisance should the war be transported to the United Kingdom (120). Being dangerous and a nuisance will be recognized by the listener-followers as a negative behavior, a level of poor morality that is not to be esteemed in Britain, and ample justification for measures of increasing stringency (120) to be taken against them. Similarly, those who engage in Fifth Column activities are so immoral that they are worthy of being put down (125). Also, those in power in the Third Reich are not referred to as leaders but as Continental tyrants (128) who are capable of every kind of brutal and treacherous manoeuvre (130). By so identifying the enemy as morally corrupt, Churchill reinforces that we are good and that
any actions taken by us to remain good are both justified and worth any hardship.

Churchill expresses shared values in both positive and negative terms in his speech and he does so both directly and indirectly. To express these shared values Churchill draws on the appraisal resources of appreciation (which allow us to give our evaluation of things; Martin & White, 2005) and, in much the same way as he expresses morality, judgment: social sanction and judgment: social esteem. Adjectives are also used to advantage to generate subtle references to shared values as are nominalizations and processes.

Among the shared values that we share are the positive values that Churchill names explicitly using appreciation: valuation, positive and appreciation: reaction, positive. These resources allow us, respectively, to react to or provide our sense of valuation of things (Martin & White, 2005). With these resources in the positive sense, Churchill endorses the goodness of things that we share such as: our long history (25); skill and devotion (78); opportunity for youth (80); our duty (113); solid assurances (132); our native soil (137); and old and famous states (138). Values that the enemy hold high are evaluated through the resources of negative appreciation in such instances as: the brutal and treacherous manoeuvres (130) referred to above; and the grip of the Gestapo (138).

Interestingly, Churchill uses three terms that would normally be positive appreciation but are here used as a negative to suggest that the enemy does not share British values. The three occur in line 130: novel methods, originality, and ingenuity. One traditionally thinks of these three things in a positive light, but by Churchill having used them in the context of what the enemy will do (adopt novel methods of war, use an
originality of malice, and also the ingenuity of aggression against the British and their Allies) they become negatives associated with values that the listener-followers will not share. Similarly, one term that would normally be seen in a negative light, outlandish (131), is cast by Churchill in the positive when he says no idea is so outlandish that it should not be considered (131) if it will support the British war effort.

The appraisal resources of judgment are also used to communicate shared values and these are again used to convey that we behave in ways that are in keeping with our (good) shared values and that they, the enemy, behave in ways that do not adhere to those shared values. We are characterized as giving life and all for our native land (82) with young men who are worthy of our gratitude (82). Among us are those who have suffered bereavement (85) and who are passionate enemies of Nazi Germany (121). We, with the French, will aid each other to the utmost of [our] strength (137) and will go on to the end (139). We are led by gallant leaders (114) and all have our duty (139) to perform. They, on the other hand, are those who behave in ways that would lead us into ignominious and starving captivity (29) and see us subjugated and starving (139). They behave in ways that are full of malice and aggression (130). They are also brutal and treacherous (130) and cause some British subjects to become suspicious characters (120).

There are also myriad indirect references to values that the audience will understand as shared values via adjectives (among them our long history, 25; some good judges, 26; young men, 78, 82; brave men, 82; its gallant Commander-in-Chief, Lord Gort, 114; measures of increasing stringency, 120; native soil, 137; etc.); via processes (capitulate, 27; cast back and disturbed, 79; we shall not flag or fail, 138; we shall fight, 139; carry on the struggle, 139); and via nominalizations (resolve, 134; will, 135).
Churchill also names those whom his listeners will recognize as positive role models who share their values: the *Knights of the Round Table and the Crusaders* (82).

There is only one reference to God in the text being analyzed: *in God's good time* (139), suggesting that God is on our side, the side of the good.

**Benchmark: Shared Hopes and Dreams**

Churchill takes the occasion of this important speech to convey *shared hopes and dreams* to his listeners. The times ahead, especially if there is an invasion, will be difficult and Churchill needs to inspire his listener-followers to action so that together they can achieve the vision of victory. As suggested above, Churchill does not want to inspire his people to anything new. Rather, he hopes to return to what was, *all that we stand for* (81) because, *without victory, there is no survival* of life in Britain as the listener-followers know it (Churchill, 1940a).

In part Churchill inspires action through expressing *emotion* around his vision. In the narrative portions of the early text, for example, Churchill creates suspense through use of such words as *but another blow* (31); *yet at the last moment* (34); *suddenly* (36); *the enemy attacked on all sides* (41); *for four or five days an intense struggle reigned* (45); *meanwhile* (47). Churchill also conjures up emotions around images of battle (*the onrush of a few thousands of armored vehicles*, 79) and of fellow suffering (*hard and heavy tiding*, 28; *ignominious and starving captivity*, 29), of people doing their duty despite the hardship (*young men going forth every morn to guard their native land and to give life and all*, 82), and of courage and fable (*Knights of the Round Table*, 82). There is one especially poignant emotion expressed when Churchill offers his condolences to Sir Andrew Duncan whose son has died in battle. Here Churchill speaks to those who *have*
felt the pangs of affliction in its sharpest form (87), empathizing with them and perhaps again feeling his own devastation over the loss of his daughter, Marigold, in 1921 (“An interview with Mary Soames,” n.d.).

Among the many emotions conveyed in the speech, it is easy to perceive anguish (the aforementioned pangs of affliction, 87); sorrow (bereavement, 85); sympathy for those who have lost loved ones in the war (express the sympathy of the House, 85); anxiety (those who are still anxious, 85); disdain (towards Fifth Column activities, 125, those who leak Parliamentary secrets to the media, 118, and those other Continental tyrants who were excited and befooled into thinking they could successfully invade the Island, 128).

These are all expressed using the resources of affect. As noted above, Churchill used a predominance of negative affect in his speech. This propensity may be indicative of the state of Churchill’s mind: he was known to have suffered from depression and would speak of his negative moods as his “Black Dog” (Chance, 1996). It may therefore have been more familiar for Churchill to communicate in terms on negative emotions such as hard and heavy tidings (28). Alternatively, Churchill may have felt that the usage of negative appraisals may have been more compelling to the British people.

Emotion towards the vision is also conveyed in the speech by Churchill’s communication of his commitment towards preserving all that we stand for (81) and never surrender[ing] . . . whatever the cost may be (139). How Churchill communicates his emotional commitment to his leaders is discussed below in the section on commitment.
In another aspect of the benchmark feature of communicating about shared hopes and dreams, Churchill is masterful in how he moves his listener-followers from self-interest to collective interest by creating the inclusivity and *us-ness* (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001) that will be necessary for success against a formidable enemy. Through his *us-ness* strategy Churchill creates a relationship and develops mutual purposes (Rost, 1993) with his listener-followers. This relationship, conveyed and established through language, enables the bonding and solidarity (Martin, 2000) that is so necessary for a vision to become a mutual purpose that can be implemented by all. The flip side of *us* is *them*; how Churchill constructs the *them* is discussed below in the section on the requirement to have a common enemy in a vision.

Among those who Churchill includes in his construction of *us* are the following: *all who have suffered bereavement or who are still anxious* (85); *the House, many of whom have felt the pangs of affliction* (87); *His Majesty's Government—every man of them* (134); *Parliament and the nation* (135); *The British Empire and the French Republic, linked together* (136); *our Empire beyond the seas . . . the New World* (139), and the elegant depiction of all of us who will fight, no matter our geographic location on the Island or our occupation in line 139: *we shall fight in France, we shall fight on the seas and oceans, we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills, etc.*

Churchill constructs his *us-ness* using the linguistic resources of pronouns and vocatives as explored in the paragraphs that follow. Much of the work of conveying Churchill’s meaning of *us-ness* to listener-followers is performed through pronouns, particularly through an interesting use of the first-person pronoun in the text, in which
Churchill uses both the singular (*I*) and the plural (*we* to advantage to communicate the distinction between his own evaluations (using the singular form) and those evaluations that are shared by others (using the plural form). Churchill also, however, uses *we* in some instances where *I* would seem to be more appropriate; this use of the royal *we* causes some puzzlement.

Fowler and Kress (1979, pp. 200-201) suggest that personal pronouns always deserve notice. The following attempts to explicate Churchill’s use of personal pronouns in the construction of *us-ness* and the distinction of that *us-ness* from *them* or the *Other* (Lazar & Lazar, 2004).

Churchill uses the singular (*I*) form in three ways: first, when he is speaking as the leader of the country and, in my opinion, wants to appear strong and assured; second, when he is expressing emotion; and, third, when he appears to be hedging but may, in fact, be a purposeful strategy to add his humanity to the vision.

The first of these usages, with Churchill as leader, includes: *I asked the House to fix this afternoon as the occasion for a statement* (25); *the hard and heavy tidings for which I called upon the House and the nation to prepare themselves* (28); and *I have, myself, full confidence . . . that we shall prove ourselves* (133). This latter clause has two instances of the first person in it, as if to construct a double dose of confidence that will hopefully be shared by the listener-followers. Churchill perhaps offers this double dose of confidence to counter what he says next, that his confidence in a successful outcome to the war is valid only *if all do their duty, if nothing is neglected, and if the best arrangements are made, as they are being* (133).
The second usage, to express emotion, include: *I feared it would be my hard lot, 2; I will pay my tribute to these young airmen, 85; I take occasion to express the sympathy of the House, 124; and there is, however, another class, for which *I feel not the slightest sympathy, 124.* Here Churchill speaks of his own feelings or stance towards someone or something, perhaps to inject some of the “average Joe” persona that enabled him to speak to all his various audiences of listener-followers.

The third way in which Churchill uses the first-person pronoun is when he wants to add a personal note to his communication as in the following examples: *I thought and some good judges agreed with me* (26); *there never has been, I suppose; I would observe* (126); and *I think that no idea is so outlandish that it should not be considered and viewed with a searching, but at the same time, I hope, with a steady eye* (131). The usage of these terms, which might be construed as hedging, is in my opinion, another Churchillian attempt at humanizing his speech and will be explored below in the section about commitment.

Churchill uses the plural first-person pronoun appropriately throughout his text to refer to himself as part of a larger population of *we.* In several instances the *we* refers to Churchill combined with the rest of the government: *we like to have our discussions free,* 118; *we have found it necessary,* 120; and *the orders which we have made,* 121.

In other instances the *we* refers to Churchill and his fellow citizens as in the following clauses: *the greatest military disaster in our long history,* 25; *we must be very careful,* 60; *there was a victory inside this deliverance,* which *we* should note, 61; *we shall not be content with a defensive war,* 112; *we have our duty to our Ally,* 113; *we have to reconstitute and build up,* 114; *in the interval we must put our defences,* 115; on
this we are now engaged, 116; we may certainly prepare ourselves for every novel stratagem which our enemy displays, 130; we must never forget the solid assurances, 132; we shall prove ourselves once again able to defend our Island home. . . . At any rate, that is what we are going to try to do, 133; we shall not flag or fail, 138; and we shall go on to the end, we shall fight with growing confidence and growing strength in the air, we shall defend our Island . . . we shall fight on the beaches, 139.

That Churchill includes himself in these instances of we is interesting. He will surely not be fighting on the beaches himself. But, in much the same way as the language Churchill uses is intended to appeal to a wide variety of people with varying levels of education and various levels of mastery of the language, by including himself in the we Churchill conveys the message that “we are all in this together.” By conveying that message, Churchill constructs what Martin and White (2005, p. 2) refer to as “relations of alignment and rapport between the writer/speaker and actual or potential respondents,” that critical solidarity in which leaders and followers have a relationship, with followers being active participants in committing to the leader’s vision making the vision a reality (Rost, 1993).

The plural form, we, can sometimes be a bit complex when the source is claiming to speak not only for him- or herself, but also for some other or others. This usage is appropriate when all the others are included (for example, when one person safely speaks for the family by saying we had take-out for dinner last night) but can be precarious when the others are implicated in the discourse only on the assumption that they would all agree to be implicated (Fowler & Kress, 1979). In chancing an inclusive we, when in fact he cannot know that all his listeners will prove (133) themselves or fight (139),
Churchill risks losing some of his listener-followers who do not see themselves performing the actions he describes. However, by intentionally including *all* (133) in his *we*, Churchill relays his assumption and his confidence that his listener-followers *will do [their] duty* (133) and *not flag nor fail* (138) in ensuring victory. Churchill’s *we shall fight* sequence (139) is both inclusive and superior: By saying *we shall fight* he eliminates the option of anyone not fighting and also imposes himself as leader/superior.

Churchill’s use of the royal *we*, using the plural first-person pronoun when the meaning he conveys would be more appropriately expressed by using the singular, is puzzling. In the case of Churchill’s use of the royal *we*, no others are implicated. This usage suggests to me that Churchill is using *we* as when a superior partner uses it on a inferior partner (such as when a doctor asks a patient, “*How are we feeling today?*”) (Fowler & Kress, 1979). In the three instances in which Churchill uses the royal *we*, he departs from what seems to have been an attempt for an egalitarian speech that would appeal to all audiences no matter their position in society or their level of education. The following are the three instances in which I see usage of the royal *we*: *Parliament has given us the powers . . . and we shall use those powers subject to the supervision and correction of the House . . . until we are satisfied* (125); *and there has never been a period in all these long centuries of which we boast when an absolute guarantee against invasion* (126); and *we are assured that novel methods will be adopted.* (130). In the first of these instances (*Parliament has given us the powers and we shall use [them] until we are satisfied*, 125), it is Churchill to whom Parliament has given the power and it is he who will be using those powers until he is satisfied that Fifth Column activities have been *stamped out* (125); the use of *I* and *my* would be more appropriate in this sentence. In the
second sentence (126), Churchill states of which we boast when, in fact, it is he who has been boasting about there never having been a guarantee against invasion; again it would have been more appropriate to say of which I boast. Lastly, in saying we are assured that novel methods will be adopted (130), Churchill is most likely referring to a briefing he received from his advisors conveying the intelligence that Hitler had new and innovative weaponry to use against the British. It is therefore Churchill who is assured that there will be novel methods adopted, not the British people who would not have been privy to the briefing; I am assured would therefore have been a more conventional way of stating this fact.

There are several uses of vocatives in the speech through which Churchill also creates a sense of us-ness. In particular, Churchill refers to The President of the Board of Trade (Sir Andrew Duncan) (86) who is not present in the House because his son has been killed (86). By including Sir Andrew’s name, Churchill conveys both that he is a sympathetic leader who cares about what is happening in the private lives of his colleagues in the House and also that even Members of Parliament (who form an elite part of the us) suffer from the pangs of affliction in the sharpest form (86) like many of the listener-followers who have also lost sons to the war. In referring to the Commander-in-Chief of the British Expeditionary Force, Lord Gort, by name Churchill communicates both that he is gallant (114) and still in favor despite the tragic near-disaster at Dunkirk. In using the vocative for Lord Gort, Churchill conveys that he still has confidence in the Commander-in-Chief and will rely on him to reconstitute and build up the British Expeditionary Force (114) that was almost completely lost at Dunkirk. Specific references to other named groups (Knights of the Round Table and Crusaders, 82) allow
Churchill to add legendary and courageous warriors to his group of *us*, thereby conveying to his listener-followers that to be a member of the *us* crowd requires no less courage and commitment than they exhibited. Similarly, by naming *Napoleon* (127), Churchill is able to cast Hitler in with other *Continental tyrants* who mistakenly were *excited and befooled* (127) into thinking they could invade Britain, only to suffer defeat.

It is difficult to know with what *enthusiasm* the speech was received by the audience of Churchill’s address save that his vision was implemented successfully with the Allies winning the war. And, although I am not analyzing an audio of the speech, I can imagine that Churchill used his voice to advantage in the narrative of Dunkirk and in establishing his enthusiasm and resolve to see victory at all cost.

There is little question, however, about the level of *commitment* expressed in the text. Knowing that both his own people and the enemy would have been listening to the speech, Churchill needed to use language to convince both his listener-followers and those who *would transport the war to the United Kingdom* (120) that he is committed to his vision and that the British will *never surrender* (139). To convey this commitment, Churchill utilizes many of the rich linguistic resources available to him including: Mood, modality, *engagement*, his use of *shall* instead of *will*, and lexical choices that will invoke the shared values that were explored above.

The first of these resources, Mood, is striking in the speech. All of Churchill sentences are in the declarative save one: the question in line 80 in which Churchill inquires *may it not also be that the cause of civilization itself will be defended by the skill and devotion of a few thousand airmen?* This question is of course rhetorical: There is no vehicle through which the listener-followers can answer the question posed in the House
of Commons. Why Churchill chose to deviate from his declarative mood to communicate this question is unknown. I can however offer some thoughts about his rationale which may rest on the modifier (realized in judgment: social sanction, positive) a few thousand airmen (80). This modifier also appears in the preceding sentence in which Churchill refers to the French army (in judgment: social sanction, negative) having been cast back and disturbed by a few thousand armoured vehicles (79). The juxtaposition here is what conveys meaning: The French can be disrupted by only a few thousand vehicles—suggesting that they are weak to be so easily defeated—while it will take only a few thousand English airmen to defend the cause of civilization itself. The rhetorical question, directed to the British audience, may have been intended to convey a subtle reference to the traditional British–French rivalry and imply that it will require only a few of our boys to help theirs out.

The second resource used to advantage to convey commitment is modality. Churchill speaks in terms of modals of obligation in such sentences as: we must be very careful (60); we have to reconstitute (114); we must put our defences . . . organization (115); and we must never forget (132). In these sentences, the modals take on the sense of implied imperatives denoting obligation and commitment to the vision.

The third resource, engagement, allows Churchill both to entertain other voices in his speech where appropriate but mostly to exclude other voices to convey his commitment to his vision. The vast majority of Churchill’s statements are of the engagement: proclaim variety, resources that rule out other alternative positions by proclaiming a proposition as highly warrantable (Martin & White, 2005) as in the following examples: wars are not won by evacuations alone, 62; the idea of a secret
session of Parliament will be readily acceded to by His Majesty's Government (119); I have, myself full confidence (133); every man of them (135); this is the will of Parliament and the nation (136); and, finally, the we shall fight sequence in 139 that brooks no alternative but fighting wherever needed, including wherever parachute landings are attempted (123). By proclaiming these to be true, Churchill communicates his commitment to his vision by impeding any other voice that suggests that these may not be true.

Other voices are allowed to intrude into the text but only when Churchill needs to include mention of others in the government who share his power. In some of these instances Churchill also gathers the full weight of the government of the United Kingdom behind him, as part of the we, by referring to them as follows: His Majesty’s government, every man of them (135), and Parliament and the nation (136).

But there are other instances in which Churchill entertains other voices to involve those others in authority including: if it be the desire of the House (117) and subject to the supervision and correction of the House (125). I get the impression from some of these instances that Churchill may be pandering to his colleagues in the House and that he would have been more comfortable forgetting about them altogether. While I have not made a study of Churchill’s leadership style, I do know that he would have experienced a command-and-control culture from his previous job as Admiral of the Navy and, given how seldom he includes other voices in his text, may have been more comfortable in that authoritative kind of culture. As Prime Minister, however, Churchill is but the first among other Ministers and relies on them and the Members of Parliament for his authority. For this reason he would have known to include these others in his text,
regardless of how uncomfortable it may have been for him to do so. In this regard, a statement referring to the views of all Members *with their knowledge of so many different parts of the country* (118) may have been strictly for the purpose of flattery.

The fourth resource used by Churchill to communicate his commitment is his use of *shall* instead of *will*. While both of these are modal auxiliaries that are used to construct the future tense, *shall* is the less common of the two and used only in the first-person singular and plural to denote intention (Quirk & Greenbaum, 1990, p. 54). *Shall* also conveys an exhortation (Fowler, 1984) when *will* could just as easily have been used; by using *shall* Churchill’s statements take on a sense of insistence and need for pressing action. From personal experience, this usage of *shall* will be recognized by anyone educated in the British school system as a much more forceful version of *will*, becoming an implied imperative denoting *let it be so*. Churchill’s listener-followers would have understood that distinction and would have interpreted *shall* as a much more forceful and compelling expression of the future tense. It is this forcefulness conveyed through his lexical choice of *shall* that best conveys Churchill’s vision and his determination to achieve it.

Finally, the fifth resource conveying commitment, lexical choices such as the following, will convince any listener-follower of the level of Churchill’s commitment to his vision: *defend our Island home . . . ride out the storm of war . . . outlive the menace of tyranny*, if necessary *for years, if necessary alone* (133), *this is the resolve . . . this is the will* (135-136), *defend to the death* (137) and *go on to the end . . . fight on the beaches . . . we shall never surrender* (139).
There are only a few waivers in Churchill’s communication of his commitment and these may be purported more to demonstrate the leader’s humanity and humility than to hedge on the commitment to victory \textit{whatever the cost may be} (139). These apparent waivers include the following: \textit{but it certainly seemed} that the [French and British armies] \textit{would be broken up} (27); \textit{British Armies in the later years of the war, seemed about to perish} (29); \textit{I understand} that some request is to be made upon this subject (119); \textit{there never has been}, \textit{I suppose}; \textit{I would observe} (126); and \textit{I think} that no idea is so outlandish that it should not be considered and viewed with a searching, \textit{but at the same time, I hope}, with a steady eye (131). Fowler and Kress (1979) discuss a range of verbs to which propositions can be attached to convey different stances by the speaker toward what he is saying. They suggest that processes like \textit{think}, \textit{feel}, \textit{want}, \textit{wish}, \textit{try}, \textit{like}, \textit{see}, and \textit{understand} all have distancing effects, serving to add a tone of indirectness to the verb (p. 206). Fowler and Kress suggest that verbs like \textit{seem} (27, 29) and \textit{understand} (119) are intended to put some distance or indirectness between the orator and the addressee(s).

I can agree with Fowler and Kress (1979) in two instances in the speech. When Churchill says that it \textit{seemed} that the whole of the French First Army . . . \textit{would be broken up} (27) and again that \textit{British Armies in the later years of the war, seemed about to perish} (29) he may have been distancing himself from what actually happened in the days leading up to Dunkirk: While it seemed at the time that there might be a disaster, in fact as it turned out, the French army was not broken up and the British Armies did not perish. Similarly, the use of \textit{understand} (119) suggests that Churchill may have wanted to
state external events of which he is merely an interpreter (Fowler & Kress, 1979, p. 206) of the facts of a request (119) being made to the House.

However, in other instances that may be perceived to be hedging I do not believe that Churchill is distancing himself from his text. On the contrary, I believe he is strategically speaking in the vernacular to build his persona and to appeal to all his various audiences as a “regular guy,” a fellow sufferer as well as a leader.

Simon-Vandenbergen (2000) would seem to agree with me. In her research, she examined the occurrence of I think in political discourse as compared with its use in informal conversation, showing that the expression “has a complex of meanings which cannot simply be labeled ‘uncertainty’ or ‘lack of commitment’ and that, depending on the context, it can signal a tentative attitude or authoritative deliberation” (p. 41). Simon-Vandenbergen studied the location of I think in a clause noting that it can appear as an initial comment (I think it’s ready now), in the middle or medial of a clause (I’ve also, I think, managed to get the work done) and in the final position (it really was Sam who did it I think). I think in the final position was completely absent from the political texts the author studied. Simon-Vandenbergen suggests that this is because I think at the end of a clause suggests an afterthought: After stating something, the speaker adds his or her reservations, thereby weakening the assertion. She adds also that, according to Halliday (1985/1994, pp. 49-50), interpersonal elements typically occur in thematic position in the clause, because if speakers wish to express their attitude towards the thesis in the clause, it is normal that they should do so right at the beginning. All of Churchill’s uses of these sorts of terms occur at either the beginning or the middle of the clause, suggesting to me (following Simon-Vandenbergen) that he did not intend to hedge or waiver on his
statements. One other clause, *I have, myself full confidence* (133), resembles a clause found in Simon-Vandenbergen’s study: She found that *I think personally* makes the utterance into a strong expression of opinion rather than into a hesitant remark (p. 49).

Churchill is clear when he seeks to create a **common enemy** (Collins & Porras, 1991) with his listener-followers. References to the enemy include naming them *(Napoleon, 108, 127; Herr Hitler, 106; Gestapo, 138; and Nazi, 121, 138; and our enemy, 118, 120, 130)* and speaking of them indirectly (*odious apparatus, 138; originality of malice, aggression, 130*). Interestingly, while referring to mostly foreign enemies (*enemy aliens and suspicious characters of other nationalities, 120*), Churchill also includes mention of some domestic common enemies in his speech: *British subjects who may become a danger or a nuisance* (120) and *the Fifth Column* (125).

There is one interesting anomaly in the naming strategy that occurs in the now famous *we shall fight on the beaches* sequence (139): Despite including many circumstances of location (*in France, on the seas and oceans . . . in the hills, 139*), Churchill does not include a complement to indicate *who* they will be fighting; he might have said *we shall fight the Nazis on the beaches*. That Churchill does not include mention here of a common enemy is perhaps indicative that he did not have to specify that enemy; all of his listener-followers would have known exactly who he intended to fight. Alternatively, by leaving out the complement, Churchill may have been expressing his vision to fight, not only the Germans, but anyone who dared to invade the Island, thereby inspiring the British people to *never surrender* (139) no matter who challenged their *native land and all [they stood] for* (82).
**Benchmark: Spans Timelines**

Churchill’s speech contains the past, the present, and the future as discussed below. He makes an elegant reference to all three time periods when he says that the Navy carried (past) over 335,000 men, French and British, out of the jaws of death and shame, to their native land (present) and to the tasks which lie immediately ahead (future) (59).

The beginning of the speech (1-24 and 31-59), a part that is not being analyzed in this study, is a narrative of the Dunkirk landings and recovery in which Churchill tells the audience of the immediate past, the rescue of troops from the beaches of Normandy. He refers also to a more distant past when he says that the situation in 1940 is not the first time the Island has faced invasion; he observes, in fact, that there has never been a period in all these long centuries of which we boast when an absolute guarantee against invasion, still less against serious raids, could have been given to our people (126).

Churchill tells the British people that this is not the first time others have thought they could invade and defeat the Island (including Napoleon, 127, and many other Continental tyrants, 128) and also refers to previous defenders (the Knights of the Round Table and the Crusaders, 82) as earlier versions of the men who in the present, in so many ways and on so many occasions, are ready, and continue to be ready to give life and all for their native land (82).

Churchill also makes a distinction between the recent past (a week ago, 30) and the day of his speech in saying when, a week ago today, I asked the House to fix this afternoon as the occasion for a statement, I feared it would be my hard lot to announce the greatest military disaster in our long history (25). Instead of reporting a military
disaster (25) Churchill is able to relay news of deliverance from those hard lot tidings by conveying the story of the rescue at Dunkirk.

The transition from the past to the present appears in line 112 in which Churchill states that we shall not be content with a defensive war. It is in this sentence that Churchill moves from relating the story of the miracle of Dunkirk (recent past) to laying out his vision for the future by causing action to be undertaken in the present. This present action includes the reconstitution and build up the British Expeditionary Force (114), putting our defences in this Island into . . . a high state of organization (115), actions that are currently in train (115) and on which we are now engaged (116).

There are numerous references to the future in Churchill’s speech (that is what we are going to try to do, 134; there is no reason why we should not in a few months overtake the sudden and serious loss that has come upon us, 103; and the now famous final sentence we shall fight on the beaches, 139). Churchill’s future also includes the unlikely situation (which [he] do[es] not for a moment believe, 139) in which Britain finds itself subjugated and starving (139) in which event the New World would step forth to the rescue and the liberation of the old (139) so that the world does not sink into the abyss of a new Dark Age (Churchill, 1940c).

As one might assume, the three timelines are represented by different process tenses: the past, the present, and the future. To communicate the past Churchill relies on the past tense to communicate about the recent past in which he narrates the evacuation at Dunkirk; asked the House to fix (25) the date of his speech; feared he would have to tell of a disastrous military failure (25); and called upon House and the nation to prepare themselves (28). The present is communicated in the simple present tense: on this we are
now engaged (116). Similarly, the future is conveyed in the future tense but with one 
interesting anomaly: Churchill uses shall instead of the more common will modal 
auxiliary. The use of shall is discussed under the benchmark feature of expressing 
urgency.

**Benchmark: Contains Imagery**

There are many examples of imagery in Churchill’s speech that will ensure that 
his ideas are concrete (Kouzes & Posner, 1995) in the minds of his listeners. To convey 
this high level of imagery—referred to as drawing word pictures by Kouzes and Posner 
(1995)—and thereby make the speech vivid in the hearts and minds of the listener-
followers, Churchill draws on the resources of amplification: augmentation and 
amplification: enrichment.

There are 37 examples of amplification: augmentation in the speech including the 
following: these instruments of colossal and shattering power (82), these young men, 
going forth every morn (82), the odious apparatus of Nazi rule (138), bereavement in its 
sharpest form (87), and outlive the menace of tyranny, if necessary for years, if necessary 
alone (138). These are intended to provide imagery to Churchill’s listener-followers in 
the House of Commons and the British public who are hearing the speech on radio or 
reading it in the print media. The imagery serves to contrast the good from the bad: The 
good soldiers fighting the Nazis are young and go forth every morn (82) to do battle. Who 
in the audience could not imagine how good and courageous the soldiers must be to go 
forth every morn (82) into certain pain or death? Similarly, who in the audience would 
doubt the badness of people who have odious apparatus (138), instruments of colossal
and shattering power (82), and who engender tyranny (138)? By augmenting his lexical choices Churchill advances his vision of the good prevailing over the bad.

Examples of amplification: enrichment, the use of an attitudinal coloring to a meaning when a core, neutral word could have been used (Eggins & Slade, 1997) in the speech, also add to the imagery. Churchill speaks, for example, of Dunkirk having been a military disaster (25) when military failure would have sufficed; this additional coloring lays the foundation for Churchill to say that, far from being the greatest military disaster in our long history (25) it was in fact a miracle of deliverance (60). He is then able to juxtapose deliverance (60) with Dunkirk not having been a victory (60) and then segue into how he and his listener-followers can work together to ensure a real victory.

In another example of amplification: enrichment, when Churchill speaks of the French and British Armies possibly being broken up in the open field and having to capitulate (27)—Churchill would have known that breaking up (and not having the advantage of a united front) and capitulation (not only a shameful thing to do but also leaving the Island open to attack as all the Army was on the continent) would be seen as very negative to his listener-followers, more so than, for example, disarmed and defeated. Similarly, seemed about to perish . . . or be led into ignominious and subjugated captivity (29) is additional coloring: perish is much stronger than die; ignominious and subjugated captivity (29) much stronger than taken captive. Ignominious (29), like capitulate (27), brings element of shame and dishonor into being taken captive, a negative shared value for the British. By using ignominious (29), Churchill risks being seen as “posh” by the use of the term to amplify the humiliation of being captured; I can construe that he wanted the enriched coloring more than he feared the risk when he chose the word.
Three other examples of amplification: enrichment are noteworthy. First, as noted above, when Churchill speaks of put[ting] down Fifth Column activities (125) he creates an image of spies as animals. The remainder of that sentence until this malignancy . . . has been effectively stamped out (125) allows Churchill to reinforce his negative stance on Fifth Column activities by equating them to cancer that has to be excised. Second, in saying that the thought of invading Britain has excited and befooled many Continental tyrants (128), Churchill conveys an image of a court jester, thereby casting those who would invade in that league of silly jokesters who are worthy of being mocked. Third, in stating that the British might be subjugated and starving (139) before they will surrender, Churchill again implies the potential of humiliation and dishonour (subjugated), and starving amplifies the suffering already being experienced by the British under food rationing. This latter allusion to the existing suffering will resonate with the listener-followers who may agree to yet more suffering rather than surrender (139) and cause all their pain to have been for nought.

Churchill’s ability to convey imagery is also due in part to his use of long and involved qualifiers, despite advice in the literature to avoid them (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). As noted in chapter 3, the linguistic understanding of qualifier may differ from that of Kouzes and Posner (1995): To a linguist, a qualifier is a descriptive word or clause that follows that which it amplifies (while a modifier precedes that which it modifies); to Kouzes and Posner a qualifier seems to be synonymous with tentativeness (p. 143). Those clauses in the text that express tentativeness (or hedging) are discussed below, but I wanted to comment here on Churchill’s use of qualifiers, in the linguistic sense, because they are noteworthy. There are numerous instances of long and involved modifiers and
qualifiers in the text, including but not limited to: greatest military disaster in our long history (25); the hard and heavy tidings (28); the whole root and core and brain of the British Army (29); an ignominious and starving captivity (29); the past—not only distant but prosaic (82); and every kind of novel stratagem and every kind of brutal and treacherous maneuver (130). The use of modifiers and qualifiers in the speech ensured that Churchill was able to draw word pictures (Kouzes & Posner, 1995) that would convey his vision in the two media in which actual pictures were not possible, that is over the radio and in written mode. Having only his language at his disposal to communicate his vision effectively, Churchill had to rely on the proverbial “thousand words” to convey a single picture of never surrender (139), and he relied on modifiers and qualifiers to do so.

While these images realized by modifiers and qualifiers would resonate with the listener-followers, the most striking example of imagery is contained in Churchill’s final sentence. Through his plentiful use of circumstances of location (in France, in the field, on the beaches, etc., 139) Churchill encourages his listeners to see themselves in his vision; by naming all the places they will fight to the end, Churchill enables his followers to envisage themselves in his visionary picture, seeing themselves implementing the vision wherever they live or whatever their occupation.

**Benchmark: Suggests Means to Implement**

Churchill offers his listener-followers a number of ways in which they can participate and contribute to navigating the crisis (Hunt, 1999) with the aim of implementing his vision of victory. Churchill re-assures the British people that we shall
prove ourselves once again able to defend our Island home (133) and offers some suggestions how they might work together to navigate the crisis, including: preparing ourselves for every kind of novel stratagem and every kind of brutal and treacherous maneuver (130); all doing their duty (133); to the utmost of their strength (136); fighting in France, on the seas and oceans . . . on the beaches, on the landing grounds, in the fields and in the streets, in the hills (139). As noted above, this latter sentence, by stating all the locations where we shall fight (139), enables Churchill to speak directly to all British subjects, including each individual in his vision, no matter where they might be required to fight, and telling them how they can each contribute to navigating the crisis and implement his vision of victory.

There are two passages that tell followers how they can be involved in implementing the vision. The first of these occurs starting in line 99 where Churchill indicates that an effort the like of which has never been seen in our records is now being made and says that the two political parties have cast aside their interests, rights, and customs and put them into the common stock (101). Churchill also notes that there are plans to build up the British Expeditionary Force (114) and that Fifth Column activities will be put down with a strong hand (125). Finally, by his mention that work is proceeding everywhere, night and day, Sundays and week days (100), Churchill encourages his listeners also to put their “all” into the war effort.

The second and most famous of the two passages that suggests a means to implement the vision occurs in lines 133-139 in which Churchill outlines what the British people will do to achieve victory. He specifies that all must do their duty and leave nothing neglected (133) and not flag or fail (138), defending our Island no matter what
the cost may be (139), never surrender[ing] (139), and fighting in many locations to achieve the victory. The most famous portion of the text occurs in 139 in which Churchill identifies all the places in which the British and their allies will fight to win the war. As stated above, this is part of Churchill’s *us-ness* strategy: By identifying who will fight, wherever they live or whatever their occupation, Churchill alerts his listener-followers that each of them has a critical role to play in ensuring a victory and that he relies on them to do their duty.

**Benchmark: Expresses Urgency**

As suggested above, Churchill’s use of *shall* is an exhortation (Fowler, 1984) that conveys a sense of pressing need to act and which enables Churchill to meet this benchmark feature of an effective vision. There is one additional reference that implies *urgency* (Kotter, 1995, 2005, 2008) in Churchill’s speech and that reference is also implicit. While Churchill speaks of *Herr Hitler hav[ing] a plan for invading the British Isles* (106), there is no immediacy to the references, no indication how soon that expected invasion might happen. Churchill is definitive on what would occur if the invasion succeeded: The people would be *subjugated and starving* (138), there would be *malice and aggression* (130), and the people *must be ready to prepare ourselves for every kind of novel stratagem and every kind of brutal and treacherous manoeuvre* (130) that may come. Yet Churchill does not give a timetable for these occurrences. Two possibilities exist as to why Churchill did not identify a timetable for the invasion: The Poles had shared their knowledge of the German’s Enigma code in July 1939 (Bletchley Park, 2011), so either the Germans had not communicated the date of the invasion via Enigma or they had and Churchill could not disclose it for fear of revealing to the Germans that
the Allies had broken their code and were privy to details about their war plans. In either case, Churchill gave no date for the invasion in his speech.

Churchill needed, however, to convey that an invasion could occur at any time and there was therefore an urgent need to get prepared in case *parachute landings were attempted and fierce fighting attendant upon them followed* (123). Churchill does not express this urgency explicitly; instead he refers to *the menace of tyranny* (133). In this sentence, *menace* might be construed as immediate in much the same way as President Bush’s reference to *threat* in his October 2002 speech (in which he justifies his decision to declare war on Iraq) implies immediacy of danger and therefore, by pre-empting the future, justifies a similar immediacy of action (Dunmire, 2005).

Having said that there are only two implicit references to urgency, however, I contend that it is unlikely that Churchill, unlike perhaps corporate leaders justifying an upcoming merger, would have needed to make the reference. The British people had been at war for many months and had suffered many losses; it is unlikely that they needed additional reminders of the urgency of the situation.

**Summary**

Even with the engaging and compelling narrative of the miracle of Dunkirk removed from the text to be analyzed, Churchill’s speech that culminates in the *we shall fight* (139) sequence is an exemplary model of speech that uses language well to communicate vision. Churchill meets the eight benchmark features that the leadership literature suggests must be present in an effective vision and, as has been shown in this chapter, uses the resources of appraisal to do so.
Following the narrative about the evacuation that saved thousands of young men from sure death on the beaches of Dunkirk, Churchill’s speech becomes political visionary discourse when Churchill advises his many listeners (including the British people and the enemy who would have been listening to the speech via radio) that *wars are not won by evacuations* (61). Churchill uses a number of linguistic strategies to convince the enemy that the British will *never surrender* (139) and also to convince the British to implement the vision.

Among these linguistic resources are those of Appraisal Theory that enable Churchill to communicate his stance on those things and behaviors that are good and that distinguish *us* from the enemy. The strategic delineation of *us-ness* through the use of these linguistic strategies is a master stroke in the speech. In addition, Churchill expresses his own commitment to the vision through the declarative Mood, *engagement: proclaim*, and the use of *shall* rather than *will* and creates word pictures through elegant lexical choices and the resources of *amplification*. 
CHAPTER VI

JOHN F. KENNEDY’S INAUGURAL ADDRESS

Background

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was born in 1917 to a wealthy family of Irish decent in Boston, educated at Choate and Harvard, majoring in Political Science. He was sickly as a child and continued to have health problems the rest of his life. After college Kennedy served in the U.S. Navy during World War II. During his time in the Navy, Kennedy’s PT boat was hit by a Japanese destroyer; his heroic actions at the time of the sinking of his boat earned him a Purple Heart and the Navy and Marine Corps Medal to commemorate his heroism (Kelly, n.d.[a]).

Before running for Congress, Kennedy worked as a journalist and his book, Profiles in Courage, won a Pulitzer Prize. Kennedy served as both a member of the House of Representatives and a Senator before running for the presidency in 1960, a time when many were tired of the cold war, McCarthyism, and discrimination yet generally satisfied with the social calm and economic prosperity (Anderson, 1990). World War II was over. The family and patriotism were evident in suburbs and in the cultural icons of the day: I Love Lucy and Leave It to Beaver entertained the 50 million families who owned television sets, while Superman entertained viewers with his “never-ending battle for Truth, Honesty, and the American way” (p. 10).
National expectations were soaring in the United States at the beginning of 1960. The Institute of Social Research surveyed the nation and found that nearly 80% of adults felt that their children could look forward to a wonderful future (Anderson, 1990). Look magazine published a poll revealing that citizens were happy with their home life, their work, and their community and that they expected to “go on enjoying their peaceable existence right through the 1960s and maybe forever” (p. 18).

Yet there were also crises emerging. On the domestic front, 1 month after the publication of the Look poll, four young African American students sat down at a lunch counter in Greensboro, North Carolina, in front of the “Whites Only” sign. American women were beginning to push back against their role restrictions, starting to fight for equal pay legislation (Anderson, 1990). On the international front, Khrushchev won supreme power in the Kremlin in 1956 and proceeded to advance his agenda, a revolutionary challenge of topping the U.S. economically and militarily and bringing communism to the rest of the world. In 1957 the USSR successfully launched Sputnik, demonstrating that the Soviets could build and mobilize intercontinental missiles capable of transporting atomic weapons to the U.S. Castro’s 1959 revolution in Cuba brought a Soviet ally to within 100 miles of the U.S. border (Bernstein, 1991).

During his campaign, Kennedy was critical of then-President Eisenhower for his alleged lack of leadership and for allowing America to fall behind the Soviets, thereby allowing a missile gap to develop between the U.S. and Soviet nuclear arsenals. The 1960 election campaign was dominated by rising Cold War tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union. Kennedy had accused Eisenhower of losing Cuba where the revolutionary regime of Fidel Castro had become economically and militarily dependent
on the Soviet Union, heightening fears of communist subversion in the Western Hemisphere ("Campaign of 1960," n.d.). Kennedy’s opponent, Vice-President Nixon, campaigned on the coattails of outgoing President Dwight Eisenhower, promising continuity and status quo. He thought Kennedy to be inexperienced because of his youth, using it against him in the campaign leading up to the election (Bernstein, 1991). In response, Kennedy noted that Nixon was also a young man but that “his approach is as old as McKinley. His party is the party of the past. His speeches are generalities from Poor Richard's Almanac. Their platform, made up of left-over Democratic planks, has the courage of our old convictions. Their pledge is a pledge to the status quo—and today there can be no status quo” (Kennedy, 1960a, para. 28).

Unlike Nixon, Kennedy campaigned for change. In his speech accepting the Democratic nomination for the presidency, Kennedy highlighted that the balance of power was shifting: “There are new and more terrible weapons—new and uncertain nations—new pressures of population and deprivation. One-third of the world, it has been said, may be free—but one-third is the victim of cruel repression—and the other one-third is rocked by the pangs of poverty, hunger, and envy” (Kennedy, 1960a, para. 17).

Kennedy summarized his vision of change as follows:

Today our concern must be with [the] future. For the world is changing. The old era is ending. The old ways will not do. . . . We stand today at the edge of a New Frontier—the frontier of the 1960s—a frontier of unknown opportunities and peril—a frontier of unfulfilled hopes and threats. . . . The New Frontier of which I speak is not a set of promises—it is a set of challenges. It sums up not what I intend to offer the American people, but what I intend to ask of them. It appeals to their pride, not to their pocketbook—it holds out the promise of more sacrifice instead of more security. . . . Beyond that frontier are the uncharted areas of science and space, unsolved problems of peace and war, unconquered pockets of ignorance and prejudice, unanswered questions of poverty and surplus. It would be easier to shrink back from that frontier, to look to the safe mediocrity of the past, to be lulled by good intentions and high rhetoric—and those who prefer that
course should not cast their votes for me, regardless of party. (Kennedy, 1960a, para. 16)

In his campaign, Kennedy drew on words uttered years before by Lincoln in the Gettysburg Address, to issue a call to action:

For the harsh facts of the matter are that we stand on this frontier at a turning-point in history. We must prove all over again whether this nation—or any nation so conceived—can long endure—whether our society—with its freedom of choice, its breadth of opportunity, its range of alternatives—can compete with the single-minded advance of the Communist system. Can a nation organized and governed such as ours endure? That is the real question. Have we the nerve and the will? Can we carry through in an age where we will witness not only new breakthroughs in weapons of destruction—but also a race for mastery of the sky and the rain, the ocean and the tides, the far side of space and the inside of men's minds? (Kennedy, 1960a)

Kennedy and Nixon engaged in four televised debates in 1960. The first debate, which dealt with domestic issues, was watched by an estimated 70 million viewers. With these debates, television for the first time had an impact on American politics, allowing voters to see the candidates in person and in competition (Allen, 2011).

The contrast between Kennedy and Nixon was dramatic:

In August, Nixon had seriously injured his knee and spent 2 weeks in the hospital. By the time of the first debate he was still 20 pounds underweight, his pallor still poor. He arrived at the debate in an ill-fitting shirt, and refused make-up to improve his color and lighten his perpetual “5:00 o'clock shadow.” Kennedy, by contrast, had spent early September campaigning in California. He was tan and confident and well-rested. (Allen, 2011)

As suggested by Montefiore (2005), “Jack Kennedy’s good looks, energy and democratic aims seemed to embody the optimism and the sense of change that characterized the early 1960s” (p. 143). He was the epitome of the new generation of Americans (7) of whom he spoke (Clarke, 2004):

Born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow
undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world. (p. 7)

An unprecedented 68 million votes were cast in the 1960 presidential election. Kennedy won by the smallest margin of popular votes since 1888 (Kelly, n.d.[a]) and became the second youngest and the first Roman Catholic President. While a 1960 survey showed that “American Protestants were remarkably preoccupied with the fact that Kennedy was Catholic” (University of Michigan Research Center, as cited in Anderson, 1990), Kennedy was otherwise the embodiment of a renewed America.

My research for this dissertation suggests that Kennedy’s win was due in large part to his abilities as an orator. Kennedy could through his “evocative words . . . engage and energize the nation—imbuing its citizens with the feeling that anything was possible if they applied themselves in a collective, selfless effort on behalf of change” (Goldzwig & Dionisopoulos, 1995, p. 3).

Kennedy took office knowing that there were seeds of discontent at the end of the 1950s. He knew also that most Americans were content with their booming economy and concentrating on their jobs, raising their families, and enjoying suburbia (Anderson, 1990). Yet Kennedy’s messages were a wake-up call intended both for domestic and international audiences.

Kennedy’s (1961a) inaugural address is a masterpiece, a moving piece of rhetoric that touched and inspired a nation. The most quoted part of the inaugural address, *Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country*, actually occurs late in the speech (line 46) and caps a long, emotional build-up of metaphors and juxtapositions that Kennedy uses to reach out to the American people and bring them on side.
Kennedy, and speechwriter Ted Sorensen, wanted the inaugural address to “create the impression of a bold, imaginative, purposeful leadership; to de-emphasize the bi-polar power struggle; and to emphasize the affirmative approaches to peace” (Goldzwig & Dionisopoulos, 1995). According to Sorensen, the purpose of the speech was fourfold: to combat lingering campaign perceptions of inexperience; to provide a U.S. answer to the Soviet’s revolutionary challenge; to speak to a variety of audiences with a clear and compelling voice; and to achieve eloquence (Goldzwig & Dionisopoulos, 1995).

**Analysis**

The Kennedy inaugural did not lend itself to being broken into segments with a view to eliminating some from the analysis. While there are some large sections that are similar in their linguistic characteristics (such as the numerous sentences addressed to other populations, for example, *to our sister republics south of the border*, 17), I judged all of these and the other sentences in the text to be what Eggins (2004) calls obligatory or defining statements with no optional elements that I could leave out and still have an understandable text.

I have therefore included the full text words in my analysis. An analysis of that length is unusual in applications of Systemic Functional Linguistics and Appraisal Theory but I felt the whole Kennedy text (available in full text in Appendix C) would prove rich in findings and believed it worthy of being analyzed in full.

**Context of Situation**

Like the other speeches in my data set, the Kennedy inaugural address is in the field of political discourse, and inaugural addresses are a formal and important part of
that field. By Constitutional law, an incoming President need only recite the oath of office to assume the full power of the presidency; by tradition, the inaugural address and the accompanying pomp and circumstance are an important part of the ritual (Goldzwig & Dionisopoulos, 1995). Inaugural addresses generally set the themes for and outline the governing principles of the new administration (Goldzwig & Dionisopoulos, 1995), that is, the leader’s vision for the county. Inaugural addresses are often used to heal any wounds brought about by a long, divisive campaign and attempt to bring closure by evoking unity and commonality through traditional values (Goldzwig & Dionisopoulos, 1995).

The tenor of the speech is that of a leader to his listener-followers. Kennedy does not depart from this tenor but consistently uses language to represent himself as a leader throughout the text. The full speech is in the appraisal resources of *engagement: proclaim* with which Kennedy suppresses or rules out other alternative positions (Martin & White, 2005) to communicate his vision for his term as President and his vision for the American people and those around the world. This propensity for *engagement: proclaim* is discussed below in the section on commitment as a benchmark of an effective vision.

Kennedy did however allow two other voices to enter his speech when he borrowed some text from both Lincoln and Churchill. This would have been intentional and for the purpose of drawing these great leaders into his discourse, to add their *gravitas* to his own stance and vision. Kennedy may have felt he needed their wisdom to compensate for his relative youth or he may have added their texts to reinforce that his vision was similar to those of two great leaders who would have been both recognized and admired by the various audiences of listener-followers. According to Clarke (2004),
“Kennedy viewed history as determined by the actions of Great Men who combined wisdom and courage with oratorical talents and inspiring leadership . . . [noting that] the high court of history [would sit] in judgment of [him]” (p. 10). Clarke suggests that Kennedy hoped this high court would compare him to Lincoln and Churchill and considered his inaugural address an opportunity to link his reputation with theirs for all time.

From Lincoln, Kennedy borrowed the clause in your hands my fellow citizens more than in mine (37). A similar statement appeared in Lincoln’s first inaugural on March 4, 1861, in which Lincoln says in your hands, my dissatisfied fellow-countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war (Clarke, 2004, p. 198). According to one Kennedy biographer, The Times of London detected the cadence of Abraham Lincoln’s oratory in the speech and also Lincoln’s sense of the spiritual mission of the great presidential office (p. 7).

From Churchill came a number of borrowed texts and some philosophical underpinnings. Kennedy had travelled to Europe and the Middle East on the eve of the Second World War and, on his visit, he learned that it is more difficult for a democracy than a totalitarian state to mobilize its citizens for war and that to overcome this vulnerability, democratic leaders had to inspire their citizens to voluntary acts of sacrifice (Clarke, 2004, p. 80). This need to inspire his listener-followers to acts of sacrifice to implement the vision may have been the philosophical foundation for Kennedy’s now-famous command, ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country (47).
On September 3, 1939, Kennedy had visited the House of Commons during which Prime Minister Chamberlain announced that Britain was at war with Germany. Churchill (who was at that time the First Lord of the Admiralty) delivered a speech the words of which echo through Kennedy’s inaugural speech:

If these great trials were to come upon our Island, there is a generation of Britons here now ready to prove itself not unworthy of the days of yore and not unworthy of those great men, the fathers of our land, who laid the foundations of our laws and shaped the greatness of our country. (Churchill, 1939, para. 3)

The mode of the speech is written to be spoken. Kennedy is known to have “refined and edited his inaugural address for two months before it was given” (Montefiore, 2005, p. 141), perhaps taking such efforts because he “cared more about his inaugural than most presidents [fearing] he might not live to deliver a second one. Poor health had plagued him throughout his life, and, by the time he was elected president at forty-three, he had [already] received the last rites three times” (Clarke, 2004, p. 11).

Kennedy was supported in his writing efforts by his speechwriter, Ted Sorensen. There is, in fact, some controversy over who had written the inaugural speech, Kennedy or Sorensen, who “always loyally affirmed Kennedy’s authorship” (Clarke, 2004, p. 12) of the speech. Regardless of who drafted which portions of the speech at the time, Kennedy would not have delivered an inaugural address with which he was not completely in accord, and we can assume that the inaugural address that was delivered was fully in keeping with how Kennedy wanted to communicate his vision.

Features of a Vision

Kennedy meets all eight of the benchmark features that the leadership literature suggests comprise an effective vision, and it is easy to see how Kennedy’s inaugural has
become an icon of visionary leadership discourse. The following is my analysis of how the inaugural speech meets those benchmarks of an effective vision, with an explanation for each of them of how language realizes the feature.

**Benchmark: Issuing a Challenge**

Of the four speeches in my data set, only the Kennedy inaugural envisions a “big, hairy audacious goal” that requires change and growth rather than a return to a previous status quo or to a state that was promised but not delivered. As Clarke (2004) suggests, “if liberal engagement in world affairs has a high-water mark, this was it: a president summoning Americans to a global crusade against tyranny, poverty, disease and war that would guarantee a more fruitful life for all mankind. No president, before or since, has made such an ambitious and idealistic proposal” (p. 199).

Kennedy meets this benchmark feature of an effective vision by expressing his crusading vision through lexical choices, a naming strategy, and Mood.

Regarding the first of these resources, Kennedy is explicit is his choice of lexical items to communicate his vision, stating that the world has to meet a powerful challenge (11) and that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans (7) who will do anything to assure the survival and success of liberty (8) and who will continue a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself (40). This specificity is appropriate for an inaugural address in which the incoming leader lays out his or her plans for the country (Goldzwig & Dionisopoulos, 1995). In my view, Kennedy’s choice to convey the themes to which the new administration will commit through lexical items speaks to his need to communicate his plans explicitly to his listener-followers. It is unknown whether the use of specific lexical choices to
communicate his vision was a stylistic preference of Kennedy’s; I can assume, however, that communicating the vision was so important to the new President that he chose to communicate explicitly rather than leave anything to doubt. This is especially important when he communicates with those behind the Iron Curtain who are his partners in maintaining some safe equilibrium in the ongoing balance of terror over nuclear warfare to stay the hand of mankind’s final war.

In identifying his vision, Kennedy gives specifics about his goal of a New Frontier, a concept on which he spoke during his election campaign:

> the frontier of the 1960s—a frontier of unknown opportunities and peril—a frontier of unfulfilled hopes and threats... the uncharted areas of science and space, unsolved problems of peace and war, unconquered pockets of ignorance and prejudice, unanswered questions of poverty and surplus. (Kennedy, 1960a, para. 32)

In that same election speech Kennedy told his listener-followers that the New Frontier was not a set of promises but a set of challenges and that those who would shrink back from that frontier should not cast their votes for him, regardless of party (Kennedy, 1960a).

The specific challenges that Kennedy’s vision calls on the American people and others to meet include: assuring the survival and the success of liberty, 8; converting good words into good deeds, 17; assisting free men and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty, 17; forging a grand and global alliance, 41; assuring a more fruitful life for all mankind, 41; defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger, 42.

The requests Kennedy makes specifically of his fellow Americans are discussed below in the section on implementing the vision. Suffice it to say here that, with their help, over the course of his short administration, Kennedy would meet the challenges he
identified in his inaugural address, particularly: creating economic programs that launched the United States on its longest sustained expansion since World War II; new civil rights legislation; the nuclear test ban treaty of 1963; the Alliance for Progress and the Peace Corps which provided aid to developing nations; and plans for a massive assault on persisting pockets of privation and poverty (“Alliance for Progress,” n.d.).

The fulfillment of these latter two goals, providing aid to developing nations and alleviating privation and poverty, supply part of the rationale behind Kennedy’s use of the second linguistic strategy in his inaugural address, a naming strategy. In the speech, Kennedy is explicit in his outreach to populations other than his immediate listener-followers. While this outreach will be discussed in the section on shared hopes and dreams in the analysis of how Kennedy creates a sense of *us-ness* in his speech, it is worth noting here that the new President issues challenges for not only his *fellow Americans* (46) but also others in his inaugural address. Among the people(s) Kennedy explicitly reaches out to are those populations to whom he offers his pledges: *those old allies*, 10; *those new States whom we welcome to the ranks of the free*, 12; *those peoples in the huts and villages across the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery*, 15; *our sister republics south of our border*, 17; *all our neighbors*, 19; and *the United Nations*, 21. These populations he pledges respectively to: remain loyal and united to take on powerful challenges together; his word that one form of colonial control will not be replaced by another; best efforts to help them be free of misery; assistance to remain free and to cast off the chains of poverty; to oppose aggression or subversion; and support to keep and expand the organization.
Kennedy also issues a challenge—*not a pledge but a request* (22)—by naming *those nations that would make themselves our adversary* (22), that is, to those *hostile powers* (18), *the Communists* (15), on whom Kennedy calls to work with the U.S. on *a quest for peace* (22) and to *explore what problems unite us instead of belaboring those problems which divide us* (29). Naming these adversaries is a bold move for Kennedy, perhaps another way for him to demonstrate that he is a strong and decisive leader despite his relative youth and reported ill health.

Kennedy had made his views on what he required of Americans clear in his election speech, promising that his administration would hold out the promise of more *sacrifice* instead of more security (Kennedy, 1960a). As noted above, Kennedy’s trip to Europe had convinced him that, to mobilize citizens in a democracy, he needed to inspire them to voluntary acts of sacrifice (Clarke, 2004). Accordingly, Kennedy challenges his listener-followers, his *fellow Americans* (46), to give testimony to their *national loyalty* (38) and to answer *the call to service* (39). If they listen to the summons of the *trumpet* (40) they can contribute to the *struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself* (40). Kennedy’s call to action is synthesized into the now famous imperative *ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country* (46). Kennedy’s call was heard by his listener-followers. In just one example of their willingness to sacrifice for their country, in 2011 the U.S. Peace Corps will celebrate its 50th anniversary; since its inception, over 200,000 Peace Corps Volunteers have served in 139 host countries to work on issues ranging from AIDS education to information technology and environmental preservation (“About us,” 2011).
Kennedy offers ample **motivation** for his listener-followers to agree to contribute to his vision and accept his challenge, not the least of which is that he does *not shrink from this responsibility*—*[he] welcome[s] it* (43). Given his popularity with the younger generation of Americans and his appeal as the symbol of a new America, Kennedy’s personal commitment to the vision would have carried weight with his listener-followers. Furthermore, the intrinsic motivator of serving one’s country—*in the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger* (42)—and the implication that this generation of Americans had been *granted* (42) this special privilege, would have resounded loudly with a generation of Americans who had been too young to serve in World War II. And, finally, Kennedy explicitly says that contributing to meeting his challenge is tantamount to doing *God's work* (49) and that their efforts *will light our country and all who serve it*—*and glow from that fire can truly light the world* (45). To convey these intrinsic motivators Kennedy alludes to values—such as *defending freedom* (42), *energy, faith, and devotion* (45)—that would have been instantly recognized as good by the listener-followers. These shared values are discussed in more depth below in the section on values as a benchmark feature of an effective vision.

Kennedy also offers a compelling extrinsic motivator to his listener-followers: In following his vision Americans will decrease the tension with the Soviet Union through peaceful means rather than allowing *the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction* (22).

The most striking way through which Kennedy communicates his Big Hairy Audacious Goal is Mood which has to do with how we construct our clauses in our texts
to communicate meaning (Eggins, 2004, p. 147). There are two predominant Moods in Kennedy’s address: declarative (the world is very different now, 3; we dare not forget, 6; united, there is little we cannot do, 11) and imperative.

The declarative Mood allows Kennedy to present his worldview as factual: The world he presents is a world in which man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life (4) and in which the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans (7) who shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty (8). Kennedy declares this worldview in a manner that permits no suggestion that it could be otherwise. Kennedy does not ask his listener-followers to consider and judge whether his worldview is in keeping with his own; instead he states this worldview in the declarative and assumes that his fellow Americans (46) and others will see it through his eyes and follow his vision. Similarly, Kennedy does not hesitate when he declares all his pledges or the single request (22) to his various audiences: These are stated as “done deals” by a leader who has the authority and the gumption to make such commitments.

The declarative Mood and Kennedy’s use of only engagement: proclaim in his address are explored in the section on the benchmark feature of commitment in the section on shared hopes and dreams. Here, the mention of Mood in the declarative serves to position Kennedy’s worldview as the platform from which he issues his challenges to his audiences in the second Mood, imperative.

The imperative Mood is most commonly constructed in commands (Eggins, 2004), for example, read the book, sit down, be quiet. However, tenor considerations
impact on language choices (Eggins, 2004) and Kennedy would have wanted to communicate his imperatives in a way that was inclusive and supportive of his *us-ness* strategy which he conveys in part through addressing his listener-followers as *my fellow citizens* (37), *my fellow Americans* (46), and *my fellow citizens of the world* (47). One option to communicate his imperatives in a more inclusive way would have been to use a modulated interrogative for an imperative, saying for example, instead of *and so, my fellow Americans ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country* (46) Kennedy might have said *and so my fellow Americans, would you like to ask what you can do for your country instead of asking what it can do for you?* The difference between the two options is remarkable: The bald imperative conveys strength and leadership while the modulated imperative is weak and more conducive to a person in an inferior position asking for help from those in a superior position. Similarly, other examples of the imperative in the inaugural speech (*ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man*, 47; and *ask of us the same high standards of strength and sacrifice*, 48) and communications typical of a strong and determined leader.

It is Kennedy’s use of the *jussive imperative*, however, that stands out as one of the most prominent and significant linguistic features of the inaugural address. Together with his use of juxtaposition (discussed in the section on imagery), the jussive imperatives are defining features of the Kennedy inaugural. The jussive is a sub-type of the imperative Mood used with the first person that means ordering and includes the speaker as well as the audience in an action proposed. It is unlike the optative sub-type of the imperative that occurs in situations of wishing and only in the third person (for
example, *Lord, save us*) and does not include the speaker in the proposed action (adapted from Halliday, 1985/1994, p. 87). Kennedy uses two types of jussive imperatives: the three instances of *we dare not* (6, 11, 23) and an astounding 16 instances of *let* (7, 8, 19, 20, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, 49).

The three instances of *we dare not* permit Kennedy to allude to the *balance of terror* (25) between the U.S. and the USSR, each of whom is *overburdened by the cost of modern weapons* (25) but retains them *for only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed* (24). Kennedy’s allusion to this Cold War stand-off is another way in which he can emphasize that a new *beginning* (1) is needed, one that will call on Americans to agree to *serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms* (30) and the creation of *a new endeavor, not a new balance of power, but a new world of law* (33). His vision of forging a *grand and global alliance . . . that can assure a more fruitful life for all mankind* (41) will require the commitment of the American people but not at the risk of their security; Kennedy says *we dare not tempt them with weakness* (23), a statement that assures his listener-followers that his proposed *alliance* (41) will not be undertaken in a fool-hearted manner and also puts the Soviets on notice that, while he has no fear of *negotiating* (27), he has no illusions about the need to maintain nuclear weapons to defend the U.S. and maintain the stand-off. Framing these comments in the jussive imperative Mood (that is, saying *we dare not tempt them with weakness* rather than, for example, *do not tempt them with weakness*) enables Kennedy to include himself in the command, perhaps signaling to the U.S. Armed Forces that he will play a role in future defense decisions. Kennedy, having been elected on the heels of an experienced military person, outgoing President
Eisenhower, may have wanted to demonstrate his tough stand on communism, both as a
president-elect who lacked the military experience of his predecessor and as a Democrat
(Bose, 1998).

Similarly, when Kennedy says *we dare not forget today that we are the heirs of that first revolution* (6), he signals that his policies will be governed by the values of *liberty* (8) and *freedom* (1, 14, 42, 47) that define the nation and remind others that they
too must be so governed. The 16 instances of *let* (7, 8, 19, 20, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 31,
32, 32, 33, 36, 49) add needed detail to what we will do together to accomplish the goals
set out in the inaugural speech.

**Benchmark: Vision as Destination**

The *destination* of Kennedy’s vision is clear as is the road map to get there. The
appraisal resources of *judgment: positive and appreciation* are used by Kennedy to
communicate that he values the destination he is proposing.

In promising *renewal, as well as change* (1), Kennedy speaks to numerous
populations to identify common and mutually beneficial destinations, thereby meeting
this benchmark feature of an effective vision. From his *fellow citizens* (1, 37), his *fellow
Americans* (49), Kennedy asks for a response when *the trumpet summons* (40) and asks
them to follow him to a destination of *sacrifice* (48) and willingness to *pay any price,
bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to
assure the survival and the success of liberty* (8). He issues his call to action because the
rights of man, the same revolutionary beliefs for which [their] forebears fought are still
at issue around the globe (5). Ensuring the *survival and the success of liberty* (9) through
*sacrifice* (48) and *paying any price* (8) are *positive* behaviors that Kennedy *judges* as
meeting his standards; in his inaugural Kennedy calls on his listener-followers to work with him to get to the destination. Kennedy suggests that with the support of his listener-followers, and with the cooperation (11, 33) of other populations and powers (25) he can create a world that is free of the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself (40).

Similarly, Kennedy calls on other populations to make the effort to reach the destination. Among those other populations are those who are old allies and faithful friends (10), new states (12), those peoples in the huts and villages across the globe who are struggling to break the bonds of mass misery (15), the United States’ sister republics south of [the] border (17) and the United Nations. Kennedy envisages a world for all that is united (11), free (14), where there is no mass misery (15) or poverty (17), no aggression or subversion (19) and in which all work together in a new alliance for progress (17). Working together, according to Kennedy, will take the world to a new destination and a more fruitful life for all mankind (41). The resources of appreciation, both positive (among them freedom, 1; the rights of man, 5; liberty, 8; good deeds, 17; peace, 22; and the wonders of science, 31) and negative (mass misery, 15; poverty, 17; hostile powers, 18; the deadly atom, 25; and destruction, 22) enable Kennedy to realize through language those things he does and does not value as part of destination.

And, perhaps to the surprise of his listener-followers, Kennedy reaches out to the second of the two great powers (25) to enlist their help in reaching the desired destination. Kennedy’s New Frontier (Kennedy, 1960a) is a destination in which both sides seek to invoke the wonders of science instead of its terrors (31) and in which both sides explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the ocean depths, and encourage the
arts and commerce (31). He asks the Soviets to explore (29) and to formulate . . . serious and precise proposals (30) and to heed . . . the command of Isaiah—to "undo the heavy burdens . . . and to let the oppressed go free" (32). He also wants their help in the struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself (40). If the Soviets agree to accept his request (22), Kennedy promises a common destination of a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved (33). Kennedy uses judgment: positive (a host of cooperative ventures, 11; a free society, 16; a peaceful revolution of hope, 18; sincerity, 26; a grand and global alliance, 38) to communicate the positive aspects of his destination to those who would make themselves our adversary (22) to convince them that their way (expressed in the resources of judgment: negative such as colonial control, 12; iron tyranny, 12; and destruction, 22) is a less desirable destination.

**Benchmark: Shared Values**

Kennedy was unambiguous about running a values-based administration, noting that the challenges he intended to offer to the American people would “appeal to their pride, not their pocketbook” and that these challenges would require “more sacrifice [not] more security” (Kennedy, 1969a). Also, Kennedy knew from his visit to Europe that to mobilize people in a democracy he had to inspire them (Clarke, 2004). Inspiring action by invoking shared values is typical in inaugural addresses, which attempt to heal any remaining divisions from the election campaign and also to bring closure by evoking unity and commonality through traditional values (Goldzwig & Dionisopoulos, 1995).

In his inaugural address, Kennedy inspires his listener-followers by appealing to their shared values and through the use of a number of linguistic strategies, particularly
the appraisal resources of *affect* that enable us to communicate our feelings (Martin & White, 2005), the appraisal resources of *appreciation* which enable us to convey how we value things (Martin & White, 2005), those of *judgment* which enable us to assess someone’s behavior against our norms (Martin & White, 2005), and several specific references to religious terms including *God*.

Kennedy uses both the *positive* and *negative* resources of *affect* in his speech. The *positive affect* he uses includes: *celebration, 1; comfort, 25; secure, 33; devotion, 45;* and *the land we love, 49*. The *negative affect* resources include: *mass misery, 15; alarmed, 25; terror, 25; two instances of fear, 27-28; embattled, 40; struggle, 40;* and *danger, 47*. Kennedy uses both positive and negative affect to communicate the polarity between our shared values (*comfort, security, devotion*) and *those who would make themselves our adversary, 22 (terror, fear)*. In this way Kennedy can convey that our positive shared values are worth maintaining by implementing the vision while their negative values must be resisted.

Like *affect, appreciation* resources are also utilized in both the *positive* and the *negative* in the speech. Among those things evaluated as being *positive* by Kennedy are: *beginning, 1; renewal, 1; the rights of man, 5; liberty, 8; loyalty, 10, 38; our word, 12; our best interests, 15; a free society, 16; free men and free governments, 17; hope, 14, 18, 21, 40; peace, 22; sincerity, 26; grand and global alliance, 38; more fruitful life for all mankind, 41; high standards, 48; strength, 48;* and *sacrifice, 48*. Those things that are evaluated as *negative* by Kennedy include: *hostile powers, 22; destruction, 22; weakness, 26; the jungle of suspicion, 33; failure, 37; aggression, 19; subversion, 19; and the deadly atom, 25*. Offering his listener-followers his own evaluation of those things he values and
those he does not value enables Kennedy to contribute to his *us-ness* strategy and to communicate his stance on those things that are to be maintained through his vision.

Similarly, Kennedy uses the resources of *judgment* to communicate this stance to his various audiences, conveying what he perceives as worthy behavior and also that conduct that does not live up to agreed standards. Among the clauses that convey *positive* judgment of behavior is the direct statement: *because it is right* (15). Other less direct statements of *positive judgment* include: mention of those other peoples, those *old allies* and *faithful friends whose cultural and spiritual origins we share*, 10; acting in a *united* (11) manner; being *rightly alarmed* (25) at the growth of nuclear weaponry; doing good works without the ulterior motive of *seek[ing] votes*, 15; working together on *serious and precise proposals*, 30; and collaborating to create a *new world of law* in which the *peace is preserved*, 33, and *a more fruitful life for all mankind*, 42, can be achieved.

On the other hand, there are those behaviors which Kennedy does not deem in keeping with American standards and which he therefore judges *negatively* including: being *divided* and *at odds and split asunder*, 11; acting because *the Communists may be doing it*, 15; being *at the prey of hostile powers*, 18; using the *absolute power to destroy all nations*, 30; and *the common enemies of man*: *tyranny, poverty, disease and war itself*, 40.

Kennedy also uses references to religion to communicate the *moral overtones* of vision to his listener-followers through shared religious values. Religion was a factor in Kennedy’s election: As noted above, American Protestants were preoccupied with the fact that Kennedy was Catholic (University of Michigan Research Center, as cited in Anderson, 1990); Kennedy would therefore have wanted to heal (Goldzwig &
Dionisopoulos, 1995) that concern in his inaugural address. In his election campaign Kennedy had delivered a speech to the Greater Houston Ministerial Association to address some concerns, particularly “because I am a Catholic, and no Catholic has ever been elected President, the real issues in this campaign have been obscured” (Kennedy, 1960b, para 3). In his speech Kennedy noted that “contrary to common newspaper usage, I am not the Catholic candidate for President. I am the Democratic Party’s candidate for President who happens also to be a Catholic” (Kennedy, 1960b, para. 18).

Kennedy is understandably careful in the religious references he includes in his inaugural, perhaps to avoid any Protestants leaving the carefully constructed us-ness as might have happened had the new President made only specific Catholic references (for example, perhaps referring in his speech to Mother Mary or our Holy Father, the Pope). By speaking in generic Christian terms, Kennedy addresses his various audiences, Catholics and Protestants alike, appealing to shared Christian values without alienating any particular Christian sect. Similarly, the references are sufficiently generic to welcome Jewish Americans into Kennedy’s we, as the only specific biblical reference is to the Book of Isaiah, which is part of the Old Testament and therefore recognized in Judaism. The inaugural address would be considered politically incorrect in today’s world because it contains only Judeo-Christian references but, at the time, Kennedy’s references to religion would have suggested to his listener-followers a powerful endorsement of his vision by a shared God.

The explicit religious references in the inaugural are as follows: reverend clergy, 1; I have sworn before . . . almighty God, 2; the rights of man come . . . from God, 5; Isaiah, 32; His blessings . . . His help, 49; and God’s work, 49. There is one indirect
reference to divinity in the following sentence: *For man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish . . . all forms of human life* (4). In this sentence Kennedy communicates that the ability to create and abolish all life, which previously was only within the purview of God, now rests with man because of nuclear weapons. By communicating that this ability is very unusual (in that it used to belong only to God), Kennedy paves the way for his contention that he fully intends to act *before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction* (22).

**Benchmark: Shared Hopes and Dreams**

Kennedy also meets this benchmark feature of an effective vision, infusing his inaugural with emotion, enthusiasm and commitment, an elegant *us-ness* strategy, and a delineation of a common enemy.

The *emotion* that Kennedy communicates includes a message of anxiety and discontent (*Time*, 1960, as cited in Goldzwig & Dionisopoulos, 1995) about the times in which he and his listener-followers were living, a time in which it was appropriate to be *rightly alarmed by the steady spread of the deadly atom* (25). Kennedy had taken office during the tumultuous time of the Cold War, winning the election on a campaign platform that had stressed the “missile gap” with the Soviet Union and the need for the U.S. to build up its forces to meet any challenge the Soviets might pose (Bose, 1998). One of Kennedy’s goals of the inaugural address was to provide a U.S. answer to the Soviet’s revolutionary challenge (Goldzwig & Dionisopoulos, 1995); in order to communicate that response, Kennedy first needed to make his listener-followers aware that a real danger existed, that man did indeed hold *in his mortal hands the power to abolish . . . all forms of human life* (22). Kennedy wanted to impress on his audiences that
the prospect of a nuclear war was real and that he was a strong enough leader to meet the challenge. Then and only then would an olive branch being extended to the Russians—a request rather than a pledge, 22—be perceived as an acceptable, not weak, policy. The emotions of anxiety and discontent that lay the foundations for the olive branch are communicated through the resources of affect: negative in such instances as: iron tyranny, 12; mass misery, 15; engulf, 22; alarmed, 25; uncertain balance of terror, 25; fear, 27, 28; terrors, 31; embattled, 40; a long twilight struggle, 40; and being in the hour of maximum danger, 47.

Kennedy then uses the resources of affect: positive to present the other side of the affect: negative coin: a New Frontier in which the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved (33) and to convey that his vision conjures emotions of happiness (celebration, 1; the survival and success of liberty, 8; united, 11; a free society, 16; and the land we love, 49) as well as security (freedom, 1; that first revolution, 6; the ranks of the free, 12; take comfort, 25 and the weak [are] secure, 33). Through subtle language usage Kennedy is able to create solidarity (Martin & White, 2005) with his listener-followers: If they will commit to his vision he will lead them away from those things that cause fear (27, 28) and terror (31) and forward to a New Frontier, a free society (16) where the weak are secure (33) and where there is peace (33) in the world.

Kennedy’s inaugural speech was addressed specifically to the American public, the free and emerging nations of the world, and the Soviets who would be request[ed] (22) to choose between cooperation and confrontation. In Kennedy’s words, the inaugural was intended to speak to friend and foe alike (7). There is little doubt in the inaugural about whom Kennedy considered to be included in the us-ness strategy and who is excluded
from this group (*them*); Kennedy addresses both populations in the early part of his speech as being opposed to each other but, in the latter part of the inaugural, speaks to *them* as allies and colleagues. This weaving of the *they* into the *we* is masterful and a key strategy in Kennedy’s pursuit of *peace* (22) in *the hour of maximum danger* (42).

As part of the construction of the *we*, Kennedy speaks primarily to Americans of his own generation, those who were *born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world* (7).

Kennedy expands on this *generation* (7) of listener-followers and also addresses those Republicans who did not vote for him and other groups that form, or could form, part of the *we*, including those in other nations. Each of these is discussed below.

The first sub-group of the *we* are those *fellow Americans* (46) who will help Kennedy implement his vision and build the New Frontier. It was therefore critical that Kennedy communicate with those he held within the *we* in order to create the bonding and solidarity (Martin, 2000) that is necessary for his vision to be shared by other leaders and implemented by the listener-followers. In addition to addressing this group directly (*born in this century, tempered by war . . . , 7*), Kennedy speaks to them through vocatives (*Vice President Johnson, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chief Justice, President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, President Truman, 1*) nominal groups (*my fellow citizens,1, 37, 47; my fellow Americans, 46; this administration, 35; young Americans, 39*); pronouns (*we*); and references to *God* who is *proclaimed* as being within Kennedy’s *we* (*I have sworn before . . . almighty God, 2; the rights of man come . . . from God, 5; Isaiah, 32; His*
blessings . . . His help, 49; and God’s work, 49). The frequent naming of those who form part of the we is intentional: Kennedy wanted all his listeners to see themselves in his vision and embrace being one of the followers who will help him implement it.

Kennedy would also have wanted to speak to a second sub-group of fellow citizens (1, 37) who were not yet part of the we, that is, those Americans who did not vote for him and yet whom he requires be part of the we and commit to his vision. Kennedy does not refer directly to the Republicans, but instead uses an inclusive naming strategy to appeal to both those Americans who wanted the status quo (and who would have voted for Nixon) and to those who aspired to his own vision of renewal (1) and change (1). In his inaugural, Kennedy would have the opportunity to address all those in the United States by television and thereby expand his us to include all his fellow Americans (46) regardless of which candidate they originally supported. His naming strategy therefore incorporates references to those Americans who would favor tradition (forebears, 2, 5; heirs of that first revolution, 6; old allies, 10) and to those who would favor the new (new generation of Americans 7; and new States, 12), hoping that his vision would appeal to both groups.

The third sub-group of the we includes those in other nations who are, or could be, on the side of the U.S. in terms of sharing similar values (liberty, 8; freedom, 1, 14, 42, 47;). These populations Kennedy speaks to directly via a naming strategy (old allies and faithful friends, 10; new states, 12; those peoples in the huts and villages, 15; those sister republics south of [the] border, 17; the United Nations, 21) and indirectly through metaphors.
The use of metaphor is a distinguishing feature of Kennedy’s inaugural and will be discussed here and in the section on the benchmark feature of imagery. Metaphor as part of the *us-ness* strategy enables Kennedy to speak to those who would participate in the *new alliance for progress* (17)—presumably *those peoples in the huts and villages across the globe*, 15; *those sister republics south of [the] border*, 17; and those who *have come out from under colonial control*, 12. These are the populations who Kennedy hopes will opt for democracy and halt the spread of communism around the world. Kennedy had campaigned on a platform of the world hanging in the balance between communism and democracy; he felt that unless the U.S. reached out to the oppressed, they would fall, like dominoes, to the enemy (Kennedy, 1957). While it is unknown why Kennedy chose to allude metaphorically to these populations rather than name them directly, I can surmise that, given U.S. covert efforts to counter the Soviet influence in countries around the world, Kennedy would not have wanted to “blow the cover” of any operations that would have been revealed had Kennedy specifically identified the countries in which Americans were active. Also, Kennedy may have wanted to be very inclusive; by not naming some countries, he avoided inadvertently forgetting to mention others. In this way he issues an open invitation to any country that wants to be included in the *we*.

One other reference, this one specific, is noteworthy in Kennedy’s construction of the *we*. Kennedy offers in his inaugural to *renew [his] pledge of support to the United Nations to prevent it from becoming merely a forum for invective* (21). This latter remark may be another allusion to the Soviets as *Other* (Lazar & Lazar, 2004), a remark that will be understood by the listener-followers who would have been aware of Khrushchev’s propensity for behaving poorly at meetings of the United Nations, including an angry
session in which he repeatedly banged his shoe on the desk during a General Assembly meeting in October 1960 (“Khrushchev, Nikita,” 2008). This outburst was televised and featured largely in the media of the day (BBC, 2008).

One other linguistic strategy of Kennedy’s construction deserves notice, that is, his description of the U.S. and the USSR as *two great and powerful groups of nations* (25). In 1961, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was already a formal group of nations; by saying that there is a second group, Kennedy uses the appraisal resource of *engagement, proclaiming* that there was an equally formal group aligned around the U.S. In so saying, Kennedy implies that a formal, aligned Western Bloc already existed when in fact there was no such thing. Kennedy makes his *proclamation* for the purpose of claiming power equal to the Eastern Bloc. Kennedy does so to advance his quest for peace via a show of (non-existing) strength in numbers, *for only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain . . . they will never be employed* (24).

Kennedy’s strategy in the inaugural speech regarding the Soviets was to provide a U.S. answer to the Soviet’s revolutionary challenge (Goldzwig & Dionisopoulos, 1995). To provide that answer (*this peaceful revolution of hope*, 18), Kennedy first needed to ensure that his listener-followers recognized the threat of nuclear war and the Soviet desire to beat the U.S. economically and militarily. Through his linguistic choices, Kennedy made it clear whom he considers to be the *Other* (Lazar & Lazar, 2004): *those who wish us ill*, 8; *those nations who would make themselves our adversary*, 22; *those hostile powers*, 18; and *the Communists*, 15. In his identification of them, Kennedy also uses metaphors, referring to the Soviets as those who would use *the dark powers of destruction* (22) and as having an *iron tyranny* (12). This latter nomination may refer to
those behind the “iron curtain,” a term coined by Churchill in 1946 when he stated that the Soviets were establishing an iron curtain across Europe (Anderson, 1990).

Kennedy also speaks to those who ride the back of the tiger (14), perhaps referring to those states which aligned with the powerful Soviet bloc after World War II, but most likely referring to Cuba. This metaphor is discussed below in the section on the benchmark features of imagery. Following taking the government by force in 1959, Castro had pursued close relations with the Soviet Union, working with other governments in Latin America to advance the geopolitical goals of the Soviets by funding and fomenting violent subversive and insurrectional activities (Coutsoukis, 2001). Through the use of the tiger metaphor, Kennedy is warning Castro that he may be in danger of being subsumed by the Soviets.

The nominal group those nations who would make themselves our adversary (22) is worthy of further discussion. Kennedy uses make as a reflexive process, to make them do something, as in they made themselves ill. In using the reflective process, Kennedy eliminated any agency role from the United States, suggesting that the U.S. played no part in those nations becoming adversaries; they did it all by themselves without any provocation or stimulus from the U.S. Perhaps Kennedy really believed that the USSR had made themselves an adversary; alternatively, he could also have been paving the way for his cooperative peace effort by indicating that the Russians could become allies by an equal act of will.

The transition of the USSR from a foe (7), hostile power (18), and adversary (22) to part of the we occurs in line 25 when Kennedy notes that neither side can take comfort from our present course (25) of a race toward nuclear supremacy. Instead, Kennedy
suggests that they work together, and, in the latter part of the inaugural, begins to address the Other (Lazar & Lazar, 2004) differently, naming them in a much less confrontational way, as if they were part of the us and a full partner in the cooperative effort for peace. In a magnificent series (26-33), Kennedy issues his request (22) to the Soviets: let [both sides] begin anew the quest for peace . . . explore what problems unite us . . . formulate serious proposals for . . . the control of arms, seek to involve the wonders of science instead of its terrors, unite to heed the command of Isaiah . . . let the oppressed go free.

Kennedy’s request of the Soviets is conveyed using the jussive imperative (let) and a series of mental processes (begin anew, 26; negotiate, 27, 28; explore, 29; formulate, 30; and seek to invoke the wonders of science, 31). In this way Kennedy communicates that he and his people are committed to partnering (let us) and that he is asking that both sides act in rational, thinking ways rather than in ways that are more in keeping with material processes (abolish . . . all forms of human life, 4; pay any price, bear any burden, 8; riding the back of the tiger, 14; and engulf, 22). To move forward together will require discussion and mutual respect, not grandstanding and banging shoes on tables.

Kennedy’s us- ness strategy also has a bearing on his identification of a common enemy in his text. Until line 26 it is clear that the enemy is those who wish us ill, 8; those nations who would make themselves our adversary, 22; those hostile powers, 18; and the Communists, 15. However, mid-way through his inaugural, Kennedy shifts his attention from the Soviets as the enemy to an invitation (request, 22) that the Soviets become part of the we. Kennedy begins to speak of cooperation and unity (united, 11) in which he shifts away from referring to the Soviets as being the target (hostile powers, 18) and
instead includes them in the *we*, allies who are going to work with *us* to target *those common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself* (40) through a *grand and global alliance, East and West, North and South* (41). By the conclusion of the speech, Kennedy implies that *citizens of America, citizens of the world* (48) working together could be doing *God’s work* (49). In shifting his naming of the Eastern Bloc from *foes* (7), *adversaries* (22), and *hostile powers* (18) to *citizens of the world* (47), Kennedy uses language to communicate his vision of providing a peaceful alternative to the Soviet’s traditional role as enemy.

One final linguistic strategy is used in conveying the *us* and the *them* in the inaugural address: the resources of *judgment*, both *positive* and *negative*. Not surprisingly, Kennedy uses *judgment: positive* to communicate his stance that our behaviors are good and *judgment: negative* to communicate about their poor behaviors, at least in the early part of the text prior to the point at which the Soviets are invited to become part of the *we* (*let us begin anew*, 26).

Among the behaviors that define us as good are: being *faithful friends*, 10, and *old allies*, 10; acting *because it is right*, 15; *civility and sincerity*, 26; and being *just*, 33. These are the behaviors that define us and distinguish us from the *Other* (Lazar & Lazar, 2004) who exhibit *judgment: negative* behaviors.

Among these behaviors that do not live up to our socially acceptable standards (Martin & White, 2005) are: condoning *colonial control*, 12; acts of *hostile powers*, 18; actions that would ensure *absolute power to destroy all nations* (30); and also those behaviors that would enact *tyranny, poverty, disease and war itself* (40). Attribution of these *negative* behaviors to the Soviets is abandoned by Kennedy when he shifts to
including the Eastern Bloc in his we, suggesting that all work together and behave in 
_judgment: positive_ ways through a series of mental processes as noted above (_begin anew_, 26; _negotiate_, 27, 28; _explore_, 29; _formulate_, 30; _seek to invoke the wonders of science_, 31; and _unite_, 33). In this way, Kennedy uses the resources of appraisal theory to advance his _us-ness_ strategy, converting old enemies into new allies.

Kennedy’s **commitment** to and **enthusiasm** for his vision are evident throughout the text. We know from speechwriter Sorensen that Kennedy wanted his inaugural speech to combat lingering campaign perceptions of inexperience and to provide a U.S. answer to the Soviet’s revolutionary challenge (Goldzwig & Dionisopoulos, 1995); to accomplish these goals Kennedy needed to speak purposefully about his vision and convince his _fellow Americans_ (46) that the way of the previous administration was no longer applicable.

Kennedy had campaigned on a platform that _change_ (1) and _renewal_ (1) were needed to counter Eisenhower’s alleged lack of leadership that allowed America’s nuclear arsenal to fall behind that of the Soviets (“Campaign of 1960,” n.d.). Kennedy needed to do two things in his speech to counter the previous administrations inaction: first, to convince the American people that they _dare not tempt_ the Soviets _with weakness_ (23) by decreasing the number of _instruments of war_ (21) in the arsenal and, second, persuade his listener-followers that a new way, a _quest for peace_ (22), was the only way to proceed _before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction_ (22).
Kennedy realizes his commitment to a vision of both decreasing the gap in U.S.–Soviet missile status and to proceeding towards peace (22) through the linguistic resources of Mood, engagement, amplification, and repetition.

The first of these, Mood, is striking in the text: Kennedy speaks only in the declarative or in the more powerful imperative. There are two rhetorical questions in the text (Can we forge against these enemies a grand and global alliance, North and South, East and West, that can assure a more fruitful life for all mankind? Will you join in that historic effort? 41), but these do not detract from the other declarative or imperative sentences. On the contrary, by reaching out specifically to his listener-followers and asking for their support, Kennedy in fact reinforces his vision by explicitly asking that others commit to it. Kennedy confirms his own involvement in the vision by stating first that only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger (42) and that not only does he not shrink (43) from that responsibility, he welcome[s] it (43).

The second linguistic resource used by Kennedy to communicate his commitment and enthusiasm to the vision is engagement: proclaim. All the sentences in the text are of this variety, leaving no room for other voices (save those of Lincoln and Churchill suggesting their support of Kennedy’s vision as noted above) in the text. There are similarly no hedges in the text and only two modals: if a beachhead of cooperation may push back the jungle of suspicion (33) and not because the Communists may be doing it (15). The consistent use of engagement: proclaim enables Kennedy to realize one of the goals of his inaugural address: to combat lingering campaign perceptions of inexperience (Goldzwig & Dionisopoulos, 1995) by ensuring that he spoke with a single determined
voice to all his audiences. This realization would have been especially important in the messages being delivered to the Soviets: Kennedy would have wanted them to be sufficiently sure of his determination to be master of [his] own house (20) to entertain the possibility of a quest for peace (22) being a logical and preferred option to an all-out nuclear war.

The lack of engagement: mitigation in the text is not surprising given Kennedy’s determination to communicate strength in his inaugural address. However, I was surprised that Kennedy mitigates knowledge about several pressing issues by leaving them out of his inaugural entirely. Kennedy should, I believe, have mentioned the rights of women and civil rights, two of the defining issues of the 1960s.

Kennedy’s failure to mention civil rights is astounding. Integration had started in the Southern U.S. in 1954 with Brown v. Board of Education in Topeka, Kansas. Jackie Robinson broke the color barrier in sports in 1957. Sit-ins had started. Most African Americans made less than 60% of the salaries of Whites; African American males mostly from jobs as laborers, African American females from domestic service (U.S. Department of Labor, 1960, as cited in Anderson, 1990). According to singer Bo Diddley, most African Americans “didn’t have the down payment on a Popsicle” (Anderson, 1990).

Kennedy should have addressed civil rights. He had won the African American vote after Martin Luther King Sr. changed his vote from Nixon to Kennedy, a fact that was reported in all the African American, but few of the White, newspapers of the time (Anderson, 1990). The African American vote went solidly for Kennedy across the nation (over 70%), providing the winning edge in several key states (“Civil Rights Movement,” n.d.). By failing to address African Americans specifically or even address the issue of
civil rights in his inaugural, Kennedy lost an opportunity to advance his agenda of speaking to various audiences (Goldzwig & Dionisopoulos, 1995). Also, by advocating that *freedom* (1, 14, 42, 47), *liberty* (8), and *the rights of man* (5) be the standard around the world, when a huge population of Americans were disadvantaged, was hypocritical.

Why Kennedy chose to speak about *the rights of man* (5) around the world but not about civil rights in his own country is unknown. In a televised speech in 1963 following the need for the Alabama National Guard to be called out to the University of Alabama to ensure the entrance of “two clearly qualified young Alabama residents who happened to have been born Negro,” Kennedy reminded his *fellow Americans* (46) that the United States had been “founded on the principle that all men are created equal, and that the rights of every man are diminished when the rights of one man are threatened” (para. 3). Kennedy acknowledged the apparent discrepancy between *the rights of man* (5) for all yet the lack of civil rights in the U.S. when he says that despite being “committed to a worldwide struggle to promote and protect the rights of all who wish to be free” (para. 4), African Americans were “not yet freed from the bonds of injustice . . . not yet freed from social and economic oppression” (Kennedy, 1963, para. 8):

> We preach freedom around the world, and we mean it, and we cherish our freedom here at home, but are we to say to the world, and much more importantly, to each other that this is the land of the free except for the Negroes; that we have no second-class citizens except Negroes; that we have no class or caste system, no ghettos, no master race except with respect to Negroes? (para. 9)

To explain Kennedy’s decision not to let the issue of civil rights have a voice in his inaugural, I can only suggest that perhaps he wanted to focus his first official address to the American people on what was in his mind the highest priority issue (nuclear deterrence), leaving other issues to a later date. However, African Americans would have
had high hopes for action on civil rights and Kennedy’s failure to address these issues in his inaugural speech is puzzling.

The third linguistic resource used by Kennedy to show his commitment to and his enthusiasm for his vision is amplification. With these resources, Kennedy is able to enrich his text with meaning and to augment his statements so that they resonate with his listener-followers.

The resources of enrichment that convey commitment include such vivid statements as man holds in his mortal hands, 4; this torch has been passed, 7; struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, 15; and push back the jungle of suspicion, 33. These enrichments are discussed in the section on the benchmark feature of imagery.

Kennedy also uses enriched processes such as the dark powers of science being unleashed, 22; racing to alter that uncertain balance of terror, 25; and granted, 42; to communicate his commitment. This latter process warrants comment: By saying that only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger (42), Kennedy implies that serving one’s country is not a duty or a sacrifice but a privilege. This contention enables him to demand of his fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country (46), thereby enlisting them in implementing his vision for the United States and the world. Another process, to pledge, is an enrichment denoting commitment; rather than pledge Kennedy could have said we offer or we promise, perfectly acceptable yet weakened versions of pledge which conjures word of honor and assurances that the U.S. will convert good words into good deeds (7).
Finally, Kennedy’s repetition of some concepts in his inaugural enables him to convey these to his listener-followers as key messages to be taken away from his visionary speech. Among the repetitions are the lexical choices of *new* (and its variants *renewal* and *change*, 1), *peace*, and *freedom*.

Communicating that he represented the new rather than the stale status quo was a goal of the inaugural as discussed earlier. Kennedy wanted to communicate that he and his policies signified a *beginning, renewal, and change* (1). Speaking of his opponent, Nixon, in the electoral campaign, Kennedy said:

> His party is the party of the past. His speeches are generalities from Poor Richard's Almanac. Their platform, made up of left-over Democratic planks, has the courage of our old convictions. Their pledge is a pledge to the status quo—and today there can be no status quo. (Kennedy, 1960a, para. 26)

Kennedy reinforces his difference from the old ways by repeating *new* and its variations throughout the text. Among the references to *new* are: *new states*, 12; *new alliance*, 17; *shield of the new*, 21; *a new endeavor*, 33; and *not a new balance of power but a new world of law*, 33. Among the variations of *new* are: *beginning, renewal* and *change*, 1; *convert*, 17; *renew*, 21; and *begin anew*, 22, 26. By weaving references to *new* in the inaugural, Kennedy is able to continue to communicate a key message to all his audiences that a new day has dawned in the United States and that it is no longer “business as usual.” Kennedy impresses on all Americans and the other various audiences who will be listening to his speech that *the world is different now* (3) and that, moving forward, U.S. policies will equally be different to meet the challenges of the present. Kennedy’s audiences will be well-positioned to hear further policies from the new administration in the days to follow, having been convinced during the inaugural to expect change and a new way of doing things.
Similarly, Kennedy reinforces his messages of a new beginning by consistently repeating those values that form the basis of his administration: *freedom* (1, 14, 42, 47) and variations of it (*liberty*, 8; *ranks of the free*, 12; *a free society*, 16; *free men and free governments*, 17; and *let the oppressed go free*, 32); *peace* (7, 21, 22, 33, and *this peaceful revolution of hope*, 18); and *hope* (14, 18, 21, 40). The numerous repetitions of these lexical items, either in the original term or in variations of it, enable Kennedy to reinforce his message that these are the values that will shape his administration. This is especially true of *hope*, to American audiences that peace could be attained, to emerging nations that freedom could be achieved, and to the Soviet Bloc that there were opportunities to work with the new administration to avoid all-out war.

**Benchmark: Spans Timelines**

Kennedy meets this benchmark feature of an effective vision by referring to all three recommended time periods in his inaugural: past, present, and future.

The past is referenced in two ways: first, by stating directly in the address that he *has sworn before you and Almighty God the same solemn oath our forebears prescribed nearly a century and three quarters ago* (2) and that since this country was founded, *each generation of Americans has been summoned* (38), and, second, through referring intertextually to the shared values on which the United States was founded. These shared values (the linguistic resources of which were discussed above in the section on shared values) include *liberty*, 8; *loyalty*, 10, 37; *a free society*, 16; and *free men and free governments*, 17. By alluding to these founding principles from the past (and the documents that contain them such as the Declaration of Independence), Kennedy is
reminding his present audiences that these values—*the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue* (5)—still shape the present.

The transition from the past to the present takes place when Kennedy notes that *the world is very different now* (3). This transition sentence sets up Kennedy’s exposé of the present reality, a world in which Americans should be *rightly alarmed by the spread of the deadly atom* (25) and ready to respond to *the trumpet [which] summons us again* (40). By using the declarative of *to be (is)* and the resources of *engagement: proclaim*, Kennedy states unequivocally that the present is different; and, because this is so, the future also needs to be different (*change and renewal, 1*).

Kennedy describes how the future should be by using imagery (discussed below in the section on imagery) and his series of pledges to other populations. In these pledges, Kennedy lays out how the world will be if all commit to and follow his vision. He promises, for example, *the loyalty of faithful friends to old allies*, 10. Similarly, to *new states* he pledges his word *that one form of colonial control shall not have passed away merely to be replaced by a far more iron tyranny*, 12, and to *those peoples in the huts and villages across the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery* he pledges *our best efforts to help them help themselves*, 15. He offers to *our sister republics south of our border a special pledge—to convert our good words into good deeds—in a new alliance for progress*, 17, and also pledges *continued support*, 21, to the United Nations. Finally, Kennedy offers to *those nations who would make themselves our adversary* (22), not a *pledge*, but a *request to work together in a quest for peace* (22).

Kennedy also lays out the timelines for when the vision might be implemented in the future, saying it may not be finished *in the first 100 days* (34), *nor in the first 1,000*
days, nor in the life of this Administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet (35). While this sentence at first examination may seem to be pessimistic, it does provide a segue for Kennedy’s assertion that we must at least begin (36) and enables him to draw his listener-followers into his vision by saying in your hands my fellow citizens more than in mine will rest the final success or failure of our course (37). This latter statement would prove to be prophetic with Kennedy’s untimely death at the hands of an assassin in 1963.

**Benchmark: Contains Imagery**

In meeting the imagery benchmark feature of an effective vision Kennedy draws on a number of linguistic devices and strategies, among them lexical choices, metaphor, interesting nominal group formations, amplification (both augmentation and enrichment), and juxtaposition. I deliberated about where to highlight this latter device because Kennedy’s inaugural is filled with juxtaposition, deciding to include a discussion of it here only because its primary usage seems to me to be for the purpose of creating imagery in the text. Juxtaposition could just have easily been discussed in the sections for other benchmark features, including commitment to the vision, destination, or challenge.

The first way in which imagery is realized in the text is through lexical choices. Kennedy paints word pictures in his inaugural with such lexical choices as the following: iron tyranny, 12; those people in the huts and villages, 15; dark powers of destruction, 22; explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the oceans depths, 31; and the graves of young Americans, 39. Through his lexical choices Kennedy enables his listener-followers to see people in huts (who will need U.S. support as they struggle to break the bonds of mass misery, 15), to feel the strength and pain of iron tyranny (12) and
the suffering caused by *the graves of young Americans* (39) who had served their country, and to imagine how wonderful it would be to *explore* (31).

The second linguistic device used to convey imagery is metaphor. These include the vivid descriptions (*the bonds of mass misery*, 15, and *the chains of poverty*, 17) and more poetic such as when Kennedy states that *the trumpet summons us again* (40) which conjures the vivid image of soldiers being called to war and also the sound of *Reveillé* being played at dawn. Perhaps the most interesting of the metaphors, however, is the following: *those who foolishly sought power by riding the back of the tiger ended up inside* (14). This metaphor comes from the saying that those who ride the tiger may end up inside, a suggestion that, if you expose yourself to danger, thinking that you are in control, inevitably you will be consumed by the danger (“What Does Riding the Back,” 2011). Through the use of this metaphor, Kennedy alerts Cuba and other nations that would align themselves with the Soviets that they are in danger of losing their sovereignty, a situation that would not occur should they instead decide to align themselves with the United States.

There is one other metaphor in the inaugural that is of interest: the reference to a new generation that has been *disciplined by a hard and bitter peace* (7) is puzzling. The opposite would seem logical: *war* is *hard and bitter* and peace is, for example, *easy and sweet*. Kennedy may be referring to the cold war, a stand-off that was peaceful and yet potentially devastating and preserved only through the maintenance of mutually annihilating nuclear arsenals. Perhaps Kennedy was communicating to his listener-followers his stance that such a *peace* was difficult and costly to maintain and that he sought another, more genuine peace with the Soviets.
The third means in which imagery is realized in the text involves an interesting and prominent series of nominal groups composed by a noun followed by another noun, which qualifies it, and introduced by of as in jungle of suspicion (33). In other words, the of noun portion of these nominal groups (e.g., of cooperation) qualifies the first noun in the construction (e.g., beachhead), that is, the second noun acts as a qualification of the head noun.

Other examples of the noun + of + noun phenomenon include: victory of party, 1; celebration of freedom, 1; ranks of the free, 12; the bonds of . . . misery, 15; chains of poverty, 17; peaceful revolution of hope, 18; instruments of war, instruments of peace, 21; dark powers of destruction, 22; balance of terror, 25; wonders of science, 31; beachhead of cooperation, 33; hour of . . . danger, 42.

Two aspects of these constructions make them unique: first that one noun substitutes for an adjective and, second, that both nouns are needed to make sense of the nominal group. Regarding the first of these aspects, Kennedy could have used adjectives instead of the unusual noun + of + noun construction: he could just as easily have said: victorious party, 1; celebratory freedom, 1; cooperative beachhead, 33; dangerous hour, 42; etc. Regarding the second of these aspects, both nouns are required to form an understandable nominal group; casting off chains (17) makes little sense without of poverty as would hour without of danger (42). The occurrence of these nominal groups is so prevalent that I wondered if it was a stylistic preference of Kennedy’s to communicate in this manner or if he purposefully constructed these nominal groups for this text to create exaggerated vivid imagery that his listener-followers could not fail to embrace. The new President’s first State of the Union address in January 1961 (Kennedy, 1961b,
1961c) does not contain these interesting nominal groupings, perhaps because that text was intended to be only an accounting of how the new administration viewed the world state of affairs and therefore Kennedy did not need to rouse his listener-followers with imagery.

The fourth way in which Kennedy creates imagery is through the appraisal resources of amplification, both augmentation and enrichment. The amplifications appear predominantly in qualifying clauses, some of which are long and involved, for example, the clause that qualifies this generation of Americans (7): born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.

Augmentation resources in the text include: to friends and foes alike, 7; a host of cooperative ventures, 11; sufficient beyond doubt, 23; two great and powerful nations, 23; always, 26; North, South, East, and West, 41; and several instances of shall (8, 12, 13, 14, 19), an augmented and stronger version of will, and never (24, 27, 28). These augmented resources enable Kennedy to create word pictures that will resonate with his listener-followers far more resoundingly than the un-augmented alternatives such as cooperative ventures, 11; two nations, 23; and sufficient, 23.

Enriched resources in the text include: man holds in his mortal hands, 4; this torch has been passed, 15; struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, 17; a special pledge, 18; unleashed, 22; engulfed, 29; belaboring, 45; and the lovely image of the energy, faith and devotion brought by the United States lighting our country and all
who serve it, with the glow from that fire truly light[ing] the world, 45. By using enriched lexical items when un-colored items would also have served, Kennedy is able to capture the imagination of his listener-followers and enlist them in his vision.

Similarly, the fifth resource with which Kennedy creates imagery, juxtaposition, enables him to create word pictures and clarify his vision in the minds of his various audiences. Juxtaposition is an instance of placing side by side, often used in poetry, to compare or contrast two words (“Juxtaposition in Poetry,” 2011). In his text, Kennedy places two opposing things side by side to communicate clearly what is and what is not part of his vision. The vast majority of these constructions start with what is not in the vision, that is, the negative quality or thing Kennedy does not endorse followed by that positive thing or quality that he does endorse. These negative to positive constructions will be addressed first, followed by several anomalies, that is, juxtapositions that do not take this form and yet are striking realizations of the vision.

As noted above, there are also several anomalies to the negative-first pattern in the text. These take the form of instances in which the positive quality is placed before the negative quality in the clause, and instances of either multiple negatives or two positive qualities being placed next to each other.

Instances of positive qualities being placed before negative qualities, contrary to the prominence of the opposite juxtaposition, include: let every nation know whether it wishes us well or ill, 8; united, there is little we cannot do . . . divided there is little we can do, 11; and let both sides explore what problems unite us instead of belaboring those problems which divide us, 29 (see Table 10).
Table 10

Juxtaposition in Kennedy Speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Not . . .</th>
<th>But . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>not a victory of party</em></td>
<td><em>but a celebration of freedom</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state</em></td>
<td><em>but from the hand of God</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 14</td>
<td><em>not always supporting out view . . .</em></td>
<td><em>but always support[ing] their own freedom</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><em>not because the Communists may be doing</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>not because we seek their votes</em></td>
<td><em>but because it is right</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td><em>Instruments of war have outpaced</em></td>
<td><em>the instruments of peace</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27, 28</td>
<td><em>Let us never negotiate out of fear</em></td>
<td><em>But let us never fear to negotiate</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td><em>not a new balance of power,</em></td>
<td><em>but a new world of law</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td><em>not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need; not as a call to battle, though embattled we are</em></td>
<td><em>—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td><em>I do not shrink from this responsibility</em></td>
<td><em>—I welcome it</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td><em>And so, my fellow Americans ask not what your country can do for you,</em></td>
<td><em>ask what you can do for your country</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ask not what America will do for you,</em></td>
<td><em>but what together we can do for the freedom of man</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clauses in which there is the juxtaposition of two negative qualities include: one form of colonial control . . . merely to be replaced by a far more iron tyranny, 12; and if a free society helps the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich, 16.

There is also the juxtaposition of two negatives with one positive: not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right, 5.
Two juxtaposed positive qualities are evident in the following clauses: *convert our good words into good deeds*, 17; *not a pledge but a request*, 22; and *for only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt*, 24.

The mode of the inaugural speech was written to be spoken; as spoken speech it needed to resonate with the listener-followers as a one-time utterance. While some of the listener-followers may have read the speech in its written form after the inauguration and some may also have seen or heard it re-played on television or on the radio, Kennedy knew he had one chance, and perhaps one chance only, to communicate his vision in a compelling way. The juxtaposition may have been a means of establishing a rhythm for his speech; in much the same way as there is cadence in poetry, Kennedy seems to have wanted a similar cadence in his speech to make it memorable and chose juxtaposition to create the rhythm.

**Benchmark: Suggests Means to Implement the Vision**

Kennedy offers numerous ways and means for his listener-followers to implement the vision and does so using the resources of Mood, particularly declarative and imperative.

Kennedy is clear that he will count on his listener-followers’ support to help him *pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty* (8), to ensure that the series of pledges that are made to other nations and organizations (10-21) are fulfilled, and to commit to his policy of negotiating for peace (26-32). Kennedy also introduces a new set of enemies against which he and his listener-followers will do battle: *tyranny, poverty,*
Kennedy states these promises and policies in the declarative Mood, signaling to his various audiences that these are matters of fact without recourse to other, alternative avenues.

While negotiating with the Russians he must also remain resolved and so commands *let all our neighbors know that we shall . . . oppose aggression or subversion* in the Americas (19). He was mostly likely speaking here of Cuba and perhaps other countries in Latin America that may have been tempted to align themselves with the Soviets.

Kennedy knew that he would require both moral support and resources, human and financial, to fulfill these promises and implement his vision. He would need not only the support of Congress for the resources to implement the vision but also those of the *new generation of Americans* (7) who will be *summon[ed] . . . to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle* (40).

In his inaugural speech Kennedy therefore needs to inspire the listener-followers to *convert good words into good deeds* (17) and take action to implement his vision. He will need young men to join the military: by May, 1961 the United States would be sending the Green Berets to Vietnam (The History Place, 1999) and, by 1969, the need for soldiers to fight in Vietnam was so great that a lottery was held by the Selective Service Agency (“The Vietnam Lotteries,” 2009). He will need young volunteers to join the Peace Corps and to work with the Alliance for Progress in 22 Latin American countries (“Alliance for Progress,” n.d.) And Kennedy will need understanding and support when he takes action on Cuba, civil rights, the economy, and the test ban in 1963 (The White House, n.d.).
The new President, therefore, through the resource of the imperative Mood, commands his fellow Americans: ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country (46).

**Benchmark: Expresses Urgency**

Kennedy meets this benchmark feature of an effective vision and communicating urgency as one of the purposes of his inaugural address. Kennedy needs to communicate this urgency both to the American people and to the Soviets: the former population because he needs to appear strong in the face of an imminent danger and the latter population because he needs to appear serious when he suggests that both sides begin anew (22) on a quest for peace (22) given that the world is in its hour of maximum danger (47) and under a threat of annihilation if the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction (22). Kennedy will reinforce his perception of his times as being critical when he says 10 days later in his January 30, 1961, State of the Union address: “I speak today in an hour of national peril. Each day we draw nearer the hour of maximum danger. Our problems are critical. . . . We should prepare ourselves now for the worst” (Kennedy, 1961c, para. 28).

Kennedy uses two linguistic devices to communicate urgency: lexical choice (with which he explicitly refers to danger, 22) and amplification.

Employing the first of these, lexical choice, Kennedy specifically refers to his times as an era in which one side unleashing the dark powers of destruction (22) and destroying the world is a distinct possibility. He says that it is appropriate to be rightly alarmed (25) at the state of affairs in 1961 because with an uncertain balance of terror, one slight shift could result in mankind’s final war (25). To Americans and other citizens
of the world (47) who had lived through World War II and the more recent Korean War, the thought of needing to be alarmed would have conveyed just how serious the world situation was and may also have signaled that the threat was imminent (Dunmire, 2005). Also, there were already Americans training troops in South Vietnam, some of whom had been killed in that effort (“Vietnam War Timeline,” 2011) and the domino effect of losing South Vietnam had earlier been identified during both the Truman and the Eisenhower administrations (“Domino Theory,” n.d.).

The use of amplification: enrichment in one process also signals urgency in the inaugural. Kennedy uses dare in three instances (6, 11, 23), a repetition of an enriched process to communicate danger and the need to act immediately. Kennedy could equally have communicated the un-colored act or proceed rather than use dare, which implies having sufficient courage to do something, that is, to act despite being afraid to do so (“Dare,” n.d.). The use of dare enables Kennedy to reinforce his stance that there are situations facing Americans and the world that are worthy of fear (27, 28) and that only through implementing his vision can the imminent threats of the situation be met and overcome.

Summary

Kennedy’s inaugural address was the first instance for America and the world to see the new President in action. Kennedy took the opportunity of the speech to advance his political aims in two areas: first, to advance his domestic and foreign policies and, second, to present himself as a strong, capable, experienced leader. To accomplish these aims, Kennedy needed to construct a political reality in such a fashion that Americans would rally behind their new President. Kennedy’s inaugural address presents a political
reality of the existence of a Soviet challenge and the possibility of peace. He presents this political reality to illicit the response of commitment to his vision from his listener-followers.

The Kennedy inaugural meets all of the eight benchmark features of an effective vision and also meets the goals set out for it by the new President and his speechwriter. The eight benchmark features are realized in language through the appraisal resources of judgment, affect, appreciation, and engagement and through the devices of metaphor, juxtaposition, and repetition.
CHAPTER VII

KING’S “I HAVE A DREAM” SPEECH

Background

Although the civil rights movement in the United States came to public attention in the 1950s and 1960s, African Americans’ struggle for racial justice dates back to when they were brought to North America as slaves in the 1800s. According to Cook (1998), African Americans have consistently put abstract promises of freedom, equality, and democracy to the test and frequently found them dismally wanting in practice. The American Civil War, and the defeat of the Confederacy in 1865, preserved the American Union, President Lincoln’s “last, best hope of earth” for which so many Northern volunteers had fought and died.

Also, while the war was fought to save the Union and not to free the slaves, it did result in the liberation of 4 million African American bondsmen and women who had provided the bulk of the labor force in the antebellum South’s vibrant cotton economy. However, what the Civil War failed to do was provide equal citizenship for the so-called freedmen despite the passage of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution, giving full citizenship rights to African Americans (Cook, 1998). The economy of the South at the time inhibited Southern African Americans from escaping from the “grip of King Cotton” for two reasons:
They lacked land and credit. . . Deprived of the means to achieve economic independence . . . African Americans were inevitably handicapped in their search for equal rights in a capitalist republic where land ownership had always been viewed as an integral component of citizenship. (Cook, 1998, p. 16)

By the 1930s racial segregation had resulted in violence, including lynchings. Public transport remained rigidly segregated as did Southern theatres, cinemas, churches, parks, beaches, and schools. African American career prospects were still heavily circumscribed and services for African American communities showed little sign of improvement (Cook, 1998).

It wasn’t until the 1950s and 1960s that that African Americans launched a major challenge to Southern segregation and the policy known as Jim Crow. In 1954 the U.S. Supreme Court’s Chief Justice Earl Warren ruled in Brown v. Board of Education that segregated schools were unconstitutional, setting “in train a long series of events that culminated, via massive resistance and the direct action phase of the modern civil rights movement, in the destruction of the southern caste system during the 1960s” (Cook, 1998, p. 38). In 1957, the Governor of Arkansas called in the National Guard to Little Rock to prohibit school desegregation.

Civil rights protests took many forms in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Sit-ins—including the one at the Woolworth’s lunch counter in Greensboro, North Carolina, in 1960—were a popular form of protest (Norris, 2008). Freedom Rides were another form of protest testing the effectiveness of the 1960 U.S. Supreme Court decision that segregation was illegal in bus stations open to interstate travel. The Freedom Riders, who were both White and African American, traveled around the South in buses. One of their buses was burned and some riders were beaten. The violence brought national attention to the Freedom Riders and fierce condemnation of Alabama officials for allowing the
violence. The Freedom Riders demonstrated to the public how far civil rights activists
would go to achieve their goals (Cozzens, 1997).

However, it was the mobilization of an entire community in 1955-56 in
Montgomery, Alabama, that suggested that the scale and pace of protest activity was
beginning to change and that a unified African American community was beginning to
take shape (Cook, 1998). The 13-month mass protest against segregation on buses that
was initiated by Rosa Parks ended only when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that
segregation on public buses was unconstitutional (“Montgomery Bus Boycott,” n.d.). It
was during the boycott that Martin Luther King, Jr., became a prominent civil rights
leader as international attention focused on Montgomery (“Montgomery Bus
Boycott,” n.d.).

At the time of the boycott, Martin Luther King Jr. was the minister of the Dexter
Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery. Born in 1929, King was the son and grandson of
Baptist pastors who perceived the church as an instrument for improving the lives of
African Americans (“King, Martin Luther, Jr. [1929-1968],” n.d.). Martin Luther had
attended segregated public schools in Georgia, and received his B.A. degree in 1948 from
Morehouse College. After 3 years of theological study at Crozer Theological Seminary in
Pennsylvania, he was awarded the B.D. in 1951. With a fellowship won at Crozer, he
enrolled in graduate studies at Boston University, completing his residence for the
doctorate in 1953 and receiving the degree in 1955. In Boston he met and married Coretta
Scott and had two sons and two daughters (Haberman, 1972). On 2 December 1955, King
conducted a meeting in the basement of the Dexter Avenue Church; the meeting resulted
in the decision to launch the Montgomery bus boycott, and 3 days later the Montgomery
Improvement Association (MIA) was founded. As MIA president, King organized and helped direct the boycott from his office in the lower half of the Dexter sanctuary. He continued to serve as president of the MIA after the boycott, a commitment that, at times, compromised his efficacy as Dexter’s pastor (“Dexter Avenue Baptist Church,” n.d.).

On the night he took on the presidency of the Association, King had to deliver a major speech to the thousands of African Americans who were involved in the bus boycott. King spoke to the audience as a pastor and they responded to his cadence, reacting to his statements with choral responses (Gardner & Laskin, 1995). According to his biographer (Branch, 1989, as cited in Gardner & Laskin, 1995), “King would work on his timing but his oratory [in this first speech] made him forever a public figure. In the few short minutes of his first political address, a power of communication emerged from him that would speak inexorably to strangers who would both love and revile him, like all the prophets” (p. 206).

King’s rise to fame was not without personal consequences. In 1958 King was the victim of his first assassination attempt. Although his house had been bombed several times during the Montgomery bus boycott, it was while signing copies of Stride Toward Freedom that he was stabbed with a letter opener. Surgery to remove it was successful, but King had to recuperate for several months, giving up all protest activity (Haberman, 1972).

In November 1959, King resigned from Dexter and joined his father the following February as co-pastor at Atlanta’s Ebenezer Baptist Church in order to more effectively lead the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), headquartered in that city. The SCLC was formed to coordinate civil rights activities throughout the region and, as
its president, “King traveled over six million miles and spoke over 2,500 times, appearing wherever there was injustice, protest, and action; and meanwhile he wrote five books as well as numerous articles” (Haberman, 1972, para. 3).

King’s approach to protest was based on his earlier studies and travels during which he was exposed to the writings of Gandhi and became interested in the connection between the individual’s responsibility to God and his or her commitment to social activism on earth:

King wedded a strong, effective visionary message with the embodiment of that message. Here was a black man coming from the ministerial heartland of the southern Black community, subject to the outrages that had plagued nearly every black person in the society. Yet, rising above the pain and suffering . . . he sought to lay out an approach that blacks, as well as other dispossessed groups, could adopt within America to achieve that place that . . . had been repeatedly promised. (Gardner & Laskin, 1995, p. 204)

King’s approach is detailed in his letter from a Birmingham jail (King, 1963), in which he likens himself to the Apostle Paul who carried the gospel of Jesus Christ. King suggests that, like Paul, he is “compelled to carry the gospel of freedom” to Birmingham, “probably the most thoroughly segregated city in the United States [whose] ugly record of brutality is widely known” (para. 6).

In his letter, King speaks about his choice of nonviolent direct action to protest the injustice done to African Americans. He suggests that “nonviolent direction action seeks to create . . . a crisis and foster such a tension that a community which has constantly refused to negotiate is forced to confront the issue. It seeks so to dramatize the issue that it can no longer be ignored . . . [creating] a situation so crisis packed that it will inevitably open the door to negotiation” (King, 1963, para. 9). In the letter King also explains that “we know through painful experience that freedom is never voluntarily
given by the oppressor; it must be demanded by the oppressed” (para. 11). King’s advocacy of nonviolence would make him at odds later with others in the civil rights movement including Malcolm X and Stokely Carmichael, known for coining the term “Black Power” and for advocating violence.

King had not wanted to be a leader. In his farewell speech to the Dexter congregation (King, 1959) he had said:

A little more than five years ago I accepted the pastorate of this Church. . . . Little did I know when I came to Dexter that in a few months a movement would commence in Montgomery that would change the course of my life forever. . . . Unknowingly and unexpectedly, I was catapulted into the leadership of the Montgomery movement. At points I was unprepared for the symbolic role that history had thrust upon me. . . . But there was no way out. (para. 1-3)

By 1963, when the March on Washington took place, protests under the leadership of Martin Luther King Jr. were taking place throughout the South (Haberman, 1972). Another African American activist, A. Philip Randolph, had also been fighting for equality and founded a union, the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, in 1925. In 1941, Randolph had planned a march on Washington to demand jobs for African Americans in the booming wartime economy. That protest was cancelled after President Franklin D. Roosevelt agreed to ban discrimination by defense industries or government. The march was re-organized two decades later when Randolph decided a march was required to speed the rate of change in the nation (Hampton, 1987, “The March on Washington”). As former U.S. Senator Robert Torricelli (Torricelli & Carroll, 1999) notes, “fears of a racial war in America were not unfounded in 1963” and that, when Martin Luther King Jr. aligned himself with the March on Washington that summer, “President Kennedy expressed concern that the event would only further enflame tensions and jeopardize the passage of a civil rights bill pending in Congress” (Torricelli & Carroll, 1999, p. 234).
However, despite Kennedy’s fears, on August 28, 1963, over 250,000 people, both African American and White, gathered together at the Lincoln Memorial to protest segregation. In his speech to the crowd, Randolph said:

Fellow Americans, we are gathered here in the largest demonstration in the history of this nation. Let the nation and the world know the meaning of our numbers. We are not a pressure group, we are not an organization or a group of organizations, we are not a mob. We are the advance guard of a massive moral revolution for jobs and freedom. (Hampton, 1987, para. 4)

Because it was televised live and broadcast across the United States, the March on Washington constituted the most public opportunity of King’s life to that point (Gardner & Laskin, 1995, p. 214). As Branch (1998, p. 131) notes:

Like other formative experiences of the mass communications era . . . the Freedom March commanded national attention by pre-empting regularly scheduled television programs. Broadcast networks voluntarily surrendered their revenues and gathered their most important news correspondents to preside over a transcendent ritual of American Identity. [It was] the first ceremony of such magnitude ever initiated and dominated by Negroes.

Before King’s speech, the crowd was entertained by Harry Belafonte, Sidney Poitier, Joan Baez, and Bob Dylan appealing for justice and harmony. As evening approached, the keynote speaker, King, took the stand to address the audience at the Memorial as well as the 10s of millions of Americans watching the event live on television. At some point in the speech King disregarded his prepared text and extemporaneously delivered one of the most soul-stirring orations of the 20th century (Torricelli & Carroll, 1999). The speech is credited with mobilizing supporters of desegregation and prompting the 1964 Civil Rights Act (Montefiore, 2005, p. 149).

Of the Washington event, the New York Times of August 29, 1963 (as cited in Gardner & Laskin, 1995) said:
It will be a long time before [Washington] forgets the melodious and melancholy voice of Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. crying out his dreams to the multitude. Dr. King touched all the themes of the day, only better than anyone else. He was full of the symbolism of Lincoln and Gandhi and the cadences of the Bible. He was militant and sad, and he sent the crowd away feeling that the long journey had been worthwhile. (p. 215)

Gardner and Laskin (1995) note that as a leader, King elaborated a full vision, one that would thereafter undergird his speeches, writings, and presence. The authors identify four principle elements in King’s emerging message as

- his fundamental Christianity;
- his experiences in the church (addressing audiences as if he were in the pulpit and they were his congregation);
- religious ideas and themes drawn from other traditions, embracing a broad inclusionary vision that was friendly to a variety of intellectual and cultural strands, especially Gandhi’s philosophy of non-violence; and
- his deep commitment to the principal ideas on which America had been founded. (p. 209)

King’s ability to focus national attention on orchestrated confrontations with racist authorities, combined with his oration at the 1963 March on Washington, made him the most influential African American spokesperson of the first half of the 1960s. King was named Time magazine’s “Man of the Year” at the end of 1963, and he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in December 1964 (“King, Martin Luther, Jr. [1929-1968],” n.d.). When notified of his selection, he announced that he would turn over the prize money of $54,123 to the furtherance of the civil rights movement (“King, Martin Luther, Jr. [1929-1968],” n.d.).

Analysis

King’s “I Have a Dream” speech, as the Washington speech has become known, appears in a number of leadership resources as being exemplary of vision. Blanchard and Stoner (2004), for example, remarking on how vision and direction from top management are critical to an organization’s success, refer to the speech in which King “created
powerful and specific images from the values of brotherhood, respect, and freedom for all—values that resonate with the founding values of the United States” (p. 22).

Conger (1991) also references this speech as notable, saying that King was speaking to a nationwide television audience and therefore had the opportunity to reach out to both African American and White viewers. In reaching out to the White television audience, King framed his vision in terms that would appeal to their values, in contrast with his “earlier, more scolding approaches to White society” (p. 35). Conger relates that King drew on some lines from the song “America” (which White children would have learned in elementary school) and also the familiar Gettysburg Address and the Declaration of Independence in his speech and that, “in framing his vision this way, King heightened the significance of the black man’s struggle for every American [and] maximized its potential acceptance by mainstream Americans” (p. 35).

Kouzes and Posner (1995) also give the example of this speech as being “among the most instructive of inspiring public presentations because of the speaker’s skill, his success in moving his listeners. King’s uplifting speech also illustrates how the ability to exert an enlivening influence is rooted in fundamental values, cultural traditions, and personal conviction” (p. 125). The authors play an audiotape of King’s speech during their leadership development programs, asking participants to listen to the content and also to the rhetorical devices used by King to convey his vision.

Participants in the Kouzes and Posner (1995) leadership development programs observe that they could relate to the speech and “see” the vivid images and examples. They also note that King’s references to values were common bonds, citing especially King’s allusion to “the Constitution, the Bible, family, church, country, [and] children”
Participants were also able to identify what makes King’s speech so uplifting and were asked to identify what from King’s speech they could incorporate into their own presentations. Among those things participants identified were King’s use of: word pictures, examples people can relate to, traditional values, repetition, shifting from I to we, and speaking with passion and emotion.

The King speech is long, running some 1,670 words in total. It was possible, however, to distinguish obligatory or defining statements from other optional elements (Eggins, 2004) because King’s speaking style was structured around making a (defining) statement and then expanding on that statement several times (with optional statements) before moving on to another defining statement. In her analysis of his speeches, M. Bell (1999) found that King would introduce a social point and then give relevance to that point by giving concrete examples of how it applied at a personal level. King would then turn to another social issue, again stating it and giving personal examples. Bell suggests that this style allowed King’s sermons to demonstrate a tension between the personal and the social dimensions of religion. This style, typical of African American preachers, is discussed in the section on tenor below.

One example may serve to illustrate the phenomenon of defining and optional statements in the King speech: the famous I have a dream sequence starts with a defining statement at sentence 49 (I say to you today that . . . I still have a dream) and is followed by nine optional statements (including, for example, I have a dream that this nation will rise up, 51; . . . that my four children will one day . . . , 54; and I have a dream today, 55). These optional statements bear similar linguistic features to the defining statement: All
are in the declarative Mood, all begin with the Theme *I have a dream*, and all conclude with a rheme of how King’s dream is to be realized.

While these optional statements give cadence and imagery to the vision, they are not necessary for a linguistic analysis of the text as a whole. Given King’s oratory style and given that the optional elements could be eliminated from the speech without reducing the understandable text or the findings, I chose to conduct a linguistic analysis of only the obligatory/defining statements of the speech. In those situations in which text from the optional statements contributes to the overall understanding of how King’s speech is visionary, I have included that text in the sections below on each benchmark feature of an effective vision. For the full text of the speech, please see Appendix D.

This chapter is organized by sections, one for each of those benchmark features, with each section comprising also an explanation of the linguistic strategies that enable the feature’s realization, that is, how language use enabled King’s text to be memorably visionary and to engage his listener-followers in his vision. Both the analysis of the speech against the benchmark features of an effective vision and the linguistic analysis of the obligatory statements are attached in Appendix C.

Context of Situation

The Martin Luther King Jr. speech is from the outset in the field of political discourse. King is the keynote speaker at the March on Washington, a march organized to highlight “a massive moral revolution for jobs and freedom” (Hampton, 1987) for African Americans. The March would have been recognized as political protest because it was organized as such: In the morning hours of August 28, more than 2,000 busses, 21 special trains, 10 chartered aircraft, and numerous private cars converged on Washington
bringing those who wanted to participate in the political protest (“The Rolling of the
Buses,” 2011).

King’s intertextual references to Lincoln, both as the signatory of the
Emancipation Proclamation and as being present symbolically in the March which began
in the shadow (1) of the Lincoln Memorial, also position this as political discourse and
set up King’s statement that we must face the tragic fact that the Negro is still not free, 4.
This statement in turn allows King to segue into the political purpose of his presence at
the March: to dramatize an appalling condition, 8. Similarly, King includes Kennedy in
his political discourse by stating that Nineteen sixty-three is not an end, but a beginning
(24), a re-phrasing of the remark in Kennedy’s inaugural address that his administration
would symbolize an end, as well as a beginning (Kennedy, 1961a).

The tenor of the King speech is predominantly that of preacher to his
congregation. King refers to his audience as my friends (49), suggesting that they are
equal in the struggle to change the appalling condition (8) of African Americans in the
United States. King may have taken extra care in preparing his speech because he knew
he needed his discourse to touch both African American and White audiences who were
onsite at the March and also watching and listening via television and radio. According to
Gardner and Laskin (1995), King

melded together strands and messages from many religions, subcultures, and
cultures in a way that made sense to his contemporaries and that . . . stimulated
individuals to be more generous, more human. Speaking and writing with ever-
increasing power and persuasiveness, he was able to establish both indirect and
direct links to many audiences. (p. 219)

At the time of the March, King did not have a ready-made audience or institution
through which to share his vision. African Americans were a non-dominant group in the
U.S. in the early 1960s and King may have wanted to modulate his utterances depending on which audience he was addressing. In fact, King’s ability to speak to both audiences, according to Carson (1995), was one thing that set him apart from other African American preachers of the time. King may have thought that his traditional African American preaching style would not resonate with the White people in the audiences and he may, therefore, have prepared a speech with a tenor that was more generic than his usual preaching style, that is, a speech that perhaps contained fewer religious references.

However, as noted above, part-way through his prepared text King ignored his notes and started to speak without them, adopting a style that was more familiar to him, that of an African American preacher speaking to his congregation (Safire, 1997). From that point of the speech to its conclusion, the African Americans in the audience would have recognized that King was speaking to them as if he were their preacher in the pulpit delivering his sermon. While this speaking style was not unique to King, his ability to use “traditional Black Christian idiom to advocate unconventional political ideas” (Carson, 1995, p. 320) was distinctive and powerful.

African American preaching has a distinguishing style of its own. Mitchell (1973) suggests that African American preaching is difficult to capture in print because it comprises the African oral religious expression adapted to Christianity. The style of preaching is based on three basic foundations: first, that the preaching must be an experience, not just the expression of ideas; second, that no mere man can adequately prepare for a sermon and that God speaks through preachers who give themselves in prayer and sincere preparation for the sermon; and, third, that even the most scholarly

The impact on tenor of King reverting to the preaching style that was familiar to him was perhaps a way in which to alter the tenor of the speech to get closer to the audience and engage them in the vision, one friend speaking to another. At that point in his career, King may have been uncomfortable with his perceived role as leader of the then unorganized movement for equal rights and may have wanted to be less the leader of the movement and more an equal in the struggle. As well, given the foundations of African American preaching tradition (Mitchell, 1973), King may have wanted his discourse to be more of an experience for his audience and he may also have felt, given the belief that God speaks through preachers, that God was moving him to change the tenor of his speech to create that experience by reverting to his familiar preaching style.

The mode of the speech is for the most part written to be spoken, yet, as noted above, King abandoned his speaking notes part way through the speech and spoke without written prompts. Safire (1997) suggested that the speech came alive when King began speaking extemporaneously. Cook (1998) agreed, stating that “King departed from his text and began to preach extemporaneously.” “Merging his voice with those of Old Testament prophets in the time-honored tradition of the Black clergy, he articulated his vision of an America at peace with itself. He did so with a rhetorical force and patriotic ardor” (p. 136). At this point, according to Brinkley (2006), “King seemed almost biblically possessed, hitting high feverish notes . . . never before imagined. His rhetoric soared, crescendoed, inspired” (p. 168).
Moving from prepared, written text to impromptu speech seems to have enabled King to express his vision in a manner that resonated better with his listener-followers. As Blanchard and Stoner (2004, p. 22) suggest, the *I have a dream* speech has passed a crucial test: it continues to mobilize and guide people beyond King’s lifetime.

**Features of an Effective Vision**

The speech delivered by Martin Luther King Jr. in Washington in 1963 meets all eight of the benchmark features of an effective vision as identified in the leadership literature. Even when reduced to only the obligatory statements, the speech is shaped linguistically to communicate King’s vision in a way that engages the listener-followers to embrace and implement it.

What was the vision? King’s was a vision of a completely integrated society, a community of love and justice wherein brotherhood would be an actuality in all of social life. In his mind, such a community would be the ideal corporate expression of the Christian faith (Smith & Zepp, 1974, para. 2). Writing in the newsletter of the newly formed SCLC, King stated his vision in these terms:

The ultimate aim of SCLC is to foster and create the ‘beloved community’ in America where brotherhood is a reality. . . . SCLC works for integration. Our ultimate goal is genuine intergroup and interpersonal living—integration. (Smith & Zepp, 1974, para. 1)

King saw the participants in the civil rights movement as representing the Beloved Community in microcosm. The people who attended the movement’s mass meetings and rallies, joined in its demonstrations, and supported its aims in many other ways came from every section of American society.

The educated and the illiterate, the affluent and the welfare recipient, White and Black—men and women who heretofore had been separated by rigid social and
legal codes were brought together in a common cause. Indeed, since King wanted
to make the base of the movement as broad as possible, he frequently called upon
Whites for help in his various campaigns. (Smith & Zepp, 1974, para. 5)

How this vision was communicated in the 1963 “I Have a Dream” speech is
discussed in the sections that follow on the benchmark features of an effective vision.

**Benchmark: Issuing a Challenge**

The March on Washington was advertised as a demonstration on jobs and
freedoms. The March was announced by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference
on June 11, 1963, the same day that President Kennedy addressed the nation on his
legislation “giving all Americans the right to be served in facilities which are open to the
public—hotels, restaurants, theaters, retail stores, and similar establishments . . . and
authoriz[ing] the Federal Government to participate more fully in lawsuits designed to
end segregation in public education” (Kennedy, 1963, para. 15).

The announcement of the March called for sit-ins on Congress as well as acts of
civil disobedience (“March on Washington for Jobs and Freedoms,” n.d.). The agenda for
the day identified the stated demands of the March’s leaders, including: civil rights
legislation; the withholding of federal funds from all programs in which discrimination
existed; desegregation of all school districts in 1963; training for and placement of all
unemployed workers; a national minimum wage act; and a federal Fair Employment

The **goal** of the March was therefore clear and recognized by all participants: jobs,
opportunities, and penalties on those who were not implementing fair employment
practices. In his keynote address, however, King chose to speak more widely, addressing
all aspects of the *appalling condition* (8) of the lives of African Americans, not focusing
specifically on jobs but offering his vision of the way forward on all aspects of the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness (11). In particular, King referred to the Emancipation Proclamation, saying that it had come as a great beacon light of hope to millions of Negro slaves who had been seared in the flames of withering injustice (2) and noting that the Proclamation had not been implemented to ensure the Negro is granted his citizenship rights (26). And therefore, said King, he and his fellow demonstrators had come here today to dramatize an appalling condition (8) and to reinforce the need for the equality that was promised in the Emancipation Proclamation.

One of the means through which King communicates that the promise of the Proclamation had not been realized is through the elegant metaphor of a check, saying that the goal of the protest was to cash a check (9), that is, to cash a promissory note (10) issued by the architects of the republic (10) to guarantee the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness (11) for all men. Continuing the check metaphor, King states that it is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note insofar as her citizens of color are concerned (12), and that instead of honoring the sacred obligation, America has given the Negro people a bad check which has come back marked “insufficient funds” (13). King tells his audiences that he refuses to believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of opportunity of this nation (15) and that there is a fierce urgency (17) to the need to implement equal rights because of that unfulfilled promissory note.

The challenge issued by King is therefore to all Americans: to open the doors of opportunity to all God’s children (20) and move towards brotherhood (21). In issuing this challenge, King is not asking for anything new; instead he seeks that which was
promised by the Emancipation Proclamation but not yet delivered 100 years later. In doing so, King is reminding his audiences of what should already be, not change and growth to something entirely different, but a fulfillment of a promise of equality that is long overdue. King describes this promised land in two sequences of obligatory and optional statements: the I have a dream sequence in which he describes a nation that one day will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: “We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal” (51), and his let freedom ring sequence in which King delineates numerous U.S. regions which will be free. These are perhaps the two most memorable sequences in the speech and define for King and his listener-followers those things that comprise the vision.

King makes reference explicitly to the sacrifices that have been asked of his listener-followers, specifically when he offers the defining statement that he is not unmindful that some of you have come here out of great trials and tribulations (42). In the lines that follow (43-45) King expands on the trials and tribulations that have been the experience of his listener-followers by noting in optional statements that some have come from narrow cells (43), some have been battered and subject to police brutality (44), and some have been the veterans of creative suffering (45).

This latter sacrifice, being the veterans of creative suffering, is not explained by King and his use of these lexical choices may not have been understood by some in his various audiences. Creative suffering is, however, a term that would have been recognized by the Christian church-goers in the audiences as a blending of suffering and hope which, as Kellerman (2010) suggests, is a way in which suffering is converted through the Cross to something that has meaning and purpose. King’s statement then
carries two purposes: he acknowledges the sacrifices of those who have suffered and also tells them that their suffering will not have been in vain. This statement, with its dual purpose, is the springboard from which King then asks his listener-followers to continue to work (46) and directs them with specific actions they can undertake to continue the cause. These specific actions are discussed below in the section on the benchmark feature of implementing the vision.

King offers numerous motivators to his listener-followers to ensure they embrace and implement his vision. Many of these are in the form of shared values using the linguistic resources of judgment both positive and negative which will be discussed below in the section on shared values. Other motivators, however, are communicated via lexical choices through which King provides the inspiration for his listener-followers to continue, despite the predicted requirement to continue to experience suffering, trials, and tribulations (42).

The first of these lexical choices occurs in line 46 in which King tells his audiences that they should continue to work with the faith that unearned suffering is redemptive. Again, this statement would not have been understood by all the listener-followers in King’s various audiences but the Christians will have recognized it as an intrinsic motivator for their continued support of the cause of equal rights for all. Redemption is a Christian concept meaning the “deliverance from sin through the incarnation, sufferings, and death of Christ or atonement for guilt” (“Redemption,” 2011). In stating that the suffering gained through no fault of the listener-followers (that is, unearned suffering) is redemptive, King is motivating his audiences to continue to suffer in the knowledge that their sins will be forgiven them if the suffering is for a good
purpose. For those who are not of the Christian faith this statement may seem to be manipulative in that it motivates the listener-followers to implement the speaker’s vision with only unproven assurances that their suffering will be rewarded. This is not political but theological motivation, effective for the Christians in the audiences but perhaps less effective for those others who are not Christian.

A specific extrinsic motivator offered by King might appeal to a more widespread American audience. In the metaphor of the promissory note, King reminds all Americans that the laws of the land have not been implemented. In doing so King appeals not only to those who see civil rights as a moral cause but also to his law-abiding fellow citizens who are encouraged to see that there are compelling judicial reasons to implement the vision. King’s speech therefore “covers his bases,” making reference to a number of reasons, moral, religious and judicial, for his listener-followers to be motivated to implement the vision.

**Benchmark: Vision as Destination**

The destination of King’s vision is clear: He wants what was promised in the Emancipation Proclamation of 1863. Despite the limitations of the document, especially in that it applied only to those states that were in rebellion against the United States (“Emancipation Proclamation,” n.d.), the Proclamation has come to symbolize the freeing of all slaves and the assurance of equal rights for all men. King tells his audiences that these equal rights were promised but not delivered and that there is a *fierce urgency of now* (17) for the full implementation of those rights in the U.S.

Given his oratorical expertise and his preaching style, King does not stop at simply stating the destination of his vision. Instead he expands and enhances the
destination using optional statements and the linguistic resources of amplification: augmentation, amplification: enrichment, appreciation, and circumstances of location, notably in the I have a dream sequence (49-58) and also in the let freedom ring sequence (65-76).

In the first of these sequences, King’s obligatory and optional statements on the theme of I have a dream, King uses augmentation to reinforce the destination of his dream. Among the augmentations are the following: every valley shall be exalted, 58; every hill and mountain shall, 58; and it is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream (58). In this sequence there is also one instance of amplification: enrichment in which King criticizes Wallace saying that his lips are presently dripping with the words of interposition and nullification (56). King also uses circumstances of location to identify four specific locations where he sees his dream being realized: Georgia (52), Mississippi (53), Alabama (56), and every hill and every valley (58). The states named by King were those in which civil rights violations were notorious and highly publicized. It was only 2 months prior to the March on Washington that Alabama Governor George Wallace (1963b) had stood at the doorway to the University of Alabama to prevent two African American students from registering. Wallace only stepped aside when President Kennedy called in the Alabama National Guard to allow the students to enter the University.

In the let freedom ring sequence (65-76), King uses the jussive imperative (let) to communicate those destinations where freedom needs to be implemented in the United States. Through a series of circumstances of location, King indicates numerous areas in the U.S., including: New Hampshire (67); New York (68); Pennsylvania (69); Colorado (70); California (71); Georgia (72); Tennessee (73); and Mississippi (74). In naming
these regions, King begins with those states that are relatively integrated and where equal rights exist and ends with those regions of the country that have yet to embrace the vision or deliver on the promissory note (10). Not only does King name the states in which Americans need to let freedom ring, but he also amplifies those regions (with added details or modifiers) by specifically naming places in each of the states: the hilltops of New Hampshire (67); the mighty mountains of New York (68); the heightening Alleghenies of Pennsylvania (69); the snow capped Rockies of Colorado (70); the curvaceous peaks of California (71); Stone Mountain of Georgia (72); Lookout Mountain of Tennessee (73); and every hill and every molehill of Mississippi (74). King may have augmented his mention of these states to add a personal touch to his circumstances of location or to connect with those in the crowd known to have come to the March from these locations. Yet at least two of these locations also had significance as places that were pivotal in the civil rights movement: Lookout Mountain in Georgia was the site of a civil war battle, and Stone Mountain in Tennessee is the symbolic meeting place for the Ku Klux Klan (Taylor, n.d.). King would have mentioned these two sites as reminders that there were places in the United States where the manacles of segregation and the chains of discrimination (5) were still present.

**Benchmark: Shared Values**

King identifies a number of values that would have been shared with his audiences. To refer to shared values King uses the linguistic resources of lexical choice (that is, stating directly those values he shared with his audiences), intertextual references, many religious references, and the appraisal resources of judgment and appreciation.
Among those values that King explicitly identifies through his lexical choices are the following: *the inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness* (11); *justice* (14, 16, 19, 27, 28, 41, 53); *equality* (23); *the American dream* (50); and *freedom* (17, 23, 30, 34, 44, 63, 65), and the *let freedom ring* sequence (67-76). These will all be recognized by King’s audiences as the national principles that they all embrace and will have served to unite King with his listener-followers in a bonded solidarity. Similarly, King’s intertextual references will strengthen that bond without King having to state the shared values specifically. Intertextual references in the speech include mention of Lincoln (*a great American in whose symbolic shadow we stand* (1), who is recognized for having signed the Emancipation Proclamation (1) which *came as a great beacon light of hope to millions of Negro slaves who had been seared in the flames of withering justice* (2). King also references two foundational documents, the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence (10), which would have been recognized by the audiences as the founding principles on which the nation was built. Finally, King refers to two musical pieces, *My Country tis of thee* (64) from which the *let freedom ring* statement derives and *the old Negro spiritual, “Free at last! Free at last! Thank God Almighty, we are free at last!”* (76).

This latter religious reference is but one among many such intertextual references to the Bible in the King text. While these references are likely so plentiful because King was a Christian preacher and these references would have been a familiar part of his oratory, they also serve to bond him with his listener-followers, many of whom were African American Christians who would recognize the terminology. These religious references serve not only as a bonding vehicle but also to cast **moral overtones** on
King’s vision to encourage its adoption by the various audiences. Among the religious references in the text are the following: righteousness (41); redemptive (46); every valley shall be exalted . . . glory of the Lord, 58; faith (46, 60, 61, 62, 63); pray together (63); all of God’s children (20, 64, 76) and thank God Almighty (76). These very Christian or Judeo-Christian references would have been appropriate for creating solidarity in the homogeneous society that was the United States of the 1960s and would have been recognized as shared values, principles that would have added credibility for King’s vision to his listener-followers.

King also uses the appraisal resources of judgment and appreciation to communicate shared values to his audiences. With the first of these, King communicates his positive judgment on those values he shares with his audiences and his negative evaluation of values they do not share. Positive values include: Lincoln being a great American, 1; this sacred obligation, 13; our rightful place, 29; the endurance of great trials and tribulations, 42; to advance the cause of civil rights; and the redemptive quality of unearned suffering, 46. Among those values that King judges not worthy of socially accepted behavior are: withering injustice, 2; wrongful deeds, 29; and wallowing, 48.

Similarly, King uses the appraisal resources of appreciation, both positive and negative, to share his evaluation of things that he values and those he does not. Those things King evaluates positively include: this momentous decree, 2 (referring to the Emancipation Proclamation); a great beacon light of hope, 2; this hallowed spot, 17; the palace of justice, 28; faith, 46; and the old Negro spiritual, 76. Among those things King evaluates negatively are: the long night of captivity, 3; an appalling condition, 8; a bad check, 13; and the slums and ghettos of our northern cities, 47. King communicates his
stance on these things in the hope that his listener-followers will share his opinions and that the sharing will bind them to his vision.

**Benchmark: Shared Hopes and Dreams**

King’s text is full of **shared hopes and dreams**, especially the dream embodied in the Emancipation Proclamation (1) and all the dreams expressed in the now famous *I have a dream* sequence (49-58). These shared hopes and dreams would have been recognized and embraced by those present onsite at the March and those who also shared the vision and who would have been watching or listening to the speech via the media.

King did not pander to audiences that did not support his vision by diminishing his message. On the contrary, as noted above, he departed from the written notes that may have been addressed to a more generic audience and spoke extemporaneously, lapsing into the familiar and highly religious preaching style for which he was known. Reverting to that style may have enflamed the members of the audiences who did not share his vision of civil rights but King was unwilling to change his message for them.

King’s speech conveys considerable **emotion**, both in its content (the injustice suffered by African Americans) and in its tone. To express this emotion King relies on his oratorical style, especially through his propensity to communicate one obligatory or defining statement followed by several optional statements that build on and personalize (M. Bell, 1999) the initial concept, and also through his use of the appraisal resource of **affect** and, as noted above, references to shared values and shared intertextual references.

King uses the **affect** resources of **happiness** and **security** to express his positive emotions and the resources of **unhappiness** and **dissatisfaction** to convey his negative emotions. **Positive** emotions are conveyed through such choices as: *joyous daybreak, 3;*
the security of justice, 16; and hope, 59. Negative emotions are conveyed in such choices as: the long night of captivity, 3; the tragic fact, 4; sadly crippled, 5; an appalling condition, 8; the valley of despair, 48; and the Negro’s legitimate discontent, 22.

There can be little doubt about King’s own commitment and enthusiasm for his vision. This commitment is expressed through the linguistic resources of Mood, modality, engagement, and through the discursive strategy of repetition.

The majority of the sentences in King’s speech are in the declarative Mood, with a number of jussive imperatives and a very few rhetorical questions. Reading the text, I thought that many of the declarative sentences could just as easily have been exclamations. The force of statements such as we refuse to believe that the bank of justice is bankrupt (14) no, no we are not satisfied (41), spoken in the traditional way of an African American preacher, could easily have been punctuated with exclamation marks. Combined with the jussive imperatives, these declarative/exclamations provide strong evidence of King’s commitment to his vision.

Similarly, King’s use of modality adds to the evidence of his commitment and enthusiasm. King uses modality in several instances in his text, among them: there is something that I must say, 28; we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds, 29; we must make the pledge, 36; and this must become true, 66. Must is a modal of obligation, a word that demonstrates a strong conviction of some concept. In using must, as opposed to, for example, might or could, King establishes his strong stance towards the vision. King’s audiences would have understood the usage of must as evidence of his determination to see the vision become reality. The appraisal resources of engagement also show that commitment. Save for the intertextual references to Lincoln and Kennedy, King allows
no other voices to enter his text. Using engagement: proclaim King states his vision convincingly, suppressing any opposing viewpoints (Martin & White, 2005) by stating his opinions as fact in such clauses as: we refuse to believe, 14; we cannot walk alone, 35; we cannot turn back, 36; I say to you today, 49; this is our hope, 59; and this must become true, 66. Repetition reinforces the commitment and provides a means through which King reinforces his points to his listener-followers and his other various audiences. As noted above, King’s style is to make one obligatory statement and follow it with optional statements that expand on the thought. This expansion provides cohesion in the text in such instances as the occurrence of time in the now is the time sequence (18-21); the we are not satisfied sequence (38-41); and, of course, the I have a dream and let freedom ring sequences (49-58, 65-76).

Also, by the time of the March on Washington in August 1963, King had already spent time in the Birmingham jail and he had survived several assassination attempts (“Kind, Martin Luther, Jr. [1929-1968],” n.d.). Being asked to deliver the keynote address would have been evidence of his stature in the civil rights movement, a stature won through his demonstrated commitment to the cause. And King himself states his commitment to the vision when he encourages his listener-followers to go back to Mississippi . . . Alabama . . . Georgia . . . Louisiana . . . the slums and ghettos of our northern cities (47) and then says with conviction that he will return to the south (60). Returning to the South was no insignificant gesture for King: This commitment would lead to his assassination in Memphis in 1968 (“King, Martin Luther, Jr. [1929-1968],” n.d.).
In creating the *us-ness* that is part of this benchmark feature of an effective vision, King speaks on behalf of African Americans (the *Negro*, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 22, 23, 25, 26, 34, 39, 40, 76; people of *color*, 12, 54; and *black*, 56, 76) and yet also acknowledges that he and his supporters *cannot walk alone* (35). King uses three linguistic strategies to delineate who constitutes the *us* in his vision, those who must walk together to ensure the fulfillment of the promise that *all men are created equal* (51): naming, pronouns, and the jussive imperative.

In his speech King distinguishes between White American and African American by naming them. He refers to *many of our White brothers, as evidenced by their presence here today, [who] have come to realize that their destiny is tied up with our destiny and their freedom is inextricably bound to our freedom* (34) and, as noted above, makes many explicit references to African Americans. This latter group, King states, has not benefited from *the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness* (11) guaranteed by the U.S. Declaration of Independence (“The Declaration of Independence,” 2011) and has come to Washington to express that *there will be neither rest nor tranquility in America until the Negro is granted his citizenship rights* (26). In this group King includes those who have experienced *trials and tribulations* (42), *narrow cells* (43), *police brutality* (44), and *creative suffering* (45).

While King uses the first-person singular pronoun frequently (notably in the *I have a dream* sequence, 49-58) it his use of the first-person plural pronoun that is particularly interesting. In King’s speech, *we* refers strictly to those committed people who are present at the March (save for one exception when he refers to the U.S. Constitution which states, “*We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are*
created equal,” 51). King states: we stand in the symbolic shadow of Lincoln, 1; we must face the tragic fact, 4; we have come here today, 8; we refuse to believe, 14; we have come to cash a check, 16; we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds, 29, in the process of gaining our rightful place; we must rise to majestic heights, 33; and we cannot walk alone, 35. These are clearly intended to refer only to the we who are present in Washington and already committed to the cause of civil rights. King does not appear to use the first-person plural pronoun to speak to any audience other than those in his immediate audience. Despite this apparent oversight by King to include others who were not present at the March, these other groups do become part of the us through King’s use of the jussive imperative. In the let freedom ring sequence (65-76) the absence of a specific you ensures that the command goes out to all, not just the relatively few who are present at the March. King could instead have said we must let freedom ring but this statement would have included in the we only those same people to whom he had been addressing his remarks using the first-person plural pronoun, that is, only those in his immediate audience. By stating his vision in the jussive imperative, King opens it up to those who are not present at the March and to those who have yet to embrace the vision.

In creating his us-ness King takes some liberties with those other audiences. The March on Washington was to promote equal rights for African Americans yet King speaks of other populations as needing to be free. In the rousing final statement, King states that when we let freedom ring . . . we will be able to speed up that day when all of God's children, Black men and White men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual Free at last! free at last! Thank God Almighty we are free at last!” (76). This statement seems to
suggest that these other populations—White men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics—are not yet free and that only through supporting equal rights for African Americans can they become free. I can understand the references to Catholics and Jews: there was concern and prejudice among Protestant Christians that Kennedy was Catholic (University of Michigan Research Center, as cited in Anderson, 1990) and Jews were subjected to anti-Semitic attacks and discriminatory legislation and practices into the 1960s (“Religion in the United States,” n.d.). I am, however, unclear why King included White men and Protestants (76) in his call for freedom given that these populations were already free. Perhaps King’s mention of these free populations was intended to be inclusive and to indicate that the populations against which there were prejudices should become free like White men and Protestants (76).

Also, in mentioning these other populations King may have been attempting to reach out to people beyond those converted Whites who are in the immediate audience. King realized that his vision could not be implemented until all Whites embraced civil rights; he may therefore have sought to reach those not present by appealing to the basic need to be free that he felt all Americans shared. In so doing, King sought to bring them into the us and obtain their active commitment to the vision. He would need all Americans to embrace the concept of a Beloved Community to bring it to reality. King does not indicate any population as a common enemy. Instead he refers to the common enemies of poverty, 8; segregation, 5, 19; racial injustice, 21; judgment of a person’s worth by the color of their skin [rather than] by the content of their character, 54; and interposition and nullification, 56. This latter reference to interposition and nullification refers to the attempts by Governor George Wallace to use the Tenth Amendment to the
U.S. Constitution to continue segregating schools in Alabama. Wallace had stated in his inaugural speech that he would ensure “segregation today . . . segregation tomorrow . . . segregation forever” (Wallace, 1963a) and chose to protest federal integration policies stating that the Tenth Amendment sustained “the right of self-government and grants the State of Alabama the right to enforce its laws and regulate its internal affairs” (Wallace, 1963b, para. 7). While Wallace is not explicitly branded as an enemy of civil rights, King notes that the governor of Alabama’s lips are presently dripping with the words of interposition and nullification (56). These are harsh words from King and would have angered those, both in Alabama and other states, who supported Wallace’s views. In making this statement, King does nothing to decrease the jangling discords of our nation (62).

**Benchmark: Spans Timelines**

In keeping with the recommendations for this benchmark feature of an effective vision, King’s speech refers to all three time periods: the past, the present, and the future.

King’s references to the **past** include both the far past and the recent past, both of which are communicated in the past tense (*this momentous decree came, 2; this note was a promise, 11*). For the far past, King makes reference at the beginning of the speech drawing on intertextuality to situate his own work in the context of Lincoln’s vision in several ways. In the first instance, King imitates the opening clauses of the Gettysburg Address in noting the date of the Emancipation Proclamation as being *five score years ago* (1). Secondly, King refers to Lincoln as *a great American* (1) and, in the third reference to him, notes that it is in Lincoln’s *symbolic shadow* that the protesters stand. This reference to Lincoln’s *symbolic shadow* may mean two things: first that the
marchers have gathered to hear speeches near the Lincoln memorial in Washington and, second, that the protestors are following in Lincoln’s footsteps, that is, fighting for the proposition that all men are created equal (51). The more recent past is referenced though King’s identification of his listener-followers having come out of great trials and tribulations (42), including having experienced creative suffering (45), persecution (44), batter[ing] (44) and police brutality (44).

King transitions from the past to the present in sentence 4 in which he states that one hundred years later, we must face the tragic fact that the Negro is still not free. This transition sentence allows King to position the current reality as being much different from that promised in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence (10). King refers to the present in the present tense (the Negro is still not free, 4; it is obvious today, 12) and communicates the difference between the past and the present realities through an elegant metaphor of a promissory note that was unable to be cashed because there were insufficient funds in the bank of justice and the great vaults of opportunity (9-16).

Given the appalling condition (8) of African Americans in the United States at the time of the speech, King proposes his vision, his dream (49-58) of a different future for his people. The transition to the future takes place in sentence 24 in which King states that nineteen sixty-three is not an end but a beginning. In making this statement, King again relies on intertextuality: the sentence is almost a verbatim reflection of Kennedy’s inaugural (a celebration of freedom—symbolizing an end, as well as a beginning; Kennedy, 1961). King may have used this intertextual reference for two reasons: first, to remind those in the audience of the refreshing promise the new president had brought to
the nation, and, second, to remind Kennedy that King had supported his candidacy (Anderson, 1990) and that he was owed action on civil rights in return.

The future, predictably, is reflected in the future tense: the I have a dream sequence (49-58) in which King shares his vision of the future is positioned using a nominal group as subject (my four children, 54) and the future tense (will live one day, 54). Other sentences use shall instead of will as in we shall march ahead (36) and several repetitions in 58: one day every valley shall be exalted, every hill and mountain shall be made low, the rough places will be made plain, and the crooked places will be made straight, and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together. This latter statement is almost verbatim from Isa 40:5 and may therefore reflect the use of shall as is typical in religious texts to depict the future.

In speaking of the future, King identifies it for African Americans by speaking of a time when the vision is implemented. He also speaks of the future to address those who hope[d] the Negro needed to blow off steam and will now be content (25). These people, said King, will have a rude awakening in the future if the nation returns to business as usual (25) as there will be neither rest nor tranquility in America until the Negro is granted his citizenship rights (26). As will be discussed below in the section on the benchmark feature of urgency, this statement borders on a threat of what will happen if the vision is not implemented. It is this statement that perhaps led Fox News to refer to King as a “domestic terrorist.” The conservatives at Fox may not have heard the pacifist message in one of King’s subsequent statements, that is, that in creating their future he and his listener-followers must not let [their] creative protest degenerate into physical
violence (32) and that they need to rise to the majestic heights of meeting physical force with soul force (34).

As will be discussed in the section below on imagery, King uses picture words to bring his vision of the future to life, offering his listener-followers a rich and comprehensive understanding of how he sees his Beloved Community being part of American life.

**Benchmark: Contains Imagery**

While the strength of this speech can be attributed to other factors, it is the use of language to create imagery that stands out as exemplary. King’s facility with language is nowhere more evident than in his ability to create word pictures of his vision, making it resonate with and be embraced by his listener-followers. This ability is in part likely a function of King’s preaching style but also a result of the use of the linguistic resources of *amplification*, both *augmentation* and *enrichment*, the use of metaphor, and King’s repetition of optional statements to expand on his obligatory statements. These latter two strategies, metaphor and repetition, were discussed above in the sections on challenge and emotion in the speech; here I will discuss King’s use of the appraisal resources of *amplification* to create imagery in his text.

There are abundant examples of the use of *amplification: augmentation* in the text. King speaks of the Emancipation Proclamation as being a *momentous decree*, 2; that came as a *great beacon light of hope*, 2; to African American slaves who were freed from the *flames of withering injustice*, 2; by it, King also *amplifies* his sense of immediacy needed to implement the vision by referring to *the fierce urgency of now*, 17; and also *augments* the suffering of his listener-followers by acknowledging that they have
experienced the great trials and tribulations, 42. But perhaps the most striking uses of amplification: augmentation occur in the let freedom ring sequence (65-76). It is in this sequence that King amplifies the locations in which freedom should ring (from every village and every hamlet, from every state and every city, 76) and in which he identifies that freedom should be the normal state of affairs for all of God's children, Black men and White men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, 76. Through augmenting his lexical choices, King not only creates imagery for his listener-followers, but also expands his vision beyond them to include all locations in the country and all populations living in it.

Similarly, there are numerous instances in which King uses amplification: enrichment to generate a meaning-laden image when a more neutral word would have served just as well. King speaks of: those listener-followers who had been seared in the flames of withering injustice, 2; the Emancipation Proclamation as being a joyous daybreak after the long night of captivity, 3; our nation's capital, 9 (so stated perhaps to remind the audiences who were not onsite that they too are responsible for implementing the nation's laws, especially those relating to civil rights); the warm threshold which leads into the palace of justice, 28; African Americans who are heavy with the fatigue of travel, 38, being unable to find lodging; and the need for his listener-followers not to wallow in the Valley of Despair, 48. These words add richness to King’s speech and enable him to paint those picture words that will linger in the memory of the listener-followers far longer than unadorned words would. They will need the richness of the vision to carry them through the difficult times to come as they continue to seek equal rights for all.
I want to note here an interesting feature of King’s communication that contributed to the imagery in the text. King had a propensity to state a concept in the form of a noun of a noun (for example, the valley of despair, 48; and the long night of captivity, 3). King could have expressed his vision by using the minimum of words without the embroidery of the extra nouns. In the given examples he could have just said despair and captivity, but it is these extra nouns that give the text a musical, poetic flavor and make it ring with emotion.

**Benchmark: Suggests Means to Implement**

King provides ample direction to his listener-followers on how they can support him by implementing his vision. The linguistic resources of modality and the imperative Mood, in its traditional command format and also in the jussive, enable King to be precise in these instructions to his listener-followers.

King’s use of modality to communicate what must be done to implement the vision appears in numerous statements in the speech. King identifies the needed actions in both the positive, what must be done, and in the negative, what must not be done in the implementation of the vision by his listener-followers. Among the things to be done, King names as musts are conduct[ing] our struggle on the high plane of dignity and discipline, 31; and ris[ing] to the majestic heights of meeting physical force with soul force, 33. Among the things not to do are: be[ing] guilty of wrongful deeds, 29; let[ting] our creative protest degenerate into physical violence, 32; and allowing the marvellous new militancy which has engulfed the Negro community [to] lead us to distrust all White people, 34.
The imperative in its traditional command format enables King to give direct and specific guidance to his listener-followers on the actions to take to implement the vision. King tells his people to continue to work with the faith that unearned suffering is redemptive (46) and then commands them to go back to Mississippi, go back to Alabama, go back to Georgia, go back to Louisiana, go back to the slums and ghettos of our northern cities (47) to continue the work. King further uses the imperative to command that freedom be rung (65-76) through all parts of the land until all of God's children, Black men and White men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual “Free at last! free at last! thank God Almighty, we are free at last!”

Using the jussive imperative, King includes his own efforts with those of his listener-followers in implementing the vision when he says let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for freedom (30) and let us not wallow in the valley of despair (48).

**Benchmark: Expresses Urgency**

King meets this benchmark feature of an effective vision by stating explicitly that he and those in the audience have come to remind America of the fierce urgency of now (17). King thereafter expands on the theme of urgency (18-27), at one point stating that it would be fatal for the nation to overlook the urgency of the moment and to underestimate the determination of the Negro (22). This latter statement could have been inflammatory given the fears that the March would ignite a racial war and enflame tensions (Torricelli & Carroll, 1999). Those listening in the audience or via radio and television may have construed the statement as a threat of violence if the nation did not act on changing the appalling condition (8). But King protested using only non-violent means, following
Ghandi’s example (Carson, 2011): It is unlikely that he was advocating an escalation to violence, but rather wanted the nation to pay attention and act to establish the promised equalities. Linguistically, King accomplishes his expression of urgency through lexical choice (*the urgency of now*, 17), the declarative Mood, and *engagement: proclaim*, stating categorically that there is an urgency and allowing no other voices to be entertained to present alternate views on that urgency.

**Summary**

King’s speech to the thousands gathered at the March on Washington, and to the millions more following the event by radio and television, ensured that the man who had not wanted to be a leader became the voice and symbolic face of the civil rights movement. King’s speech is part leadership vision, part preaching, and part inspiration. Through the use of language King speaks passionately about civil rights and reminds both his listener-followers and those who oppose the cause that *equal rights for all men* (51) is a founding principle for the United States, a legal responsibility, and *a promissory note* (10) which was issued to all Americans but which had yet to be paid to African American citizens.

King meets and exceeds the eight benchmark features of an effective vision and realizes these through the linguistic resources of metaphor, repetition, and the resources of appraisal theory.
CHAPTER VIII

FINDINGS

The purpose of this chapter is to provide the results of a cross-case analysis of the individual analyses that comprise chapters 4-7. It is in the cross-case analysis of the four speeches that common patterns and trends in language choices made by the orators to make their speeches exemplary cases of communicating vision can be found.

I begin the chapter with a discussion of the context of situation for the four speeches. This is followed by a summation of common characteristics across the speeches for each of the benchmark features of an effective vision, including a discussion of the common linguistic devices that were used by the orators to express those features. How these eight features appear in each speech and their common linguistic elements is summarized in Table 11.

I end with the potential discovery of a genre for visionary political speeches from which I have been able to develop a model for leaders to follow in crafting their own visions.

Cross-Case Analysis: Summation of Common Characteristics

This section addresses the common characteristics of the four speeches and their shared linguistic patterns and trends, first examining the common elements of the four contexts of situation and then addressing commonalities across the speeches for each of the eight benchmark features of an effective vision.
Table 11

Synthesis of Features and Common Linguistic Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Lincoln</th>
<th>Churchill</th>
<th>Kennedy</th>
<th>King</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue a challenge</strong></td>
<td>No new goal; preserve existing principles. parallelistism, repetition, alliteration, and juxtaposition Intertextual (Four-score . . . new nation, 1)</td>
<td>No new goal; preserve existing principles. Intertextual (Knights, Crusaders, 81) Appreciation + and – Us = +, them = –</td>
<td>Bold new direction Intertextual (same solemn oath, 1)</td>
<td>No new goal: existing principles to be implemented: deliver of promise of equal rights for all men Intertextual (refers to Lincoln, 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sacrifice</strong></td>
<td>Weak Juxtaposed material processes vs. mental processes</td>
<td>Judgment</td>
<td>Imperative; juxtaposition (ask not, 46)</td>
<td>Religious references (creative suffering, 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change and growth</strong></td>
<td>No new goal; preserve existing principles</td>
<td>No new goal: preserve existing principles amplification: augmentation and amplification: enrichment</td>
<td>Bold new direction; lexical choices; naming strategy; declarative Mood; jussive imperative</td>
<td>No new goal: preserve existing principles; metaphor (promissory note, 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivators</strong></td>
<td>Weak Expressed through shared values; intrinsic only</td>
<td>Expressed through shared values; intrinsic and extrinsic</td>
<td>Expressed through shared values; intrinsic and extrinsic</td>
<td>Expressed through shared values; intrinsic and extrinsic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Destination</strong></td>
<td>No new direction; preserve existing principles</td>
<td>No new direction; preserve existing principles; one positive affect and many negative affect (depression?); appreciation positive and negative; shared values; locations</td>
<td>Bold new direction— naming (change, 1) judgment: positive and appreciation</td>
<td>No new direction; preserve existing principles; locations; amplification: augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared values</strong></td>
<td>Judgment: positive only; God; appreciation: positive only; amplification: augmentation</td>
<td>Judgment; God; appreciation: adjectives</td>
<td>Judgment; God; affect; appreciation</td>
<td>Judgment; God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral overtones</strong></td>
<td>God; judgment</td>
<td>God; judgment</td>
<td>God; judgment</td>
<td>God; judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared hopes and dreams: Emotion</strong></td>
<td>Limited; no affect (depression?) some augmentation: enrichment</td>
<td>Affect: mostly negative; (depression?)</td>
<td>Affect: negative and then positive</td>
<td>Affect: negative and positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Us-ness</strong></td>
<td>Strong; naming: no 1st-person singular pronoun (only we); processes (we mental, they material)</td>
<td>Strong; naming: pronouns: 1st-person singular and plural and royal we; vocatives</td>
<td>Strong; naming: metaphor; judgment, both positive and negative</td>
<td>Strong; naming: predominantly 3rd-person plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment</strong></td>
<td>Mood (declarative); engagement: proclaim (one mitigation); Repetition; amplification: augmentation; shall vs. will</td>
<td>Mood (declarative, one rhetorical question); engagement, mostly proclaim; modality; shall vs. will lexical choices</td>
<td>Mood, (declarative, two rhetorical questions); Engagement: proclaim; amplification; repetition; shall</td>
<td>Mood (declarative; one rhetorical questions); engagement: proclaim; amplification; repetition; shall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Lincoln</th>
<th>Churchill</th>
<th>Kennedy</th>
<th>King</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common enemy</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Naming and vocatives</td>
<td>Traditional enemies are requested to become part of us</td>
<td>No traditional enemies (segregation, 5; poverty, 8; injustice, 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spans timelines:</td>
<td>Distinction: far past and recent past; intertextual references</td>
<td>Distinction: far past and recent past</td>
<td>Distinction: far past and recent past Intertextual references</td>
<td>Distinction: far past and recent past Intertextual references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Transition sentence (now we are engaged, 2); present tense</td>
<td>Transition sentence (we shall not be content, 112); present tense</td>
<td>Transition sentence (the world is very different now, 3); present tense</td>
<td>Transition sentence (one hundred years later we must face, 4); present tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Future tense, shall</td>
<td>Future tense, shall</td>
<td>Future tense, shall</td>
<td>Future tense, shall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contains imagery</td>
<td>Amplification: augmentation; amplification: enrichment; circumstances of location</td>
<td>Amplification: augmentation; amplification: enrichment; circumstances of location</td>
<td>Lexical choices; metaphor; interesting nominal group formations; amplification: augmentation; amplification: enrichment; circumstances of location; juxtaposition.</td>
<td>Amplification: augmentation; amplification: enrichment; circumstances of location; interesting nominal group formations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggests means to implement</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Details (we shall fight, 139); implied imperative</td>
<td>Details; jussive imperative</td>
<td>Details (go back to . . ., 47); imperative modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expresses urgency</td>
<td>Weak (birth, 10)</td>
<td>Weak (menace, 133)</td>
<td>Strong and specific; lexical choices (danger, 22); amplification: amplification.</td>
<td>Strong and specific; lexical choices (fierce urgency of now, 17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context of Situation

There were many similarities in the contexts of situation across the four speeches.

All four, for example, are in the mode of written to be spoken and all four are in the field of political discourse (despite the fact that two speeches, Churchill’s and Lincoln’s, did not start out to be political speeches).

There are, however, differences in the tenor of the speeches. Lincoln and Kennedy both spoke in a singular voice, leader to listener-follower, unlike Churchill who
adopted several voices, letting more of his personality enter his speech and appealing to those listener-followers who communicated in a less “posh” manner. King stands alone in his adoption of a traditional African American preaching tone, using familiar preaching cadence and Christian lexical choices to create alignment and solidarity with his audiences.

Features of an Effective Vision

Based on my study of four exemplary speeches on vision, I can confirm (with only a minor reservation about the need to express urgency) that the eight benchmark features of an effective vision as recommended in the literature are present in three of the four speeches that comprise my data set. Of the four speeches, only Lincoln’s stands out as an anomaly; yet despite not meeting or only weakly representing some of the sub-themes of the eight benchmarks, Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address remains one of North America’s most outstanding visionary speeches.

The similarities and linguistic patterns across the four speeches that realize the benchmark features are discussed below in individual sections on each of the eight benchmark features (and sub-themes) of an effective vision.

Benchmark: Issue a Challenge

In all four speeches the orator issued a challenge to his audiences. However, although each of the four speeches identified a challenge, in only one of the four speeches is there a challenge of something new that requires change and growth. Only Kennedy’s inaugural address contained a bold new direction; in the other three speeches, the leader advocated a return to that which was rather than to something new. For Lincoln, the
proposition that all men are created equal (1), a founding principle of the nation, was the goal. For Churchill, it was a preservation of all that we stand for (82). And for Martin Luther King Jr., delivery of what was promised to African Americans in the Declaration of Independence and the Emancipation Proclamation was the challenge he issued to America.

All four orators advocated sacrifice in order to achieve the vision and all offered motivators (both extrinsic and intrinsic except for Lincoln, who offers only intrinsic motivators) to inspire their listener-followers to commit to the vision. The majority of these motivators are in the form of values that the orator and the listener-followers share and also through intertextual references to inspiring documents or people who will have been perceived by the audience as positive endorsements of the orator’s vision. The linguistic resources that realize the expression of shared values are discussed below in the section on the benchmark feature of that name.

**Benchmark: Vision as Destination**

All four orators communicated a destination to their listener-followers with the intriguing fact, as noted above, that only Kennedy offers a vision of a new direction, a new beginning of renewal and change (1). While each of the orators drew on a number of linguistic resources to communicate the destination of his vision, there are no discernable common linguistic patterns or trends across all speeches.

**Benchmark: Shared Values**

This is the benchmark feature that is perhaps, together with the creation of us-ness, the most highly developed in the four speeches. The values shared by the orator and his
listener-followers were referenced in some detail and in some frequency to communicate the advantages of the vision. While other linguistic resources were used by some of the orators, all four drew upon the appraisal resources of judgment to communicate their stance on what values were good and what were bad. Not surprisingly, those values which we share (all men are created equal, Lincoln, 1; duty, Churchill, 113; united, Kennedy, 11) were stated in positive judgment terms and the values that they share (every kind of brutal and treacherous maneuver, Churchill, 130; colonial control, Kennedy, 12; injustice and oppression, King, 53) were stated in negative judgment terms.

Because shared values was a feature that was so highly developed in the four speeches, and because my curiosity was piqued, I decided to examine whether there were similar values that were shared, not only between each of the orators and his listener-followers, but also between the four orators. Again not surprisingly, since the four orators were leaders of populations that espoused similar Western cultures, there were a number of values that the four shared. Among these values, freedom, liberty, sacrifice and duty were prevalent. All leaders also referred to the founding principles on which their visions were built: the principles of the founding fathers (Lincoln, 1); our long history and all that we stand for (Churchill, 25 and 82); the same revolutionary beliefs and the land we love (Kennedy, 5 and 49); and the Emancipation Proclamation (King, 1).

Another value shared by all four orators was God. Each of the orators spoke of God by name and two of them, Kennedy and King, also added religious references to Bible passages to give a moral overtone to their visions. Given the generally homogeneous Judeo-Christian audiences to whom these orators were speaking, these religious references would be understood by the audiences and would have created the
desired alignment and solidarity between the leader and his listener-followers. Given the
diversity of faiths in modern Western audiences, however, I have some doubts about the
continuing appropriateness of religious references in leadership visions. I address this
issue in chapter 9.

**Benchmark: Shared Hopes and Dreams**

All orators except Lincoln expressed shared hopes and dreams and abundant emotion in their speeches through the appraisal resources of *affect*. Lincoln’s emotion around his vision is readily apparent in his speech but he chose other linguistic resources (repetition, processes, alliteration) to communicate the passion he felt for preserving the Union. That all four orators were committed to their vision is not in doubt: All drew on the linguistic resources of the declarative Mood, the usage of *shall* rather than *will*, and *engagement: proclaim* to state their visions in a manner that brooked no discord or alternatives. Only two of the four orators, Churchill and Kennedy, chose to highlight shared hopes and dreams through the naming of a common enemy; neither King nor Lincoln did so.

As noted above, the sense of *us-ness* created in the speeches is remarkable. This *us-ness*, the distinguishing of *we* from *they*, provides for the listener-followers a demarcation between how *we* behave and how *they* behave and, in so doing, provides guidance on how *we* can act to implement the leader’s vision. *Us-ness* is created in the speeches via pronouns (especially through the repeated use of the first-person plural *we* to create solidarity between the leader and his listener-followers), processes (such as Lincoln’s use of material processes when referring to those who died at Gettysburg, while *we the living*, 10, are relegated to mental processes such as *to be dedicated* to continue
their work) and naming. Through masterful use of these linguistic resources each orator wove a profound sense of the standards to which he holds his listener-followers for them to continue to be part of the *we*.

**Benchmark: Spans Timelines**

All four orators span the past, the present, and the future in their speeches with, not surprisingly, verb tense being the main indicator of which time period is being signalled. However, three interesting patterns emerged in how the three timelines were realized in the speeches. The first of these patterns is the reference, in all four speeches, to both a recent and a distant past. The second pattern concerns the past being realized through intertextual references to past people and documents that would evoke a positive and inspiring response in the listener-followers. The third pattern is the existence in each of the four speeches of a transition sentence that allows the orator to position the present as being different from and less desirable than the positive principles of the past. By highlighting these differences, the orator is then well-placed to describe his vision of the future that will restore those past principles.

**Benchmark: Contains Imagery**

All four speeches contain imagery that would have made the vision resonate with the listener-followers. Even Lincoln, despite the brevity of the Gettysburg Address, expressed his vision using enough picture words to make the vision vivid through language. The linguistic resources that are used to help the listener-followers “hear, taste, smell, see and touch the vision” (Kouzes & Posner, 1995) are those of *amplification*, both *augmentation* and *enrichment*, and circumstances of location. While lexical choices and
metaphor (and in the case of Kennedy and King an interesting *noun + noun* formation for the nominal group) contribute to the imagery in the speeches, it is the use of amplification in such instances as *a great beacon light of hope* (King, 2) and *these young men going forth every morn* (Churchill, 82) that make the visions ring true in the hearts and minds of the audiences. Circumstances of location were used to expand the reach of the vision beyond those in the immediate vicinity, thus implying that the vision applied to all. When Churchill, for example, delineated that *we shall fight in France, on the seas and oceans, on the beaches, in the air*, etc. (139), he was ensuring that all those British who could fight, no matter where they lived or what they did, would fight and *never surrender* (139). Similarly, in listing those regions of the United States in which we must *let freedom ring*, King expanded his notion of freedom for all to all regions of the country.

**Benchmark: Suggests Means to Implement**

Only Lincoln failed to offer his listener-followers strong guidance on what they must do to enact his vision, saying only that they *must take increased devotion* (10) to the cause of preserving the Union. The other three orators were specific in their guidance to their listener-followers, using the imperative Mood as the linguistic resource with which to issue implementation instructions.

**Benchmark: Expresses Urgency**

Of all the benchmark features, this is the one that is weak in two of the four speeches. Where both Kennedy and King expressed urgency using lexical choices (*danger*, Kennedy, 22; and *the fierce urgency of now*, King, 17), Lincoln and Churchill
only alluded to urgency using nominalizations (birth, Lincoln, 10; and menace, Churchill, 133) that imply, but do not specifically state, a sense of urgency to their visions.

It is clear to me that these four speeches, with perhaps the exception of the Gettysburg Address, contain the eight benchmark features of an effective vision as recommended in the leadership literature. These features and the linguistic patterns that realize them are summarized in Table 11.

Genre and a Model of Visionary Speech

The application of SFL on the four speeches revealed not only patterns and trends in language usage, but also an interesting shared feature: in three of the four speeches, the discourse is constructed around a minimum of obligatory statements (Eggins, 2004), each one of which is then expanded or reinforced by a number of additional statements. To give one example of this phenomenon, Martin Luther King Jr.’s I have a dream sequence is perhaps the most famous of these obligatory statements followed by expansions of the thought; I have a dream is stated once (50) and then reinforced eight times (51-58). Only Lincoln’s text, because of its precision and short length, is an anomaly that does not manifest this expansion phenomenon: All statements in the Gettysburg Address are obligatory statements. On closer examination of the obligatory (Eggins, 2004) statements, I found eight common stages that are evident in the four speeches as follows:

1. Situational positioning of the past (then)
2. Situational positioning of the present (now)
3. The purpose of the speech
4. A synopsis of the orator’s vision or goal—how the future should be
5. Statement(s) on how the vision/goal might be implemented or change effected
6. The timetable for needed change and an expression of urgency

7. Statement(s) of the orator’s personal commitment to the vision/changes needed

8. Call to action/rallying cry.

The discovery of these eight common stages suggests that there may be, subject to further study, a genre of political visionary speech. This finding is significant: Its discovery suggests that there is a model of visionary speech that could be adopted by leaders who want to communicate their own visions in a way that has been tried and found effective by four great political leaders.

Table 12 summarizes the stages of the genre in the speeches and provides a brief snapshot of how each stage was realized in the individual speeches. These stages are further discussed in the following section in which I identify the common linguistic features of each of the stages.

Linguistic Features of the Stages Common in Each Speech

This section discusses the common linguistic features of each of the stages that are shared by all four speeches. As Eggins (2004) suggested, each stage of a genre (such as the recipe example cited in chapter 3) contains its own grammatical and lexical features. Unpacking these common linguistic features was therefore a necessary prerequisite to the claim of a potential discovery of a genre for political visionary speech.

The following sections are organized around each of the eight stages I have identified in the proposed genre of political visionary speeches. For each of the eight stages I (a) provide a short introduction to the stage and its role in the speech, (b) offer a table that depicts the text that realizes this stage in all four speeches, and (c) discuss common or similar grammatical lexical features in each stage.
Table 12

*Stages of the Proposed Genre of Visionary Speeches*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Realization in Lincoln</th>
<th>Realization in Churchill</th>
<th>Realization in Kennedy</th>
<th>Realization in King</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past situational positioning (then)</td>
<td><em>(Four score ... (referring to the founding of the nation in 1776))</em></td>
<td>No formal intro—might have been <em>Mr. Speaker ... instead, narrative introduces miracle of Dunkirk (112) which took place in the recent past to position his vision that <em>we shall not be content</em> with an evacuation (i.e. not to expect another miracle, need to take offensive)</em></td>
<td>Formal, ritual introduction: *Vice-President Johnson, Mr. Speaker ... (3) in which he refers to the <em>same solemn oath</em> that past incoming presidents swear on inauguration day</td>
<td><em>(Five score years ago ... allusion to Lincoln ... Emancipation Proclamation in 1863)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current situational positioning (now)</td>
<td><em>(Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure (2))</em></td>
<td><em>(We shall not be content with a defensive war (112))</em></td>
<td><em>(We dare not forget today that we are the heirs of that first revolution (6))</em></td>
<td><em>(But one hundred years later, we must face the tragic fact that the Negro is still not free (4))</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of speech</td>
<td><em>(we are met ... we have come to dedicate (3, 4))</em></td>
<td><em>(we must be very careful ... wars are not won by evacuations (60, 61))</em></td>
<td><em>(we dare not forget today that we are heirs to that first revolution (6))</em></td>
<td><em>(we have come to dramatize ... we have come to cash a check (8))</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synopsis of vision/goal</td>
<td><em>(we are now engaged (2))</em></td>
<td><em>(we shall not be content with a defensive war (112))</em></td>
<td><em>(we shall pay any price ... assure the survival and success of liberty (8))</em></td>
<td><em>(I have a dream sequence (52-59))</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Realization in Lincoln</th>
<th>Realization in Churchill</th>
<th>Realization in Kennedy</th>
<th>Realization in King</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of vision/ how changes to be made to reach goal</td>
<td>with increased devotion . . . new birth of freedom (10)</td>
<td>offensive actions being taken (115-125)</td>
<td>outreach, pledges (8-17, 21-22) and let us (26-32)</td>
<td>what not to do e.g., must not be guilty of wrongful deeds (29-34) and continue to work . . . go back to Mississippi (46-47)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Timetable for change/urgency | Birth = allusion to imminent action (10) | menace which is being used to imply an imminent threat (133) | Rightly alarmed (25); deadly atom; uncertain balance of terror; the hand of mankind’s final (26) acknowledges fear | remind America of the fierce urgency of now (17) |

| Personal commitment | Includes himself in the we who must act on the vision: for us here (10) | I . . . His Majesty’s Government, Parliament, the nation (133-136) | I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it (43) | I return to the south (61) |

| Call to action/rallying call | It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us (10) | we shall fight . . . (139) | let us sequence (36) and ask not . . . let us go forth (46-49) | continue to work . . . go back to Mississippi . . . (46, 47) let freedom ring sequence (68-77) |

**Stage 1: Situational Positioning of the Past (Then)**

In each of the four speeches the orator begins his text with a sentence that positions his speech in the principles or values of the past; in the four speeches of this data set the reference to these principles or values appeared in intertextual references to people and/or documents that the listener-followers would have recognized as being
positive endorsements of the vision. This situational positioning of *then* is a critical platform on which the orator will then build Stage 2, a text that suggests that the present is different from the past. It is on the joint foundation of the past and the different present that each orator builds his compelling case for his vision of a different future (or in the case of Lincoln, Churchill, and King, a return to a set of past principles and values that are in jeopardy) that comes in Stage 4.

The realization of Stage 1 in the four speeches is depicted in Table 13.

Common features of situational positioning of the past (then) stage

There are a number of similar features that characterize this first stage of the potential genre. The most marked of these is the intertextuality that is a feature of all four speeches, a not surprising discovery because in this stage each of the orators will be using language to position his vision in relation to the solid foundation of the past. In Lincoln’s case, his reference to *four score and seven years ago* (1) and *our fathers* (1) is a direct reference to 1776 and the U.S. Declaration of Independence. Churchill makes several intertextual references in his speech, among them the *Knights of the Round Table* (81) and the *Crusaders* (81). Kennedy refers in his opening remarks to *the same oath our forebears prescribed nearly a century and three quarters ago* (1), meaning the oath a U.S. President takes on assuming office. And, finally, King refers twice to Lincoln: first through the reference to *a great American . . . [who] signed the Emancipation Proclamation* and, second, in his reference (*in whose symbolic shadow we stand*, 1) to the Lincoln memorial near to where King was delivering his speech. These intertextual references were chosen carefully by the orators: Each refers to a person, document, or
**Stage 1: Situational Positioning of the Past (Then)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orator</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td><em>Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal (1)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill</td>
<td>Narrative of Dunkirk positions need for offensive action; <em>Knights of the Round Table, Crusaders</em> (81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>... <em>I have sworn before you and Almighty God the same solemn oath our forebears prescribed nearly a century and three quarters ago (1)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td><em>Five score years ago, a great American, in whose symbolic shadow we stand signed the Emancipation Proclamation. This momentous decree came as a great beacon light of hope to millions of Negro slaves who had been seared in the flames of withering injustice (1-2)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

principle that will be seen in a favorable light by the members of the audience, both present and the larger group of listener-followers. The intertextual references are then one of the ways in which the orators create solidarity between themselves and their audiences and encourage the audience to commit to the vision being espoused in each of the speeches.

Another common feature in this first stage is that all orators express the positioning of the past in the declarative Mood. This Mood was chosen by the orators perhaps because positioning the past in the facts of history brooks no hesitancy or doubt. Furthermore, each orator would have wanted to express the foundation of the past in which the vision of the future will be situated as solid and good and for this purpose the declarative Mood is appropriate. In similar fashion, given the orators’ desire to speak in
factual terms, there is no marked modality in the opening stage of these visionary speeches.

Appraisal resources provide another similarity in this stage of the proposed genre: both judgment and appreciation are used by the orators to lay the foundation for their vision in this stage as are the appraisal resources of engagement: proclaim. Regarding the resources of judgment and appreciation, these are all expressed in the positive; this is not surprising when one considers that the orators want to position the past principles and shared values—a among them our fathers, a new nation, all men are created equal, the courage of the Knights of the Round Table and Crusaders, the same solemn (inaugural) oath, a great American, a momentous decree—as favorable and worthy of retention. The strategic use of engagement: proclaim reinforces that these values are good and worthy by not allowing any potentially discordant voices into the text.

Stage 2: Situational Positioning of the Present (Now)

Having positioned the values and principles of the past as good in the minds of the listener-audiences, each orator then turns to positioning the present as being different from the past. Three of the orators are subtle in this positioning of the now: Lincoln speaks of the civil war as testing (2) the proposition that all men are created equal (1); Churchill notes that we shall not be content with a defensive war (111-112); and King refers to the present, 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation as being a time when the Negro is still not free (3). Only Kennedy is explicit when he states that the world is very different now (3). Unlike the other orators who I argue envision a return to the
shared values and principles of the past, only Kennedy seeks a genuine beginning—
signifying renewal, as well as change (1).

As noted above, Stage 2 is a critical part of the platform on which each orator will
build his vision. For three of them, the vision will comprise a return to what was or, in the
case of King, what was promised but not delivered. For Kennedy, the vision comprises
genuine change: negotiation with the USSR to avoid nuclear war. The realization of
Stage 2 in the four speeches is depicted in Table 14.

Common features of the situational
positioning of the present (now)
stage.

The most striking characteristic of this stage in the potential genre is that it marks
a turning point from the past to the present. In making the shift, each orator will have,
first, reminded his listener-followers of the shared values of the past and then, second,
turned their minds to the present. Because the present is different from the past, and the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orator</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td><em>Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure</em> (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill</td>
<td><em>But this will not continue. We shall not be content with a defensive war</em> (111-112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td><em>The world is very different now</em> (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td><em>But one hundred years later, we must face the tragic fact that the Negro is still not free</em> (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
past was good, this stage sets the scene for the orator to make his case for either a return
to those worthy values that are now in jeopardy or, in Kennedy’s case, embark on a way
to ensure the future is equally worthy. Each orator needs to create this tension between
the past and the present in order to compel his audience(s) to act on his vision of a better
future. In making this difference between the past and the present so marked, each orator
lays the foundation for why his vision is important and also begins to build a platform for
Stage 4 in which he states his vision of the future. Without this stage, and if the present
were not different from the past, there would be no need for the orator’s vision of a better
future.

As in Stage 1, the strategic and common use of the declarative Mood in all the
speeches enables the orators to reinforce their views—as statements of fact—that, in
Kennedy’s words, *the world is very different now* (3). There is only one modal:
Churchill’s *we must be very careful* (3), an obligation which, in this usage, strengthens *be
very careful*, a way in which Churchill readies his audience to move beyond the
happiness of the miracle of Dunkirk and accept the hardships associated with *measures of
increasing stringency* (120) that will be needed for Britain to engage in an offensive war
and protect the Island from invasion. While Churchill’s remarks at this stage of his
speech may appear to be in the future (*this will, we shall*) this is actually the mid-point,
the reference to the present, between the past miracle of Dunkirk and the future possible
invasion.

And, again as in Stage 1, appraisal resources enable the orator to speak with a
single voice through the consistent use of *engagement: proclaim*. Unlike Stage 1,
however, *amplification* plays a role in Stage 2, with *amplification: augmentation* being
present in all four speeches \textit{(a great civil war, shall not be content, the world is very different now, still not free)}. These resources of \textit{amplification} enable the orators to reinforce their stance that the situation the listener-followers face in the present is such that a new vision for the future is needed.

**Stage 3: Purpose of the Speech**

The third stage of the proposed genre is the portion of the text in which the orator identifies the purpose of his speech. The purpose of each speech, at first examination, might seem obvious: Lincoln is ostensibly commemorating a cemetery; Churchill is addressing the House of Commons and, via radio, the people of Britain to provide a prime ministerial update on the war; Kennedy is delivering an inaugural address; and King is one speaker among many at the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedoms. However, as noted in chapter 4, Lincoln quickly turns the commemoration into a politically charged visionary speech. Similarly, Churchill turns the update on the war, especially the miracle of Dunkirk, into a political vision in which he communicates to both domestic and foreign audiences that Britain \textit{shall never surrender} (139) and that the war is going to become offensive and more demanding. Only Kennedy and King deliver the political visionary speeches they were predicted to deliver, the first an inaugural address, the second a keynote speech in a protest march. The texts that realize Stage 3 are depicted in Table 15.

Common features of the purpose of the speech stage.

As in the previous two stages, this stage is also all in the declarative Mood. The declarative sentences, combined with the resources of \textit{engagement: proclaim}, enable each
of the orators to state his purpose with certainness and without other potentially discordant voices entering the text. This certainty is supported by the fact that there is only one modal (Churchill’s *we must be very careful*) in the texts; this modal of obligation is strengthening Churchill’s statement that an evacuation is not a victory and positioning him to launch his vision of a more offensive war.

In each text, the orator is careful to use only the first-person plural pronoun *we* to speak of his purpose. Using *we* is a purposeful way for the orators to create solidarity between the listener-followers and the vision and leaves no room for assuming there is another option. This is in keeping with the suggestion by Fowler and Kress (1979) that the inclusive *we* allows the orator to claim to speak for himself and on behalf of others which in turn implicates the addressee in the content of the discourse, that is, the orator’s vision.

Table 15

*Stage 3: Purpose of the Speech*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orator</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td><em>We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live</em> (3-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill</td>
<td><em>We must be very careful not to assign to this deliverance the attributes of a victory. Wars are not won by evacuations</em> (60-61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td><em>We dare not forget today that we are the heirs of that first revolution</em> (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td><em>So we have come here today to dramatize an appalling condition</em> (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The resources of judgment have a role to play in Stage 3. All judgments save one are in the positive; only Churchill uses a negative evaluative stance when he states that 

*wars are not won by evacuations.* Churchill does so to cast a negative light on evacuations, a necessary act because he has just spoken in laudatory terms about the evacuation of Dunkirk that would have been received favorably by the people of Britain. Churchill does not dare leave his countrymen with the thought that evacuations are positive outcomes; Britain faces the prospect of a German invasion and needs to take the offensive to defend the Island.

**Stage 4: Synopsis of the Vision/Goal—How the Future Should Be**

This is the stage in the proposed genre in which the leader lays out his vision of the future. Interestingly, the synopsis of the vision appears at different points in the four speeches. All synopses of the future follow the first three stages but only Kennedy’s (*we shall pay any price*, 8) occurs early in the speech. The others state their visions much later in their texts: Lincoln in his penultimate sentence, Churchill in his final sentence, and King at about the two-thirds mark in his speech. Regardless of where in the text each synopsis appears, each orator will first have gone through the required three stages that precede the vision. Although the various positionings of this stage in the texts may seem unusual, it is in keeping with Eggins’s (2004) statement that order is important in a genre; by the time each orator declares his view of the future he has already undertaken the necessary stages of positioning the situation in both the past and the present and stating his purpose to his listener-followers. The texts that realize Stage 4 are depicted in Table 16.
Table 16

*Stage 4: Synopsis of the Vision/Goal—How the Future Should Be*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orator</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td><em>It is for us the living rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so advanced</em> (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill</td>
<td><em>We shall never surrender</em> (139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td><em>We shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any</em> (amplification: augmentation) <em>hardship, support any friend, oppose any</em> (foe, in order to <em>assure the survival and the success of liberty</em> (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td><em>I have a dream</em> sequence (52-59)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Common features of the synopsis of the vision/goal stage

The declarative Mood and *engagement: proclaim* are again common features of this stage of the proposed genre. *Amplification: augmentation* also has a role to play in this stage, particularly in Kennedy who repeats *any* several times to strengthen his vision of ensuring *the survival and the success of liberty*. And two of the orators, Churchill and Kennedy, use the amplified *shall* instead of *will* in their texts, again with the purpose of strengthening their visions. As noted in the chapter on the Churchill speech, while both *shall* and *will* are modal auxiliaries that are used to construct the future tense, *shall* is the less common of the two and used only in the first person, singular and plural, to denote intention (Quirk & Greenbaum, 1990, p. 54). *Shall* also conveys an exhortation (Fowler, 1984), conveying strength, when *will* could just as easily have been used.
The texts all gain extra strength from the absence of modality: Each of the orators is sure of his vision and does not express any doubt or require any intermediate zone (Martin, 2000) with which to express the future he envisages.

Each of the orators uses the inclusive *we* (Fowler & Kress, 1979) in this stage of his text, again in a purposeful way to create solidarity with the listener-followers who will needed to implement the vision. Combined with the resources of *engagement: proclaim*, which brook no opposition and the declarative Mood, the inclusive *we* makes a strong and compelling case for the vision and its implementation.

**Stage 5: Implementation**

By Stage 5 of his speech, each orator will have positioned the need for a vision to change the circumstances in which he and his listener-followers find themselves. In this stage of the speeches, each orator states how the listener-followers can help him implement his vision of how the future should be. For three of the orators—Lincoln, Churchill, and King—implementing the vision of the future will require an adherence to and return to the values of the past. For Lincoln these past values include the proposition *that all men are created equal* (19), *liberty* (1), and *freedom* (10). Lincoln calls on his listener-followers to take increased devotion to these values so that those who fell at Gettysburg *will not have died in vain* (10). For Churchill, whose nation is facing an imminent invasion, implementation of the vision means the retention of *and all that we stand for* (81). To retain those values, the British people will be subjected to *measures of increasing stringency* (120)—in addition to all the deprivations they have already endured for the war effort—so that the British Expeditionary Force can be built up and reconstituted (114) after the evacuation at Dunkirk. King refers to the freedom that was
promised but not delivered to African Americans in the Emancipation Proclamation of 1863. In implementing the vision of a future of freedom, King advocates Ghandi’s passive resistance, saying that his listener-followers must *meet physical force with soul force* (33) and that they must *go back to Mississippi* and other locations (47) to make the necessary changes that will bring about the promised freedom.

Only Kennedy steers his listener-followers in a brand new direction. This is not surprising given that Kennedy ran for office on a platform for change (Kennedy, 1960a) noting that *the world is very different now* (3). Given that the world is different, old methods and old policies will not serve the American people well and only new approaches to the world’s problems will work. Kennedy therefore suggests to his listener-followers and to his larger audiences in the world (especially the USSR) let us begin anew (3). In beginning anew, Kennedy calls on his audiences to implement his vision of a new future by uniting and negotiating for peace and an end to the Cold War to assure the survival and the success of liberty (8). Kennedy pledges the support of the United States to those nations that also embrace peace (8-17, 21-22) and promises to struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself (40). Table 17 depicts the four texts that realize this stage of the proposed genre.

Common features of the implementation stage

The Mood in the texts for Stage 5 is predominately in the imperative but these imperatives are sometimes implied rather than being explicit. In Lincoln, for example, the statement *it is rather for us to be here dedicated* (10) utilizes an infinitive (to be dedicated) to imply an imperative that would have been awkward to express explicitly
(you, be dedicated). For Churchill, we have to and we must (114-115) are in keeping with his mode of speaking in the inclusive we rather than the alternative explicit imperatives (you have to and you must).

Similarly, the marked and repetitive usage in Kennedy of let us (26-32) is another inclusive we. And by using the jussive imperative, and inclusive command, Kennedy also avoids having to command the American people, other nations, and the USSR to implement his vision.

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orator</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td><em>It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth</em> (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill</td>
<td><em>We have to reconstitute and build up the British Expeditionary Force once again . . . All this is in train; but in the interval we must put our defenses in this Island into such a high state of organization that the fewest possible numbers will be required to give effective security and that the largest possible potential of offensive effort may be realized</em> (114-115); and the list of offensive actions to be taken (116-125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td><em>We pledge sequences (8-17; 21-22) and let us sequence (26-32)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td><em>We must not be guilty of wrongful deeds. Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred. We must forever conduct our struggle. . . . We must not allow . . . we must rise . . . (29-34); and continue to work . . . Go back to Mississippi, go back to Alabama, go back to Georgia, go back to Louisiana, go back to the slums and ghettos of our northern cities</em> (46-47)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, King is the only orator to express how his listener-followers can implement his vision by using the explicit imperative, *go back to Mississippi, go back to Georgia.* Similarly, his preference for the addressing imperatives directly to the audience of listener-followers also makes King’s speech stand out from the other three texts. The other three orators utilize only first-person plural pronouns in conveying how their listener-followers can implement the vision, using only *us* (Lincoln and Kennedy) and the inclusive *we* (Churchill) in the texts. It is unknown why these three orators preferred to include themselves in the implementation of their visions and an interesting potential future study. Regarding processes, unlike in the previous stages in which there is no consistency between the orators, in Stage 5, Implementation, there is uniformity in three of the four speeches. Only Churchill stands out as an anomaly in this stage, using only material processes—*build up and reconstitute* (114), *put our defences into . . . a high state of organization* (115)—to convey how his listener-followers can implement the vision. The other three orators rely only on mental processes. Lincoln, for instance, calls on his listener-followers to *take increased devotion* (10) to his cause, preservation of the Union. Kennedy also uses only mental processes to suggest how his listener-followers can implement the vision, calling on both sides to *negotiate* (27), *explore* (29), *formulate* (30), *seek to invoke* (31), *unite to heed* (32). And, finally, King also uses only mental processes when he states that his listener-followers: *gain[ing] our rightful place* (29), *not seek to satisfy* (30), *rise to the majestic heights* (33), *not . . . distrust* (34), and *come to realize* (34). Even the usually material process of *drinking* (in *drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred*, 30) is a mental process here because King uses it symbolically
(that is, he and his listener-followers know that there is such a thing as "a cup of bitterness and hatred").

That Churchill uses material process and the other orators do not can be explained by the situation in which each orator finds himself. Churchill has a plan for an offensive war and that plan calls for *measures of increased stringency* (120): Two days after delivering his speech, Churchill will announce a ban on the production of hundreds of household goods in Britain ("War in Britain," 2006) which will cause his people yet more discomfort. Churchill therefore calls on his listener-followers to take action: to give up comforts, to build up, to get ready for an invasion. The use of material processes here is therefore appropriate to how the listener-followers can implement Churchill’s vision.

In the case of the other three orators, however, there is limited action that the listener-followers can take to implement the visions. Lincoln calls on his audience(s) to support his vision by continuing *to be devoted* (10) to preserving the Union; he cannot call on the dignitaries assembled at Gettysburg nor the extended audiences reading the newspaper the following day to give *the last full measure of devotion* (10) and so must rely on mental processes. Kennedy must also rely on mental processes: He is not in a position to mandate the USSR or other nations to act on his vision by specifying exactly how they should *begin anew* (26), and *negotiate* (27), and so must rely on his persuasion and mental processes to compel them to do so. Similarly, in a democracy, Kennedy cannot tell his American listener-followers specifically what actions to take; he must also persuade them via mental processes to implement the vision. Finally, King, who is in the same position as Kennedy and unable to compel his audience(s) to take specific actions, must also rely on mental processes—such as *come to realize* (34)—to get their support.
There is one linguistic strategy which all orators employ in this stage of their speeches: The appraisal resources of amplification (both augmentation and enrichment) are evident in all the texts. Examples of amplification: augmentation include Lincoln’s increased devotion (10), Churchill’s high state of organization (115) and largest possible potential (115), Kennedy’s two instances of never (27, 28) and his statement that we should heed in all corners of the earth (32), and King’s again and again (33). Examples of amplification: enrichment include Lincoln’s devotion (10) and perish (10), Kennedy’s belaboring (29), and King’s thirst for freedom (30), degenerate (32), and engulfed (34).

It is safe to assume that each orator will have wanted to make the implementation of his vision as compelling and motivating as possible; the use of these appraisal resources to do so is warranted and makes excellent sense. Through amplification: augmentation each orator is able to adjust the degree of their evaluation to denote how strong his feelings are; the use of the resources of amplification: enrichment enables each orator to add an attitudinal coloring to a meaning when a core, neutral word could have been used thereby conveying their attitude or stance that implementing the vision is good without having to say so explicitly (Eggins & Slade, 1997).

Stage 6: Timetable for Changes/Urgency

This is the stage in which Kotter’s (1995, 2005, 2008) recommendation that leaders express the urgency of their vision appears in each of the texts. Kotter (2008) advocated the expression of urgency to drive people out of their comfort zones, and suggested that “the pull of the status quo is so strong as to derail transformation efforts if urgency is not clear” (p. 10). The orators will have understood that action was needed immediately from the listener-followers and will have wanted to express urgency,
explicitly or implicitly, to get that action started. Table 18 depicts how urgency is realized in the texts.

Table 18

**Stage 6: Timetable for Changes/Urgency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orator</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td><em>New birth of freedom</em> (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill</td>
<td><em>The menace of tyranny</em> (133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td><em>Rightly alarmed by the steady spread of the deadly atom, yet both racing to alter that uncertain balance of terror that stays the hand of mankind's final war</em> (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td><em>To remind America of the fierce urgency of now</em> (17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Common features of the timetable for changes/urgency stage

Only King expresses urgency explicitly in his speech when he refers to *the fierce urgency of now* (17). Two other orators express urgency implicitly only: Churchill, *menace*; JFK, *danger*, 22, and *balance of terror*, 25. This is reminiscent of Dunmire’s (2005) study of the language of George W. Bush who used *threat* to justify his war on Iraq; like *threat, menace and balance of terror* also invoke a feeling of immediacy and therefore urgency. Only Lincoln expresses a weak urgency; as noted in chapter 3, I argue that his use of *birth (this nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom*, 10) denotes immediacy if not explicit urgency.

It is interesting that all four orators use nominalizations to express urgency. While this may seem unusual it can be explained by the fact that, unlike processes, nouns can be
modified and qualified to strengthen the thought. The declarative Mood and absence of modality in all of the texts also supports the sense of urgency by not questioning the facts in the statements or allowing any hesitancy to intrude.

**Stage 7: Orator’s Personal Commitment to the Vision/Goal**

In this stage each of the orators lends his personal support to seeing the vision come to fruition as seen in Table 19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orator</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td><em>It is rather for us to be here dedicated</em> (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill</td>
<td><em>I have, myself, full confidence</em> (133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td><em>I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it</em> (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td><em>... I return to the South</em> (60)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Common features of the orator’s personal commitment to the vision/goal stage

Three of the orators (Churchill, Kennedy, and King) show their commitment to the vision by placing themselves in it through the use of the first-person singular pronoun; only Lincoln shows his commitment by including himself in the plural *us*. While both the plural and singular of the first-person pronoun denote commitment, I believe that the first-person singular conveys the orator’s personal commitment to the vision and is therefore stronger. In one example, King’s statement *I return to the south* (60), where he had been incarcerated for his civil rights activities, shows a strong personal commitment:
He is returning to a dangerous (and it would prove deadly as he is killed in Memphis in 1968) situation to continue to fight for the cause. Additionally, only King uses a material process to show his commitment (return, 60); the other orators use mental processes (*be dedicated, have full confidence, and do not shrink*) to express their commitment.

**Stage 8: Call to Action/Rallying Cry**

This final stage in the proposed genre enables each orator to issue a call to action or rallying cry to his listener-followers. It is these portions of the texts that continue to live long after the speeches were delivered, with memorable clauses such as *government of the people, by the people and for the people* (Lincoln), *we shall fight on the beaches... we shall never surrender* (Churchill), *ask not what your country can do for you* (Kennedy), and *let freedom ring* (King). The texts in which the calls to action are realized are shown in Table 20.

Common features of the call to action/rallying cry stage:

This is the stage in which there is the most consistency between the four speeches. There is consistent use of the imperative Mood (with it being implied in Lincoln’s *to be here dedicated*, 10, and Churchill’s *we shall fight*, 139), an expected and appropriate Mood for issuing a rallying call.

There are also, for the first time in the proposed genre, marked religious references in each of the texts. This usage is consistent with Lazar and Lazar (2004) who analyzed political speeches following 9/11 and found that one way to vilify an enemy or to distinguish between good and bad is to use religious references and to rally a people. Being on the side of the good is “construed vis-à-vis an alignment with God and religion.
Table 20

Stage 8: Call to Action/Rallying Cry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orator</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us . . .—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not must not perish from the earth (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill</td>
<td>we shall go on to the end, we shall fight . . . we shall defend our island, we shall never surrender until, in God's good time, the New World, with all its power and might, steps forth to the rescue and the liberation of the old (139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>Let us sequence (26-32); and so, my fellow Americans: ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country. My fellow citizens of the world: ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man. Finally, whether you are citizens of America or citizens of the world, ask of us the same high standards of strength and sacrifice which we ask of you . . . knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Continue to work. . . Go back to Mississippi, go back to Alabama, go back to Georgia, go back to Louisiana, go back to the slums and ghettos of our northern cities, knowing that somehow this situation can and will change (46-47); and the let freedom ring sequence (68-77): speed up that day when all of God's children, Black men and White men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual, “Free at last! free at last! thank God Almighty, we are free at last!”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The appeal to (the Christian) religion in politics is part of an American tradition” (p. 236). Leaders often weave religion into discourse by interdiscursivity (the incorporation of religious discourse such as Lincoln’s this nation under God, 10) and realized intertextuality (the appeal to specific scriptural expressions, such as Kennedy’s let both sides unite to heed . . . the command of Isaiah—to "undo the heavy burdens . . .
and to let the oppressed go free,” 32), both of which allow religious references to be included in what would otherwise be secular text.

Table 21 summarizes these findings. It is followed by Figure 13, which shows the stages and their common linguistic features in visual form. Figure 13 depicts the eight stages of the genre with examples of the linguistic features that are common to each stage.

**Summary**

This study first identified eight features and sub-themes of an effective vision as recommended in the leadership literature. These eight features were designated as benchmark features of an effective vision against which the four speeches in the data set were compared. In that comparison I found that three of the four speeches met those benchmark features. Only the Gettysburg Address failed to meet the benchmark features by not containing several of the sub-themes.

Systemic Functional Linguistics, including Genre Theory, and an extension of SFL, Appraisal Theory, were then applied to discover how the eight features were realized in the speeches. These applications revealed lexical and grammatical choices made by the orators which, when combined with their discursive strategies, enabled them to communicate their visions in compelling and memorable ways.

In particular, the application of Appraisal Theory found that the orators availed themselves of the rich resources of Appraisal to communicate their stances and evaluations to their listener-followers. In particular, the orators’ use of judgment, both positive and negative, and intertextuality realized their communication of shared values. Also, amplification: augmentation, amplification: enrichment, and circumstances of location realized the strong imagery in the speeches and the masterful creation of a sense
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of the speech</th>
<th>Title of the stage</th>
<th>Purpose of the stage</th>
<th>Linguistic features of the stage</th>
<th>Guidance to leaders</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Situational positioning of the past <em>(then)</em></td>
<td>Create solidarity with the audience; reflect on shared principles, values, goals</td>
<td>Intertextual references to shared documents, principles, values; shared past expressed as good <em>(positive judgment and appreciation)</em>; statements of fact <em>(declarative Mood)</em></td>
<td>Remind listeners and followers in positive terms of your shared past including the values and principles that defined it</td>
<td>Lincoln: <em>four-score and seven years ago . . . our fathers created a new nation</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Situational positioning of the present <em>(now)</em></td>
<td>Show how the present differs from the past shared values; mark a needed turning point <em>(and the requirement of a vision to lead us to a better future)</em></td>
<td>Declarative sentences; strong statement of the need for change <em>(amplification)</em></td>
<td>Be clear: today is different from yesterday; tomorrow needs to be different still</td>
<td>Kennedy: <em>the world is very different now</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The purpose of the speech</td>
<td>State the need for an intervention to change from the difficult present to a better future</td>
<td>Continue declarative sentences; first-person singular and first-person plural pronouns—begin to craft personal commitment to the vision and a sense of “us-ness”</td>
<td>State why you are speaking: you have the answer to how the future will be better; state your own personal commitment to that better future and speak in terms of it being achieved by a joint effort <em>(use we, us, our)</em></td>
<td>King: <em>we have come here today to dramatize an appalling condition</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage of the speech</td>
<td>Title of the stage</td>
<td>Purpose of the stage</td>
<td>Linguistic features of the stage</td>
<td>Guidance to leaders</td>
<td>Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Synopsis of your vision or goal—how the future should be</td>
<td>Show listeners and followers that there is a better future; begin to get them engaged; create solidarity with you and with the vision</td>
<td><em>Amplification</em>; <em>engagement</em>: <em>proclaim</em>; <em>shall vs. will</em></td>
<td>Create imagery of a compelling future (<em>amplification</em>); <em>proclaim</em> your vision (allow no other voices to intrude); <em>shall vs. will</em>; avoid modals (<em>might, could</em>) and hedging (<em>sort of</em>)</td>
<td>Churchill: <em>we shall fight . . . we shall never surrender</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Statement(s) on how the vision/goal might be implemented or the change effected</td>
<td>Tell the listeners and followers how they can contribute to making the vision a reality</td>
<td><em>Imperative Mood</em>: optative and jussive; material processes; <em>amplification</em>; repetition.</td>
<td>Optative imperative: (<em>do this</em>) and jussive imperative (<em>let’s do that</em>); consider using “doing” verbs (<em>build, produce</em>) vs. “thinking” verbs (<em>consult, meet, consider</em>); add imagery and adjectives to make compelling case for action; repeat key statements</td>
<td>King: (optative) <em>go back to Mississippi . . .</em> Kennedy: (jussive) <em>let both sides join</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Timetable for needed change and an expression of urgency</td>
<td>Convey urgency to spur listeners and followers to immediate action on the vision</td>
<td><em>Lexical choice</em>: explicate statement or implicit reference; state urgency or allude to it</td>
<td>Get agenda moving by expressing the urgency of the need to act now</td>
<td>King: (explicit) <em>here to remind America of the fierce urgency of now</em> Churchill (implicit): menace of tyranny</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of the speech</th>
<th>Title of the stage</th>
<th>Purpose of the stage</th>
<th>Linguistic features of the stage</th>
<th>Guidance to leaders</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Statement(s) of personal commitment to the vision and needed changes</td>
<td>The leader conveys his or her personal commitment to the vision; continue building sense of “us-ness” and solidarity</td>
<td>First-person pronoun singular or plural or both</td>
<td>State what you will do to see vision implemented</td>
<td>Kennedy: <em>I do not shrink from this responsibility, I welcome it</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8                   | Call to action or the issuing of a rallying cry | The leader spurs the listeners and followers to act on the vision by issuing a compelling rallying call | Imperative Mood; lexical choices | Seek commitment; be direct by using commands; refer back to shared values (or religious reference if appropriate to the audience); these are often the most memorable statements in a visionary speech | King: *let freedom ring*  
Lincoln: *that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish* |
of *us-ness* by each of the orators was realized through naming and pronoun usage. Finally, the use of Mood and the elimination of other alternative opinions via the Appraisal resource of *engagement: proclaim* realized the communication of commitment by each of the orators.

While the discovery of the eight benchmark features of an effective vision and the linguistic resources that enabled their realization were significant findings, it is the discovery of a potential genre for political visionary speech that is the major contribution of this dissertation. The eight stages, each with its own linguistic features, which are

---

**Figure 13. Stages and common linguistic features of the genre of visionary speech.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Situational positioning of the past (<em>then</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intertextual references; shared values expressed with resources of <em>judgment</em> and appreciation <em>positive</em>; declarative Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Situational positioning of the present (<em>now</em>)—show how it differs from the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong statement of the need for a vision (<em>amplification</em>); declarative Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Purpose of the speech—to provide an intervention/vision for a better future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First-person pronouns; <em>us-ness</em>; declarative Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Synopsis of the vision—how the future should be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Engagement: proclaim; amplification; shall vs. will</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Statement on how to implement the vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amplification; imperative Mood; repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Timetable for implementation—express urgency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit statement of urgency; also implicit reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Statement of personal commitment to the vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First-person pronoun, singular and plural; <em>us-ness</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Issue call to action/rallying call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imperative Mood; explicit word choices to enroll others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
common to the four speeches can, subject to further study, be used by other leaders as a model for the communication of their own visionary speeches. This discovery of a potential genre, together with the linguistic patterns found in the four speeches, bridges the gap in the literature by providing evidence-based guidance to leaders on how to communicate vision.

In chapter 9, I discuss how these findings contribute to the literature and to leaders who want to use language effectively to communicate their own visions.
CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This chapter summarizes the purpose of my work, the research questions and methodology that shaped the analyses, the findings that resulted from those analyses and, finally, my recommendations. These recommendations are presented in two themes: recommendations for leaders and recommendations for future study. I begin with a personal note on my triple fascination with language, with communications, and with vision, the three abiding passions that fueled this study.

Personal Commentary

I have worked for many years in the field of communications, mostly as a consultant to the Federal Government of Canada in the area of strategic communications and also as a coach to leaders who want to (or have been told to) improve their interpersonal communications. My lens on the world is that of a communicator: I believe that most if not all misunderstandings in our workplaces, families, and communities have at their root issues of language interpretation or gaps in communication. Knowing that I wanted to focus my doctoral work in the area of the language of leadership, I realized I needed a stronger foundation of knowledge of how language works to combine with my passion for communication in order to make a meaningful contribution in my
dissertation. At the start of my doctoral work I therefore also pursued and obtained an M.A. in Linguistics, specializing in discourse analysis.

In my M.A. program I explored numerous theories and methodologies for analyzing how discourse functions as a semiotic resource, that is, how discourse enables us to communicate meaning. None of those theories appealed to my sense of order like Systemic Functional Linguistics; in it I found a way to understand and explain how our day-to-day lexical and grammatical choices and discursive strategies enable the exchange of understanding (and often misunderstanding) in the communications between people. With SFL I was also able to explore the possibility of a genre in the speeches; I discovered that the four speeches shared common stages and that each stage had its own distinct linguistic features. Appraisal Theory enriched my appreciation for the subtle ability of language to allow us to communicate our evaluation of things and people to one another, an ability that proved to be a key factor in the communication of leadership vision.

Finally, I am a late convert to the power of vision. Part of my doctoral work required the identification of my own vision, a task that was extraordinarily difficult for me to do. I was unable to visualize my life looking into the future and had to resort to pretending that my life was over and I was looking back on it and “seeing” how it had played out. Looking backwards, from the future into the past, was the only way my mind could be tricked into creating a vision of how I would spend the rest of my life. My vision, such as it was, therefore took the form of a eulogy on my life to be delivered by a person unknown after I had passed away. This unorthodox means of arriving at a vision
worked for me but I knew there had to be an easier way and I began to research vision in the literature.

The analyses that comprise this study required a painstaking level of detailed scrutiny; this is common in linguistic analyses and a necessary precursor to ascertaining any patterns or trends within the individual speech and then across the four speeches that comprise my data set. My motivation to do the work resulted from an obsession with communication, a passion for language, and an intrigue with vision. It has continued to engage me over many years of research and analysis, and realizing that this part of the journey has ended is a bittersweet moment.

**Purposes**

There is wide recognition in the literature that having a vision is a key requirement of leadership. The fact that effective leaders then need to communicate their vision is identified only in a small subset of the leadership literature. How to use language to communicate that vision is either rarely mentioned in the literature or, if there, is not based on robust linguistic analysis. This gap leaves leaders in the position of being expected to articulate their visions without scholarly guidance on exactly how to use language to meet that expectation.

This study was guided by the assumption that we know visionary speech when we hear it but that, unless we unpack how language was used to express that vision, we cannot duplicate it in communicating our own visions. I therefore wanted to find and analyze several visionary speeches to see if they shared common discursive strategies that other leaders could imitate to communicate their own visions. For my analyses, I chose four speeches that I felt would be easily recognizable as visionary speech: Abraham
Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address; Winston Churchill’s We Shall Fight on the Beaches; John F. Kennedy’s inaugural speech; and Martin Luther King, Jr.’s I Have a Dream speech.

Research Question

In conducting this study I was guided by three research questions. The first of these related to identifying what features the leadership literature recommended be present in an effective vision and then asking: Do these four speeches contain those recommended features? The second question I asked was: How did the language utilized by the orators enable the expression of those features and thereby convey vision to the listener-followers? With the addition of Genre Theory to the study I asked: Were there similar stages in the four speeches that would suggest there might be a political visionary genre?

Method

This study comprised two distinct analyses. The first of these comprised a synthesis of common features of an effective vision as recommended in the leadership literature. I found eight common features that I designated benchmark features (with subthemes) against which I conducted my first analysis, that is, a comparison of the four speeches against these benchmarks.

Second, an application of the theory of Systemic Functional Linguistics, including Genre Theory and Appraisal Theory, was conducted on those four visionary speeches to discover how language choices and discursive strategies were utilized by the orators to enable the expression of those eight benchmark features in the speeches and to find
similar stages in the texts with a view to determining if a genre for political visionary speeches might exist.

**Results**

Vision appears in abundance and in many forms in the leadership literature. For example, the literature contains references to vision as a leadership competency and makes recommendations on what features should be present in an effective vision. Three speeches met all the benchmark features of an effective vision (although one benchmark, expressing of the urgency of the vision, was weak in two speeches). Only the Gettysburg Address did not contain the eight benchmark features of an effective vision, a puzzling finding given its standing as one of North America’s better known and most recognizable visionary speeches.

The application of the Theory of Systemic Functional Analysis and its extension, Appraisal Theory, revealed a number of interesting findings on how language choices and discursive strategies enabled the expression of those benchmark features. I found that the rich resources of Appraisal were utilized to communicate the leader’s stances towards things and people, thereby enabling him to communicate his vision to his listener-followers. Among the rich resources of Appraisal Theory that stand out as being particularly good contributions to the expression of vision are: the communication of shared values through use of *judgment*, both *positive* and *negative*, and intertextuality; the addition of imagery to the speeches via *amplification: augmentation, amplification: enrichment*, and circumstances of location; the very strong creation of a sense of *us-ness* through naming and pronoun usage; and the communication of commitment through
Mood and the elimination of other alternative opinions via the resource of engagement: proclaim.

The application of Genre Theory to the four speeches proved to be especially rewarding. I found that there were eight distinct stages in the four speeches and that each stage shared similar linguistic characteristics appearing in habitual and recurring schematic structures (Eggin, 2004) that provide evidence of genre. I named these eight stages as follows:

1. Situational positioning of the past (then)
2. Situational positioning of the present (now)
3. The purpose of the speech
4. A synopsis of the orator’s vision or goal—how the future should be
5. Statement(s) on how the vision/goal might be implemented or the change effected
6. The timetable for needed change and an expression of urgency
7. Statement(s) of the orator’s personal commitment to the vision/changes needed
8. Call to action/rallying cry.

I am therefore confident in stating that this study answered the research questions that shaped it.

The first question that shaped this study asked whether there were common features the leadership literature recommended be present in an effective vision and, if these features did exist, whether the four speeches contained those recommended features. I was able to identify eight features of an effective vision as recommended in the leadership literature, several of which had sub-themes. These eight features became the
benchmarks against which I compared the four speeches, finding that three of the speeches met the benchmarks while one, the Gettysburg Address, did not meet some of the sub-themes of the benchmarks.

The second question I asked was: How did the language utilized by the orators enable the expression of those features and thereby convey vision to the listener-followers? Through an application of Systemic Functional Linguistics and its extension, Appraisal Theory, I discovered shared linguistic patterns that enabled the orators to realize their visions through language.

The third question that shaped this research was whether there were similar stages in the four speeches that would suggest there might be a political visionary genre. In applying SFL to the texts through the lens of Genre Theory I was able to discern eight common stages in all four speeches, each with its own linguistic characteristics. These findings led me to the conclusion that, subject to further study of a larger sample, a genre for political visionary speech may have been discovered in this research.

**Recommendations**

Two sets of recommendations have emerged from this study: recommendations for leaders who want to inspire others to embrace their vision and recommendations for future study.

**Recommendations for Leaders**

There are four main sets of recommendations for leaders that result from this study.
1. My first recommendation is that leaders consider adopting the eight features of an effective vision as necessary elements of their own visionary speeches and that they employ those features as the benchmarks against which to measure their own visionary discourses.

2. Second, I suggest ways in which leaders can learn from the four visionary speeches that were studied for this dissertation with a view to adopting their discursive strategies to assist in the communication of visions.

3. Third, I recommend that leaders consider structuring their visions according to the eight stages of the new genre.

4. And, fourth, I offer two recommendations that are linked to but do not directly result from the analyses.

While all four recommendations may be of some use to leaders who want to communicate their own visions, I believe it is in the structuring of their visions according to the model suggested by the proposed genre that is the most significant contribution of this study. Although the proposed genre was derived from political discourse, the model can equally be used by leaders in organizations, government, non-government organizations, the voluntary sector, academia, etc.

I expand on each of the four recommendations in the sections that follow.

**Recommendations to Leaders on the Features of an Effective Vision**

Regarding the first recommendation, that leaders adopt the eight features of an effective vision in their own visionary discourse, my analyses would suggest that there is good reason and precedent for encouraging leaders to do so. In particular I would
recommend the following to leaders who want to emulate four visionary orators in the communication of the own visions:

1. While establishing a Big Hairy Audacious Goal or a challenge in the vision has been identified as a benchmark feature, my research suggests that the challenge may not need to include a new direction. Given my analysis, it would seem to be acceptable and effective to have the goal be a return to previous state or to foundational principles rather than a new goal. In my experience working with large organizations, leaders often communicate their vision is a way that suggests all previous efforts and policies were inherently wrong and that, therefore, a new direction is needed. This discounting of the past can lead to feelings of dismissal and marginalization in those people who contributed their hard work to past efforts, feelings which may cause them to be cynical about the new direction or, at worst, cause them to take action to sabotage it. Instead, referring to the past as the foundation on which to continue to build and grow positions it in a more positive light and acknowledges the past efforts of the listener-followers as important. The vision can then be positioned as a continuation of the efforts of the organization to grow and evolve.

2. From that past may come values—duty, equality, human rights—that are shared between the leader and his or her listener-followers. These values may stem from the principles that caused the founding of the organization, from a profit motive, or from a commitment to innovation, the environment, or giving back to the community. When a leader articulates these shared values, listener-followers are reminded that “we are all on the same team” and “we know what we stand for.” The resulting feeling of inclusion may
be sufficient to convince listener-followers of the merit of the vision such that they will commit to acting on it.

3. While the literature calls for a leader to include motivators in a vision, my research would suggest that articulating the shared values may be sufficient motivation for listener-followers. This is not to say that intrinsic and extrinsic motivators cannot also be included in the vision: Where these are obviously part of the need for the vision (such as *never surrender[ing]*, for fear of suffering *the menace of tyranny*, Churchill, 139 and 133), motivators can certainly add to the strength of the vision.

4. The sense of inclusion brought about by having shared values in the vision can be enhanced through the leader’s construction of a strong sense of *us-ness*. Independent of having a common enemy or the need to compete with some other (*them*), the creation of a strong sense of who *we* are builds on the “what we stand for” sentiment and commitment that is inherent in shared values.

5. Of the four speeches that were analyzed for this study, only one, Lincoln’s, contained limited emotion. The other three speeches resounded with feeling, suggesting to the listener-followers that the orator was passionate about his vision and personally committed to it. This level of emotion in the speeches is perhaps one of the factors of their continuing appeal and I would recommend today’s leaders consider, to the level of their own comfort with emotion, conveying their own feelings about their visions.

6. The importance of personal commitment to the vision cannot be overstated. As will be discussed below in the section on how language enabled the expression of the benchmark features, I found that all four orators used linguistic strategies to show their profound personal commitment to their vision. Given the “change fatigue” that I see in
my clients’ workplaces, a leader who does not show his or her personal commitment to the vision is doomed to have it fail. Workers who have been inundated with change initiatives, transformations, and renewals can be jaded about the “next new thing” which they are expected to support.

7. While I did not find mention to it in the literature, to overcome this “change fatigue” I would recommend that leaders make the vision relevant to their listener-followers. Asking “what’s in it for them?” and then expressing that to the listener-followers may serve to situate the vision as a necessary and rewarding initiative that is worthy of effort despite the scepticism and fatigue that might greet the new vision when it is first communicated (such as in the Kennedy speech in which he appeals to his listener-followers’ pride, claiming only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger, 48).

8. All four speeches contained statements that positioned the vision in the past, present, and future. This spanning of timelines as recommended in the literature therefore seems to be a valid and important feature of an effective vision. Leaders who wish to emulate the four orators studied for this dissertation can easily span timelines in their own speeches; this aspect will be discussed below in the recommendations on genre.

9. Imagery played a large and vital part in the four speeches. Even Lincoln, despite the very short length of his speech, was able to incorporate imagery in his text (the final resting place, 4, and last full measure, 10). I believe that part of the resounding success of these speeches, at the time of their deliveries and years after, is that they are replete with imagery that continues to resonate. How imagery was expressed through language use is discussed below.
10. The literature recommends that leaders give their listener-followers directions on how to implement the vision. While this feature was present in all four speeches, in my view it could have been expressed more forcefully and with more details. Lincoln, for example, speaks only of having to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us and taking increased devotion to [the] cause (10); while Lincoln’s statements may be visionary they do not provide, in my mind, sufficient details to the listener-followers to allow them to be precise in their efforts to implement the vision. Churchill’s speech is stronger in detail, especially when he states where fighting will take place (in the air, on the beaches, etc., 139) as is Kennedy’s (we will pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty, 8). However, only King directs his listener-followers in what they must do next to implement the vision: in stating go back to Mississippi, go back to Alabama, go back to Georgia, go back to Louisiana, go back to the slums and ghettos of our northern cities (47), King gives detailed guidance on how to implement his vision. Other leaders who recognize the cause and effect relationship between concrete objectives and performance may want to imitate King and offer their listener-followers specific directions on how to implement the vision.

11. Finally, the expression of urgency was weak in two of the four speeches, those of Lincoln and Churchill. It is possible that neither orator identified urgency because it was evident: Both leaders were speaking in wartime situations in which the urgency would have been obvious to the listener-followers. For those leaders who are not speaking in times of war, and yet for whom the vision is important and time-sensitive, an expression of urgency is recommended.
Recommendations to Leaders on the Use of Language in Visionary Discourse

There can be no doubt that certain language choices were responsible for these four great speeches being visionary and compelling to the listener-followers: It is, after all, through language that the visions were communicated by the orators. There were sufficient similarities in discursive strategies in the four speeches for me to be confident in making recommendations to leaders who also want to be strategic with their language when communicating their own visions. Therefore, in guiding leaders on how to use language to communicate their visions I would suggest the following:

1. The use of the resources of judgment was striking in the texts. All four orators drew upon these resources to communicate their stance on what was good and what was bad. As suggested in the cross-case analysis, those values which we share (all men are created equal, Lincoln, 1, King, 51; duty, Churchill, 113; united, Kennedy, 11) were stated in positive judgment terms and the values that they share (every kind of brutal and treacherous maneuver, Churchill, 130; injustice and oppression, King, 53; colonial control, Kennedy, 12) were stated in negative judgment terms. Using these subtle judgment resources allows a leader to communicate his or her vision without having to state baldly that we are good and they are bad. Although subtle, these resources will be received and understood by the listener-followers as the leader’s offering of his or her stance on behaviors that are deemed to be positive and those that are deemed to be negative. By positioning the vision as being in keeping with the positive things that we do and the positive people we are, the leader communicates that the vision is in keeping with who we hold ourselves to be. The chance of the leader’s vision being embraced and implemented is thereby enhanced through the positioning of the vision in judgment.
resources. Leaders who want to position their own visions in this manner are encouraged to consider using judgment to do so.

2. As noted above, shared values as agents of solidarity between the leader and his listener-followers were abundant in the texts. These shared values were expressed linguistically through judgment, appreciation, and also through intertextual references to people and documents that would be recognized by the listener-followers. I have already made recommendation above on the use of judgment. Regarding appreciation, by referring to things as either positive or negative, leaders can offer their view of what positive things would serve our future and what negative things would not. Lincoln’s new nation (10), Churchill’s our long history (25), Kennedy’s same solemn oath (2), and King’s this momentous decree (2) all communicate positive appreciation of those things that frame a future as promised in the vision. Regarding intertextuality, other leaders who want to communicate their vision in a way that shows how it respects the values they hold to be of import, would do well to refer to mutually respected persons or texts. References to revered leaders, documents on which the organization was founded, the values that underpin the work, the altruistic motives for which the organization was created—all could be referenced in the vision.

3. The use of amplification: augmentation and amplification: enrichment was a major contributor to the orators’ ability to communicate the rich imagery that made a compelling impression on the listener-followers. Picture words like King’s a great beacon light of hope (2) and the warm threshold which leads into the palace of justice (28) are but two examples of his use of amplification to make his images resonate. Similarly, Lincoln’s statement that the world will little note nor long remember what we
say here (8) and Churchill’s hard and heavy tidings (28) were descriptions that will resound with their audiences. Finally, Kennedy’s statements such as man holds in his mortal hands the power to all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life (4) captured the imagination of his listener-followers and made them open to his vision of negotiating with the Soviets. The resources of amplification are highly recommended to leaders who want their visions to resonate with imagery.

4. Creating the sense of us-ness as mentioned above is a key feature of an effective vision, and all four orators were masterful in realizing this benchmark feature. The bonding and solidarity that results from a sense of us-ness is a necessary and important precursor to the vision being implemented. Pronouns and the Appraisal resources of judgment proved to have enabled the linguistic creation of us-ness in the speeches. While there were a few first-person singular pronouns used in the speeches to communicate personal commitment to the vision, the orators spoke predominately in terms of we and us, creating an us-ness that included both the orator and the listener-followers in the vision. In his speech, Kennedy was particularly astute in this regard, claiming solidarity with other countries and even drawing the United States’ enemy, the Soviet Bloc, into the we in an effort to create a beachhead of cooperation, 33. Judgment also played a large role in creating us-ness: using judgment: positive in regard to the things we do, enables a leader to distinguish our actions from those of the other. Using judgment: negative to refer to their actions further distinguishes them from us. I would recommend the use of both pronouns and judgment be utilized by leaders who wish to create a similar sense of awe with their listener-followers.
5. Similarly, the use of circumstances of location, as so elegantly portrayed in Churchill’s *we shall fight in the air, on the beaches*, etc. (139), expands the resources available to leaders who want to create images in their visions. By indicating where the vision will take place or indeed where it will have an impact, the leader delineates examples of how the vision will improve the life of the listener-followers.

6. As noted above, three of the four speeches resonated with emotions that had a positive influence on the listener-followers. The use of emotion (Aristotle’s *pathos*) can be an effective means of persuading others to one’s way of thinking. Yet, in my experience, not all leaders are comfortable expressing emotion and in many organizational cultures there remains a residual sense that it is unseemly for a man to express emotion, especially on the job. If, however, a leader is comfortable with emotion and feels a genuine passion for his or her cause, I would advocate the use of the Appraisal resources of *affect* to express that emotion.

7. Leaders would also be wise to use *engagement: proclaim* in communicating their visions. This resource eliminates the expression of other voices in a text and, by extension, ensures that no alternatives to the vision are presented. Avoiding such terms as *it seems* or *it appears* and using only *proclamation* resources will enable a leader to communicate with authority, that is, without *mitigating* his or her statements or *entertaining* any options to the vision.

8. The use of *shall* instead of *will* adds to the certainty of those proclamations and is also recommended. All four orators used *shall* to add force to their statements (Fowler, 1984) and to show their personal commitment to their visions, a strategy that proved to be effective and could be easily adopted by leaders of today.
9. Mood choices also played a large role in ensuring the effectiveness of the four speeches. In all four, the declarative and imperative Moods were predominant with only minor usage of rhetorical questions in three of the speeches. The declarative Mood enabled each of the orators to express his vision as a statement of fact, again precluding other voices or alternative visions to intrude. The imperative Mood proved effective in calling listener-followers to action and directing them on how to implement the vision. The jussive imperative (let us as seen most notably in the Kennedy speech) is an alternative to the much more direct optative imperative (do this), one that permits the leader to include him- or herself in the implementation of the vision. By being included in the doing, the leader is able to enhance the sense of solidarity with his or her listener-followers, suggesting that moving forward on the vision will be a joint effort. In a democracy and in organizational cultures that are not of the command-and-control type, the jussive imperative is a more polite and embracing imperative and is recommended.

**Recommendations to Leaders on Applying the New Genre to Visionary Discourse**

The potential existence of a genre of political visionary speech is an exciting development for leaders in the political sphere and elsewhere. Based on the sample of four speeches there seems to be a structure of political visionary speech that could easily be duplicated by leaders who want to communicate their own visions. The following section outlines a genre-based model that is recommended to leaders who want to craft their own visionary speeches in a manner that has been tested and found effective by at least four visionary leaders.

As noted above, eight stages were found to be present in the four speeches. Each
of these stages is amplified in the sections that follow with specific guidance to leaders who want to structure their own speeches based on the proposed genre model.

Stage 1: Situational positioning of the past
(*then*)

This stage of the model is characterized by the orator reminding the listener-followers in positive terms of their shared past and the values and principles that defined it. This stage is the platform from which the orator will move to Stage 2, indicating that the present is different from the past. This situates the leader to then position the need for a better future, one that will be realized through the implementation of his vision.

Each leader will need to decide for him- or herself what past values and principles would be recognized by the listener-followers as positive and worthy. As noted above, corporate leaders may want to refer to the rationale for founding the company. For example, Tom’s of Maine was founded in 1970 to provide consumers with environmentally friendly personal care products (Chappell, 1999); a reminder by founder Tom Chappell of that founding principle would resonate with his listener-followers. For leaders in academia, a reminder of the institution’s mission statement would resonate, and, in the voluntary sector, the mention of the good work for which the organization was created would prompt listener-followers to remember their shared values.

Having identified the shared values that he or she wants to bring to the listener-followers attention, the leader then needs to provide some intertextual references that the audiences will recognize as positive symbols of those shared values. These references to people or documents will create solidarity between the leader and his or her listener-followers as they remember what they and their organization stand for.
In this stage of the speech, leaders might also consider using the resources of Appraisal to support positioning the past as positive; in this regard, both judgment: positive (to refer to people’s behavior as worthy) and appreciation: positive (to refer to things as valuable and worthy) are recommended. The declarative Mood, through which the leader positions the past in statements of fact, can also reinforce past values as being positive. Additionally, the use of engagement: proclaim, which allows no other voices to enter the discourse, will contribute to the presentation of the past shared values as being worthy of maintenance.

Stage 2: Situational positioning of the present (now)

Having positioned the past shared values as worthy, this is the stage in the proposed model in which the leader identifies that the present is different from the past. This difference can include dramatic change (such as in the case of the Lincoln and Churchill speeches in which wars are being fought over the proposition that all men are created equal (1) and all that we stand for (82) or less dramatic change such as a shift in the market that requires more innovative approaches to marketing. This stage needs to be carefully crafted by leaders because it will mark a turning point from the past to the present, one that will position him or her to define a necessary and different future.

The declarative Mood and engagement: proclaim should be used in this stage to position the difference between the past and the present as a statement of fact with which there can be no confusion or quarrel. Additionally, the appraisal resource of amplification, both augmentation and enrichment, can add to the significance of the difference.
One example from current times may serve to illustrate the power of language in marking this transition. In his first address to a Joint Session of Congress in February 2009, President Obama used the recommended linguistic resources to position the past and distinguish the present from it. Obama (2009) started his speech by positioning shared values of the past as worthy in his reference to “the distinguished men and women in this great chamber” (para. 2). Obama then noted that the situation in the United States at the time of the address was one in which “the state of our economy is a concern that rises above all others” (para. 3). His turning point from the negative present to his better future appears in his statement that “well that day of reckoning has arrived, and the time to take charge of our future is here. Now is the time to act boldly and wisely” (para. 11). Obama used the declarative Mood to state his turning point as fact and, by using engagement: proclaim, allowed no other voices to intrude in his speech. Obama also amplified his statement in such instances as positioning the need to act as being bold and wise (amplification: augmentation) and the day of reckoning (amplification: enrichment).

Stage 3: The purpose of the speech

At this point in the speech, a leader is able to claim a need for an intervention to change from the difficult present to a better future, and can position his or vision as that intervention. It is here, therefore, that the leader should indicate the purpose of his or her speech, why the leader is addressing the audience. The declarative Mood, judgment, and the first-person plural pronoun are important to communicating this stage.

As in the previous stages, the declarative Mood enables the expression of the purpose of the speech as a statement of fact. The resources of judgment will also contribute to the overall meaning in that the purpose can be positioned through judgment:
positive as being in keeping with what we stand for. And, despite Churchill’s purpose having been stated in the negative (we must be very careful . . . wars are not won by evacuations, 60), I would advocate the use of positive judgment only to position the purpose of the speech as being on the side of the good. Finally, this stage provides the point at which the leader can begin to craft his or her us-ness strategy. A key factor in the creation of that strategy, according to the findings of this study, is the use of pronouns, particularly the first-person plural, we. By including him- or herself in the we, the leader is able to demonstrate personal commitment to the purpose and then to the vision of a better future. Abundant use of we, us, and our is therefore recommended for this stage of the proposed genre.

Stage 4: A synopsis of the orator’s vision or goal—how the future should be

This stage of the model marks the point at which the leader lays out his or her vision of a better future. Based on my analyses, this stage does not necessarily have to occur in a linear progression from the first three stages but must occur at some point in the speech: This is the crux of a visionary speech, the communication of the leader’s vision.

The statement of vision in this stage should be enabled by the declarative Mood and engagement: proclaim. It is especially important here that the leader avoid any modality or mitigation that might weaken the perception of his or her conviction that the vision will lead to a better future or his or her personal commitment to that vision. Modality choices such as may, might, could, ought to (or the popular kinda and sorta) would reduce the impact of the vision and should not be used. Similarly, terms such as I
think or we hope should not be used as these too would mitigate the perceived certainty of the leader and weaken the vision.

To make the vision vivid in the minds and hearts of the listener-followers, the leader would be well-advised to use the rich resources of amplification: augmentation and amplification: enrichment at this stage in the speech. For example, Kennedy’s repeated use of amplification: augmentation in we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty (8) enabled him to share his passion about his vision. Other leaders are encouraged to add imagery to their level of comfort to create picture words that will resonate with their own listener-followers.

The leader’s us-ness strategy can continue in this stage through the use of an inclusive we that binds the leader and the listener-follower together in solidarity to the vision. Depending on the circumstances of the vision, the leader may also want to name those who are included in the we and, if it is appropriate, identify those others (them) who are not included. And, finally, again depending on the circumstances and if the leader if comfortable with the suggestion, the use of shall rather than will can act as a strengthening force, an exhortation (Fowler, 1984), to contribute to the power of the vision.

Stage 5: Statement(s) on how the vision/goal might be implemented or change effected

Having described the vision of a better future, this stage of the model is the point at which the leader provides guidance or direction to the listener-followers on how they
can contribute their efforts to implementing the vision. The imperative Mood, modals, and certain process types will contribute to accomplishing this stage.

There are three types of imperative Mood that I would offer for the leader’s consideration in communicating this stage of the model: the optative imperative (a direct command, do this), the jussive imperative (let us do this), and an implied imperative. All three were in evidence in the speeches that were analyzed for this study. The optative was apparent in King’s speech when he directed his listener-followers to go back to Mississippi (47) and in Kennedy’s famous statement ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country (46). Kennedy also used the jussive imperative to advantage in his inaugural when he communicated a long series of actions to be taken to implement the vision in the let us and let sequence (26-33). The implied imperative is a more subtle means of communicating a command and might be preferred by leaders who embrace a more transformational style of leadership. The implied imperative appeared in Lincoln’s speech when he stated, it is rather for us to be here dedicated (9); the message is clear (be dedicated), but the delivery is more restrained.

Modality of obligation can also be used to imply an imperative as was the case when Churchill said we must put our defences in . . . order (115) and we must never forget (132). These modals signal an imperative to the listener-followers (put our defences in order and never forget) without the leader bluntly saying so. As Kennedy learned from Churchill, it is more difficult for a democracy than a totalitarian state to mobilize its citizens for war and that, to overcome this vulnerability, democratic leaders had to inspire their citizens (Clarke, 2004, p. 80); believing this to be true Churchill chose to inspire via the implied imperative rather than dictate through a direct command.
Leaders who similarly embrace a democratic workplace are encouraged to follow Churchill’s lead in this regard and use implied imperatives.

Leaders might also consider how they choose their processes to communicate their vision. Material processes may be used in this stage of the model if concrete doing actions are called for (such as Churchill’s *we shall fight*, 139, *reconstitute and build up*, 114, *we shall never surrender*, 139); alternatively mental processes (Kennedy’s *explore*, 29, *formulate*, 30, and *seek to invoke*, 31) might be more suitable in some circumstances. For Obama, mental processes served in 2009 to communicate how his vision would be implemented:

That is why I have **asked** Vice President Biden to **lead** a tough, unprecedented oversight effort—because nobody messes with Joe. I have **told** each member of my Cabinet as well as mayors and governors across the country that **they will be held accountable** by me and the American people for every dollar they spend. I have appointed a proven and aggressive Inspector General to **ferret out** any and all cases of waste and fraud. And **we have created** a new website called recovery.gov so that every American **can find out** how and where their money is being spent. (Obama, 2009, para. 19)

Stage 6: The timetable for needed change and an expression of urgency

While a sense of urgency was only weakly expressed in two of the four analyzed speeches, it remains a benchmark feature of an effective vision and presented as a marked stage in my analyses.

Leaders who want to express urgency in their own visions can say so directly (as King did in his statement about *the fierce urgency of now*, 17; and Kennedy did when he referred to both sides being *rightly alarmed* about *the balance of terror*, 25) or can allude to it through the use of nominalizations (Lincoln’s *birth*, 10; and Churchill’s *menace*,
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Either explicit or implicit mentions of urgency can drive people out of their comfort zones (Kotter, 2008) and into action.

Stage 7: Statement(s) of the orator’s personal commitment to the vision/changes needed

In this stage of the model the leader states or re-iterates his or her personal commitment to the vision. In this stage it is perfectly in keeping for the leader to refer to him- or herself in the first-person singular, I. Doing so will not jeopardize the us-ness strategy that has been carefully crafted in the speech; on the contrary, it will reinforce that the leader as an individual is fully engaged and committed to the vision. Leaders might consider following Kennedy’s example of stating explicitly that he welcome[s] (43) the challenge, signaling to his listener-followers that he will champion the changes he asks of them.

Stage 8: Call to action/rallying cry

The final stage in the model of the proposed genre is the point at which the leader has an opportunity to issue a call to action, a rallying call to bring the listener-followers fully onboard with the vision. In the speeches that were analyzed for this study, it is in the call to action that the memorable phrases were captured: Lincoln’s that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish (10); Churchill’s provoking statement that we shall fight on the beaches . . . and shall never surrender (139); Kennedy’s ask not command that aroused a whole generation of Americans to volunteer their efforts to change the world (46); and, finally, King’s let freedom ring (67-75) sequence.
Use of the imperative Mood, both explicit and implied, was apparent in this stage in the four analyzed texts; leaders who wish to emulate these great orators in issuing their own calls to action are encouraged also to use the imperative at this point in their own speeches.

All four orators in the data set also made religious references at this point in their discourses; I make recommendations on the use of religion in the following section. As noted above, all four orators in this study made specific references to God and two referred to specific biblical passages. While, these intertextual references may have been fitting at the time when the orators were addressing a largely homogenous Judeo-Christian audience of listener-followers, they may no longer be appropriate in our communications to diverse audiences. My recommendation would be that leaders consider eschewing religious references in their visions unless they are assured that all listener-followers in the audience share the same religious beliefs.

**Additional Recommendations for Leaders**

The following are some additional recommendations from this study:

1. I was intrigued by Churchill’s use of language to speak to people of differing levels of education among his listener-followers. Given his education and worldliness, Churchill could have used a more extended vocabulary to communicate his vision. Instead, he spoke in terms that everyone could understand, avoiding the use of “posh” words that might have marginalized some of his listener-followers, potentially causing them to reject his vision as not being pertinent to them. I have seen other leaders forget this important lesson in communicating their own visions. Examples from my experience include: a leader using sports analogies that marginalized many female listener-followers;
a leader using terminology and metaphors from his experience in the military, marginalizing all non-military listener-followers; and many instances in which leaders used jargon, unintentionally excluding those who did not understand some of the terms being used. In all cases the message of the vision was lost through inappropriate language use. Leaders would be well advised to follow Churchill’s lead and speak in a register that can be understood and embraced by all.

2. Given its important role in how the vision is implemented, there was relatively little in the literature (Baloni, 2003; Blanchard & Stoner, 2004; Cartwright & Baldwin, 2007; Quigley, 1994; Walesh, 2008; Welch & Welch, 2010) to suggest that leaders need to sustain the communication of their vision over time. In my experience, leaders often launch their visions in an initial flurry of communication, then, perhaps succumbing to other pressing priorities, fail to communicate their visions over a period of time. This failure to communicate only causes the leader to lose opportunities to articulate the vision until all listener-followers are bonded to it and committed to implementing it. Crafting key messages from the initial communication and continuing to communicate them is recommended to leaders who want to sustain the life of the vision and continue to encourage solidarity with it.

Recommendations for Future Study

The possibility that a genre for political visionary speech exists is an exciting development. Unfortunately, the sample size, being only four speeches, is too small to allow any generalization beyond noting that a genre might exist, subject to other studies. Further study, including the analyses of more speeches in the field of political visionary discourse, would be necessary before confirming the existence of such a genre.
Finding speeches of similar gravitas to those analyzed in this dissertation for that broader research might, however, be difficult. If I were to add other speeches to my sample in order to carry out further research on the genre, I would have to look further afield, widening the selection parameters that guided this present research beyond the criterion that the speeches be recognizable to a North American audience. Whether these wider parameters would dilute the meaning of the findings is a factor to be considered in any future study of the proposed genre.

Another parameter for this study, that only speeches delivered in English be part of the data set, might also need to be re-examined in order to conduct further studies on the existence of a genre. On reflection, however, investigating whether similar stages exist in other leaders’ political visionary speeches may not require the level of delicacy demanded by SFL and Appraisal Theory; without the requirement to analyze at such a profound level of delicacy it may be possible to analyze texts in languages other than English and still discover findings that would result in a conclusion about the proposed genre. Extreme care would, however, have to be taken to ensure that the stages of the proposed genre in non-English texts contained similar linguistic features and strategies; in this regard, cooperating with another linguist whose mother tongue is the language in which the speech was delivered might prove to be beneficial.

**Conclusions**

While we are not the first generation to think so, we live in challenging times. In the second decade of the 21st-century North American leaders face the new reality of a general public distrust of large business, a growing distrust of government, the near collapse of the financial system and the automobile industry, very low rates of return on
financial investments, and the emotional and spiritual fall-out from 9/11. It has been suggested that we live in a society of fear, fear of change, fear of terrorism, fear of the future, fear of epidemics, and fear of corporate failure.

In times of turbulence like these, as in the challenging times in which the four orators delivered their visionary speeches, all leaders need to be able to persuade and rally their followers. It is my hope that the results of my study will assist in some small way some leaders to communicate their own visions to inspire others to lead our society back into stability and security.
APPENDIX A

ANALYSIS OF THE LINCOLN TEXT
Analysis of the Lincoln Text

The Gettysburg Address  
Abraham Lincoln  
November 19, 1863

1. Four score and seven years ago our fathers (appreciation: valuation, positive) brought forth on this continent a new nation (appreciation: valuation, positive), conceived in liberty (appreciation: valuation, positive) and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal (judgment: social esteem, positive; appreciation: valuation, positive).

2. Now we are engaged (engagement: proclamation) in a great (amplification: augmentation; appreciation: reaction, positive) civil war, testing (amplification: enrichment) whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can (modalization: probability) long (amplification: augmentation) endure.

3. We are met (engagement: proclamation) on a great battlefield (amplification: augmentation; appreciation: reaction, positive) of that war.

4. We have come (engagement: proclamation) to dedicate (appreciation: valuation, positive) a portion of that field as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live (judgment: social esteem, positive).

5. It is altogether fitting and proper (judgment: social sanction, positive) that we should do this (engagement: proclamation; modulation: obligation).

6. But in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate (engagement: proclamation; judgment: social esteem, positive), we cannot consecrate (judgment: social esteem, positive; engagement: proclamation), we cannot hallow (judgment: social esteem, positive; engagement: proclamation) this ground.

7. The brave (judgment: social esteem, positive) men, living and dead (amplification: augmentation; judgment: social esteem, positive), who struggled (amplification: enrichment) here have consecrated (amplification: enrichment; judgment: social esteem, positive) it far above (amplification: augmentation) our poor (amplification: mitigation) power to add or detract.

8. The world will little note nor long remember (amplification: augmentation) what we say here, but it can never (amplification: augmentation) forget what they did here (judgment: social esteem, positive).

9. It is for us the living rather to be dedicated here (engagement: proclaim) to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so (amplification: augmentation) nobly (appreciation: reaction, positive; judgment: social esteem, positive) advanced.
10. It is rather (engagement: proclaim) for us to be here dedicated (modulation: obligation) to the great (amplification: augmentation) task remaining before us (appreciation: reaction, positive)—that from these honored dead (judgment: social esteem, positive) we take increased (amplification: augmentation) devotion (judgment: social esteem, positive) to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion (amplification: augmentation; judgment: social esteem, positive)—that from these honored dead (judgment: social esteem, positive) we take increased (amplification: augmentation) devotion (judgment: social esteem, positive) to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion (amplification: augmentation; judgment: social esteem, positive)—that we here highly (amplification: augmentation) resolve (modulation: obligation) that these dead shall (amplification: augmentation) not have died in vain, that this nation under God (amplification: enrichment; judgment: social esteem, positive) shall (amplification: augmentation; engagement: proclaim) have a new birth of freedom (appreciation: valuation, positive), and that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not (amplification: augmentation; engagement: proclaim) perish (amplification: enrichment) from the earth.
Table 22

*Analysis of Lincoln’s Speech Against the Benchmark Features of an Effective Vision*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features of a Vision</th>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Realized by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues a challenge:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“big, hairy, audacious goal”; defines success; empowers people and calls forth their best efforts; is ambitious, often calling for sacrifice, change and growth; extrinsic and intrinsic motivators.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Goal:</strong> liberty; proposition that all men are created equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>the endurance of that nation (can long endure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>that that nation might live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>the world . . . can never forget (our goal is also not to forget what the dead sacrificed and to continue their great task)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>be dedicated to the unfinished work . . . they so nobly advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>we take increased devotion to that cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>be dedicated to the great task (freedom, preservation of the Union) this nation . . . shall have a new birth of freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sacrifice:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>they gave their lives that that nation might live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>what they did here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>it is for us the living to be dedicated to the unfinished work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>these honored dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>they shall not have died in vain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change or growth:</strong> Lincoln does not call for change or growth—he calls only for the maintenance of that which exists, that is, the Union and the principles of liberty, freedom and all men are created equal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrinsic motivators</strong> only:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>our fathers—denoting the founding fathers and the revered values that are foundational to the creation of the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>liberty—shared value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>all men are created equal—a reference to the Declaration of Independence with which the audience will have been familiar;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>freedom—shared value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>this nation under God—suggesting that God sanctions the preservation of the Union, a factor that should also motivate the audience to do so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>government of the people, by the people, for the people—a reference to the U.S. system of government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 22—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features of a Vision</th>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Realized by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision as destination:</td>
<td></td>
<td>No new target is presented; instead, Lincoln reminds his audience of the existing target—the foundational principles of the Union such as freedom, liberty, and all men are created equal— that are in jeopardy if the Union is not preserved (that is, if the North does not persevere in its dedication—to the great task, the unfinished work, the new birth of freedom—and if it allows the South to win the Civil War)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Depicts shared values:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Values:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>liberty; proposition that all men are created equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the endurance of that nation (can long endure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>that that nation might live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>be dedicated to the unfinished work we take increased devotion to that cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>be dedicated to the great task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>this nation . . . shall have a new birth of freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moral overtones:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Four score and seven years ago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gave their lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nobly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>these honored dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>shall not have died in vain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>this nation under God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emotion:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>we are being tested (testing whether . . . can endure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>we are unworthy of their sacrifice (we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the work of the fallen is noble (they so nobly advanced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>we must have increased devotion to finish their work (the great task remaining before us)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>our work will ensure that they shall not have died in vain (this nation under God)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Features of a Vision | Line(s) | Realized by
--- | --- | ---
**Inclusivity/us-ness:** Lincoln does not use “I” at all in the speech; has frequent use of “we” to refer to himself and the audience and to the larger audience *us the living* (9)
2 | *we are engaged*  
3 | *we are met*  
4 | *we have come*  
5 | *we should do so*  
6 | *we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground*  
7 | *our poor power*  
8 | *what we say here*  
9 | *us the living*  
10 | *us, us, we, we, this nation under God*

**Commitment/enthusiasm:** difficult to assess save from the perspective of history (the fact that the Union was preserved)

**Common enemy:** no common enemy is explicitly stated; Lincoln refers only to *great battlefield* and *war*, both of which imply an enemy that would be easily understood by the audience

**Spans timelines:**
draws from the past, 1  
the present, and the 7, 10  
future; exposes others 10  
to the painful reality 10  
of their present 10  
condition and 2  
demands they fashion 2  
a response; interprets 3  
reality for followers. 3  

**Past:**
*Four score and seven years ago*
the brave men . . . who struggled . . . have consecrated 7  
they gave 10  
*they nobly advanced* 10

**Present:**
*Now we are engaged*
we [are] testing 2  
*We are met* 3  
*We have come to dedicate* 3  
*we should do* 10  
*we highly resolve* 10

**Future:**
*The world will little note or long remember . . . it can never forget* 8  
to be dedicated (infinitive denoting future: we will be dedicated) 10  
*ellipsis: we [will] take increased devotion* 10  
*these dead shall not have died in vain* 10  
*government . . . shall not perish* 10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features of a Vision</th>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Realized by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contains imagery:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Imagery:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive, not negative; crystal clear; vivid; highly-desirable future state; tangible; makes abstractions concrete; avoids tentativeness and qualifiers</td>
<td>4, 10, 10</td>
<td>final resting place, the great task, last full measure of devotion, and new birth of freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hedging:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggests means to implement: Contains strategies/plan for achieving the vision, audacious but achievable, has a destination</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lincoln makes no specific references to how the audience can participate in the unfinished work (9) or the great task (10), save that the audience should (10) take increased devotion in it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expresses urgency</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Birth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appraisal Analysis of *the Gettysburg Address*

**Attitude**: concerned with our feelings, including emotional reactions, judgments of behavior and evaluation of things: sub-divided into (a) affect; (b) judgment; and (c) appreciation

**Affect**: enables us to express emotional states

None

**Judgment**: enables us to relate our attitudes toward people and the way in which they behave—their character and how they measure up in reference to a set of institutionalized norms or expectations. Judgment: construing moral evaluations of behavior, how people should and should not behave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Example of Judgment</th>
<th>Type of Judgment</th>
<th>Positive/Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Our fathers</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>A new nation</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Proposition that all men are created equal</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>we</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>we</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>we</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Final resting place</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>those who gave their lives</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>It is . . . fitting and proper</em></td>
<td>Social sanction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>To be dedicated here</em></td>
<td>Social sanction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>Thus far so nobly advanced</em></td>
<td>Social sanction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>Devotion</em></td>
<td>Social sanction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>Under God</em></td>
<td>Social sanction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appreciation**: reaction to and evaluation of reality; enables evaluation of things

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Example of Appreciation</th>
<th>Type of Appreciation</th>
<th>Positive/Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>our fathers</em></td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>a new nation</em></td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>liberty</em></td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>proposition that all men are created equal</em></td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>a great battlefield</em></td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>to dedicate</em></td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>so nobly advanced</em></td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>to the great task</em></td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>a new birth of freedom</em></td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Engagement**: enabling external voices to be present in the discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Example of Engagement</th>
<th>Type of Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>we are engaged</em></td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>we are met</em></td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>we have come to dedicate</em></td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>we should do this</em></td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>we cannot dedicate</em></td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>we cannot consecrate</em></td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>we cannot hallow</em></td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>it is for us the living rather to be dedicated here</em></td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>it is rather for us to be here dedicated</em></td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>this nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom</em></td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not (perish)</em></td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Amplification:** general resources for grading; allows writers/speakers to adjust the degree of their evaluation, either up or down, to denote how strong or weak their feeling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Example of Amplification</th>
<th>Type of Amplification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>in a great civil war</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>testing</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>long endure</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>a great battlefield</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>men, living and dead</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>struggled</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>have consecrated</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>far above</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>our poor power</em></td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>will little note nor long remember</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>never forget</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>so nobly</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>the great task</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>we take increased devotion</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>the last full measure of devotion</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>we here highly resolve</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>that these dead shall not have died in vain</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>this nation under God</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>shall have</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
<pre><code>  | *perish*                                         | Enrichment            |
</code></pre>
**Modality**: the intermediate zone between positive and negative polarities, between yes and no

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Modal</th>
<th>Type of Modality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>We <strong>should</strong> do this</td>
<td>Modulation: obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>It is rather for us to be here dedicated</em></td>
<td>Modulation: obligation (implied)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>We here highly resolve</em></td>
<td>Modulation: obligation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Gettysburg Address by Abraham Lincoln

November 19, 1863

1. Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

2. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure.

3. We are met on a great battlefield of that war.

4. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live.

5. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

6. But in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground.

7. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract.

8. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here.

9. It is for us the living rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced.

10. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us – that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion – that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth.
APPENDIX B

ANALYSIS OF THE CHURCHILL TEXT
Analysis of the Churchill Text

We Shall Fight on the Beaches
June 4, 1940, House of Commons

Narrative of Dunkirk. The narrative phases of the text will not be analyzed but should note paternalistic tone; Churchill speaking to the nation by radio is reminiscent of a father telling bedtime stories. Examples include: but another blow . . . was to fall upon us (31), yet at the last moment (34), meanwhile (47), suddenly (55)

(1-24: narrative)
25. When, a week ago today, I asked the House to fix this afternoon as the occasion for a statement, I feared (affect: negative, insecurity) it would (modulation: obligation) be my hard lot (affect: negative, dissatisfaction) to announce the greatest (amplification: augmentation) military disaster (amplification: enrichment) in our long history (amplification: augmentation; social esteem, positive; appreciation: valuation, positive).

26. I thought—and some good judges agreed with me (engagement: proclaim, endorse)—that perhaps 20,000 or 30,000 men might (modalization: probability) be re-embarked.

27. But it certainly (amplification: augmentation) seemed that the whole of (amplification: augmentation) the French First Army and the whole of (amplification: augmentation) the British Expeditionary Force north of the Amiens-Abbeville gap would (modalization: probability) be broken up (amplification: enrichment) in the open field or else would (modalization: probability) have to capitulate (judgment: social esteem, negative; affect: negative, unhappiness; amplification: enrichment) for lack of food and ammunition.

28. These were the hard and heavy tidings (affect: unhappiness; amplification: augmentation) for which I called upon the House and the nation (inclusion) to prepare themselves a week ago.

29. The whole root and core and brain (amplification: enrichment) of the British Army, on which and around which we were to build, and are to build, the great (amplification: augmentation) British Armies in the later years of the war, seemed (engagement: entertainment) about to perish (amplification: enrichment) upon the field or to be led into (affect: negative, unhappiness; judgment: social esteem, negative) an ignominious and starving captivity (judgment: social esteem, negative; amplification: augmentation).

30. That was the prospect a week ago.

(31-59: narrative)
60. We (inclusion) **must** (modulation: obligation; engagement: proclaim) be **very** (amplification: augmentation) careful not to assign to this deliverance the attributes of a victory.

61. Wars are not won by evacuations. (judgment: social esteem, negative; engagement: proclaim)

62. But (engagement: disclaim, counter) there was a victory inside this deliverance, which (ellipsis: we, inclusion) **should** (modulation: obligation) **be noted** (engagement: proclaim).

(63-77: narrative)

78. I will pay my tribute to these **young** (judgment: social esteem, positive: amplification, enrichment) airmen.

79. The **great** (amplification: augmentation; appreciation: reaction, positive) French Army was very largely (hedge), for the time being (hedge), cast back and disturbed (judgment: social esteem, negative) by the onrush of a few thousands of armored vehicles (gradation, augmentation).

80. **May** (modalization: usuality) it not also be that the cause of civilization itself will be defended by the **skill and devotion** (judgment: social esteem, positive) of a few thousand airmen (amplification: mitigation)?

81. There **never** (modalization: usuality) has been, I suppose (hedge), in all (gradation, augmentation) the world, in all (amplification: augmentation) the history of war, such an opportunity (judgment: social esteem, positive) for youth.

82. The Knights of the Round Table (inclusion), the Crusaders (inclusion), all fall back into the past—not only distant but prosaic; these young (judgment: social esteem, positive) men, **going forth** (amplification: enrichment) **every morn** (amplification: augmentation; judgment: social sanction, positive) to guard (judgment, social esteem, positive) their **native land** (appreciation: valuation, positive) and all that we stand for (judgment: social esteem, positive), holding in their hands these instruments of colossal and shattering power (amplification: augmentation), of whom it may be said that **every morn** (amplification: augmentation; judgment: social sanction, positive) brought forth a **noble** (appreciation: reaction, positive) chance and every chance brought forth a noble (appreciation: reaction, positive) knight, **deserve our gratitude** (judgment: social esteem, positive), as do all the **brave** (judgment: social sanction, positive) men (inclusion) who, **in so many ways and on so many occasions** (amplification: augmentation), are ready, and continue ready
(amplification: augmentation) to give life and all for their native land
(judgment: social sanction, positive).

(83-84: narrative)

85. I take occasion to express the sympathy of the House (affect: negative, unhappiness; engagement: proclaim) to all (inclusion; amplification: augmentation) who have suffered bereavement or who are still anxious (affect: negative, unhappiness; affect: negative, insecurity).

86. The President of the Board of Trade [Sir Andrew Duncan] is not here today.

87. His son (inclusion) has been killed, and many in the House have felt the pangs of affliction (affect: negative, unhappiness) in the sharpest (amplification: augmentation) form.

(88-110 narrative)

111. But this will not continue (engagement: proclaim).

112. We (inclusion?) shall (amplification: augmentation) not be content (engagement: proclaim; affect: negative, unhappiness) with a defensive (appreciation: reaction, negative) war.

113. We have our duty (judgment: social sanction, positive) to our Ally (engagement: proclaim).

114. We have to (modulation: obligation; engagement: proclaim) reconstitute and build up (amplification: augmentation) the British Expeditionary Force once again, under its gallant (appreciation: reaction; judgment: social esteem, capacity) Commander-in-Chief, Lord Gort (vocative implies judgment: social esteem, capacity, positive).

115. All this is in train; but in the interval we (inclusion?) must (modulation: obligation) put our defenses in this Island into such a high state of organization (amplification: augmentation) that the fewest possible numbers (amplification: mitigation) will be required to give effective (appreciation: valuation, positive) security and that the largest possible potential (amplification: augmentation) of offensive effort may (modalization: probability) be realized.

116. On this we are now engaged (engagement: proclaim).
It will (engagement: proclaim) be very (amplification: augmentation) convenient, if it be the desire of the House (engagement: entertainment), to enter upon this subject in a secret Session.

Not (comparator) that the government would (modulation: obligation) necessarily (amplification: mitigation) be able to reveal in very great detail (amplification: augmentation) military secrets, but we like to have our discussions free (appreciation: valuation, positive), without the restraint imposed by the fact that they will be read the next day by the enemy (judgment: social sanction, negative); and the Government would benefit by views freely expressed in all parts of the House (amplification: augmentation) by Members with their knowledge of so many (amplification: augmentation) different parts of the country.

I understand (engagement: entertain) that some request (amplification: mitigation) is to be made upon this subject, which will be readily acceded to by His Majesty's Government (engagement: proclaim).

We (inclusion?) have found it necessary (modulation: obligation; engagement: proclaim) to take measures of increasing stringency (amplification: augmentation), not only against enemy aliens and suspicious (judgment: social esteem, negative) characters of other nationalities, but also against British subjects who may become a danger or a nuisance (exclusion; judgment: social esteem, negative) should the war be transported (amplification: enrichment) to the United Kingdom.

I know (engagement: proclaim) there are a great many people (amplification: augmentation) affected by the orders which we have made who are the passionate (amplification: augmentation) enemies of Nazi Germany (judgment: social sanction, positive).

I am very sorry (affect: negative, unhappiness) for them, but we cannot (engagement: proclaim), at the present time and under the present stress (amplification: mitigation), draw all (amplification: augmentation) the distinctions which we should (modulation: obligation) like to do (affect: negative, unhappiness).

If parachute landings were attempted and fierce (amplification: augmentation) fighting attendant upon them followed, these unfortunate (affect: negative, dissatisfaction) people would be far (amplification: augmentation) better out of the way, for their own sakes as well as for ours.

There is, however, another class, for which I feel not the slightest sympathy (affect: negative, dissatisfaction; judgment: social esteem, negative).
125. Parliament has given us the powers to put down (amplification: enrichment; judgment: social esteem, negative) Fifth Column activities with a strong hand (amplification: augmentation), and we shall (amplification: augmentation) use those powers subject to the supervision and correction of the House (amplification: mitigation; engagement: entertainment), without the slightest hesitation (amplification: augmentation) until we are satisfied, and more than satisfied (amplification: augmentation; affect: positive, satisfaction), that this malignancy (affect: negative, dissatisfaction; amplification: enrichment) in our midst has been effectively stamped out (amplification: enrichment).

126. Turning once again, and this time more generally (amplification: mitigation), to the question of invasion, I would observe that there has never been (engagement: proclaim) a period in all these long centuries of which we boast (judgment: social esteem, positive) when an absolute guarantee against invasion, still less against serious raids (amplification: augmentation), could have been given to our people.

127. In the days of Napoleon (exclusion) the same wind which would have carried his transports across the Channel might have driven away the blockading fleet.

128. There was always the chance (engagement: entertain), and it is that chance which has excited and befooled (amplification: enrichment) the imaginations of many (amplification: augmentation) Continental tyrants (judgment: social esteem, negative; exclusion).

129. Many are the tales that are told (engagement: proclaim).

130. We (inclusion?) are assured (engagement: attribution) that novel (appreciation: negative here although usually positive) methods will be adopted, and when we see the originality (appreciation: negative here although usually positive) of malice (appreciation: reaction, negative), the ingenuity (appreciation: negative here although usually positive) of aggression (appreciation: reaction, negative), which our enemy (exclusion) displays, we may certainly prepare ourselves for every kind of novel stratagem and every kind of brutal and treacherous maneuver (affect: negative, unhappiness; judgment: social sanction, negative).

131. I think that no idea is so (amplification: augmentation) outlandish (appreciation: reaction, negative) that it should not be considered and viewed with a searching, but at the same time, I hope, with a steady (appreciation: reaction, positive) eye.

132. We must (modulation: obligation; engagement: proclaim) never (amplification: augmentation) forget the solid (appreciation: reaction, positive) assurances (affect: positive, security) of sea power and those which belong to air power if it can be locally exercised (amplification: mitigation).
I have, myself (engagement: proclamation; inclusion), full confidence (engagement: proclaim) that if all do their duty, if nothing is neglected, and if the best arrangements are made, as they are being made (amplification: mitigation), we shall (amplification: augmentation; engagement: proclaim) prove ourselves once again (judgment: social esteem, positive) able to defend our Island home, to ride out the storm of war, and to outlive the menace (amplification: enrichment; appreciation: valuation, negative) of tyranny, if necessary (amplification: mitigation) for years, if necessary alone (amplification: augmentation).

At any rate, that is what we are going to try to do (amplification: mitigation)

That is the resolve (amplification: enrichment; engagement: proclaim) of His Majesty's Government—every man of them (inclusion; engagement: proclaim; amplification: augmentation).

That is the will (engagement: proclaim) of Parliament and the nation (inclusion; engagement: proclamation; amplification: augmentation).

The British Empire and the French Republic (inclusion), linked together in their cause and in their need, will defend (engagement: proclaim) to the death (amplification: augmentation) their native soil (appreciation: valuation, positive), aiding each other like good comrades (appreciation: reaction, positive) to the utmost of their strength (amplification: augmentation).

Even though large tracts of Europe and many old and famous States have fallen or may fall into the grip (appreciation: reaction, negative; amplification: enrichment) of the Gestapo and all the odious (affect: negative, dissatisfaction) apparatus of Nazi rule (exclusion), we shall (amplification: augmentation; engagement: proclaim) not flag or fail.

We shall (amplification: augmentation; engagement: proclaim) go on to the end, we shall (amplification: augmentation; engagement: proclaim) fight in France, we shall (amplification: augmentation) fight on the seas and oceans, we shall (amplification: augmentation; engagement: proclaim) fight with growing confidence and growing strength in the air, we shall (amplification: augmentation) defend our Island, whatever the cost may be (amplification: augmentation), we shall (amplification: augmentation; engagement: proclaim) fight on the beaches, we shall (amplification: augmentation; engagement: proclaim) fight on the landing grounds, we shall (amplification: augmentation; engagement: proclaim) fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall (amplification: augmentation; engagement: proclaim) never (amplification: augmentation) surrender, and even if (engagement: entertain), which I do not for a moment believe (amplification: mitigation), this Island or a large part of it were subjugated and starving (amplification: enrichment;
judgment: social esteem, negative), then our Empire beyond the seas (inclusion), armed and guarded by the British Fleet, would (modulation: obligation) carry on the struggle (judgment: social esteem, positive), until, in God's good time, the New World, with all its power and might (amplification: augmentation), steps forth to the rescue and the liberation of the old.

The following identifies those parts of the text in which there are changes in tenor relations between Churchill and his listeners:

1-24: story teller—Churchill relates the story of Dunkirk in a tone reminiscent of a father telling a bedtime story: advanced across the Somme (4); the German eruption swept like a sharp scythe (5); thus it was (19); they were pressed on every side (24)

25-30: the tenor positions reverts to Churchill as authority and leader when he relates to his people/followers how he felt when he thought he would have to tell of the hard and heavy tidings for which he had called upon the House and the nation to prepare themselves a week ago (28).

31-59: Churchill resumes his narrative in his paternal story teller voice: But another blow (31); yet at the last moment (34); suddenly (36); the enemy attacked on all sides (41); for four or five days an intense struggle reigned (45); meanwhile (47).

60-62: In this passage, Churchill reverts to his position of leader, taking a moral, paternal tone (we must be very careful not to assign (60).

63-77: storyteller (I will tell you about it, 67).

78-82: Prime Minister (I pay my tribute, 78) and historian (Knights of the Round Table, the Crusaders, 82).

83-84: Story teller (I return to the army, 83).

85-87: Prime Minister/fellow sufferer (I take this occasion to express the sympathy of the House, 85).

88-92: Prime Minister and average fellow sufferer, speaking of the many losses, many in the House have felt the pangs of affliction in the sharpest form (87).

93: Prime Minister; Churchill assumes his leadership voice to communicate actions being taken now Work is proceeding everywhere, night and day, Sundays and week days (100).
94-107: Prime Minister: present activities and storyteller (*the French army has been weakened, 105*)

108-110: historian: Napoleon had thought he could invade Britain before (108)

111-123: Prime Minister: start of Churchill’s vision *we shall not be content with a defensive war* (112).

124: moral paternal tone: There is, however, another class, for which I feel not the slightest sympathy.

126-132: voice of historian: *Napoleon* (127) and *many Continental tyrants* (128).

133-137: Prime Minister/fellow sufferer: Churchill indicates his strong resolve and the will of the British people to continue to fight until they are victorious and, if they fail, then the *New World* and the *Empire beyond the seas* (139) will continue the fight.
Table 23

*Analysis of Churchill’s Speech Against the Benchmark Features of an Effective Vision*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Realized by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues a challenge:</td>
<td>133-137</td>
<td>Goals: we shall prove ourselves once again able to defend our island . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“big, hairy, audacious goal”</td>
<td></td>
<td>ride out the storm of war, and outlive the menace of tyranny . . . if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defines success;</td>
<td></td>
<td>necessary, alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empowers people and calls forth their best efforts;</td>
<td></td>
<td>we shall fight on the beaches . . . we shall never surrender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is ambitious, often calling for sacrifice, change and growth;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extrinsic and intrinsic motivators.</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Sacrifice: will defend to the death, not fail[ing] or flag[ing]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>going on to the end . . . [even if] subjugated and starving . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fighting in the fields, in the streets, on the beaches, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change or growth</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>the brave who, in so many ways and on so many occasions are ready, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>continue ready to give life and all for their native land we shall not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
<td>be content with a defensive war.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>we have to reconstitute and build up the British Expeditionary Force once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>again all this is in train; but in the interval we must put our defences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>in this Island that the largest possible potential of offensive effort may</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>be realized. on this we are now engaged we have found it necessary to take</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>measures of increasing stringency also against British subjects who may</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>become a danger or a nuisance put down Fifth Column activities with a strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>hand we may certainly prepare ourselves for every kind of novel stratagem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>and every kind of brutal and treacherous maneuver if necessary (hedge;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>amplification; mitigation) for years, if necessary (hedge) alone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Realized by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>effective security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>we may certainly prepare ourselves for every kind of novel stratagem and every kind of brutal and treacherous maneuver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>subjugated and starving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>I take occasion to express the sympathy of the House to all who have suffered bereavement or who are still anxious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>British subjects who may become a danger or a nuisance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>we cannot, at the present time and under the present stress, draw all the distinctions which we should like to do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Napoleon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>we must never forget the solid assurances of sea power and those which belong to air power if it can be locally exercised. at any rate, that is what we are going to try to do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>that is the resolve of His Majesty's Government-every man of them . . . That is the will of Parliament and the nation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>defend to the death their native soil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision as destination:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>road map; paints a target; helps navigate through crises.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>native land and all that we stand for ride out the storm of war and to outlive the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>prepar[ing] ourselves for every kind of novel stratagem and every kind of brutal and treacherous manoeuvre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>menace of tyranny</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>prove ourselves once again able to defend our Island home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>all do[ing] their duty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>to the utmost of their strength</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>fighting in France, on the seas and oceans . . . on the beaches, on the landing grounds, in the fields and in the streets, in the hills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>[may also require the efforts] of the Empire beyond the seas, the New World</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features</td>
<td>Line(s)</td>
<td>Realized by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depicts shared values: contains values/high ideals that are worthwhile and important to people; moral overtones.</td>
<td>56, 78, 81, 82, 82, 85, 112, 125, 128, 133, 138, 139</td>
<td><em>Knights of the Round Table, Crusaders</em>&lt;br&gt;skill and devotion&lt;br&gt;opportunity for youth&lt;br&gt;to give life and all for their native land&lt;br&gt;all those who have suffered bereavement (have my sympathy); gratitude&lt;br&gt;we shall not be content&lt;br&gt;malignancy&lt;br&gt;passionate enemies of Nazi Germany&lt;br&gt;Fifth Column . . . [a] malignancy&lt;br&gt;originality of malice, the ingenuity of aggression&lt;br&gt;many Continental tyrants&lt;br&gt;our duty&lt;br&gt;the Gestapo and all the odious apparatus of Nazi rule&lt;br&gt;Moral overtones:&lt;br&gt;60 we must be very careful not to assign . . .&lt;br&gt;139 God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depicts shared hopes and dreams, evokes emotion: move others from self-interest to collective-interest; “us-ness”; “we” vs. “I”; inspires commitment/enthusiasm; identifies a common enemy.</td>
<td>31-59, 28, 29, 79, 82, 82, 82, 87, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139</td>
<td>Emotions:&lt;br&gt;suspense in the narrative&lt;br&gt;hard and heavy tidings&lt;br&gt;ignominious and starving captivity&lt;br&gt;the onrush of a few thousands of armored vehicles&lt;br&gt;Knights of the Round Table&lt;br&gt;these young men going forth every morn to guard their native land&lt;br&gt;to give life and all&lt;br&gt;have felt the pangs of affliction in its sharpest form&lt;br&gt;Inclusivity/us-ness:&lt;br&gt;His Majesty’s government, every man of them&lt;br&gt;Parliament and the nation&lt;br&gt;British and French . . . linked together aiding each other like good comrades&lt;br&gt;Commitment/enthusiasm:&lt;br&gt;defend our Island home . . . ride out the storm of war . . . outlive the menace of tyranny, if necessary for years, if necessary alone&lt;br&gt;this is the resolve . . . this is the will&lt;br&gt;defend to the death&lt;br&gt;go on to the end . . . fight on the beaches . . . we shall never surrender</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Realized by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common enemy:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>dull brute mass of the German Army</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Napoleon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Herr Hitler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>enemy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>enemy aliens, suspicious characters, British subjects who may become a danger, the Fifth column</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>originality of malice, aggression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Gestapo, Nazi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Spans timelines: draws from the past, the present, and the future; exposes others to the painful reality of their present condition and demands they fashion a response; interprets reality for followers. | 1-110 | Dunkirk narrative |
| | | 30 | a week ago |
| | | 82 | Knights of the Round Table and the Crusaders |
| | | 82 | are ready, and continue ready to give life and all for their native land |
| | | 93-103 | expansion of military and other steps, an effort the like of which has never been seen in our records is now being made all this is in train |
| | | 115 | on this we are now engaged |
| | | 116 | Future: |
| | | 103 | in a few months overtake the sudden and serious loss that has come upon us |
| | | 112 | we shall not be content with a defensive war |
| | | 134 | that is what we are going to try to do |
| | | 139 | we shall fight . . . never surrender |
| Contains imagery: Positive, not negative; crystal clear; vivid; highly-desirable future state; tangible; makes abstractions concrete; avoids tentativeness and qualifiers. | 5 | like a sharp scythe |
| | | 7 | severed |
| | | 8 | plodded |
| | | 29 | ignominious and starving captivity |
| | | 42 | narrow exit |
| | | 43 | details of armaments |
| | | 46 | hurled |
| | | 47 | strained every nerve |
| | | 48 | ceaseless trail of bombs |
| | | 54 | struggle was protracted and fierce |
| | | 55 | crash and thunder |
| | | 73 | 12 airplanes have been hunted by 2 |
| | | 76 | Churchill names several types of aircraft |
| | | 82 | these instruments of colossal and shattering power; these young men, going forth every morn |
| | | 138 | odious apparatus |
| | | 139 | on the beaches . . . (series of locations) |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Realized by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hedges:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very largely, for the time being</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I suppose</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the present time and under the present stress</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if all do their duty, if nothing is neglected, and if the best arrangements are made</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if necessary</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggests means to implement:</strong> Contains strategies/plan for achieving the vision, audacious but achievable, has a destination</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>If all do their duty, if nothing is neglected, if best arrangements are made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an effort the like of which has never been seen in our records is now being made</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan to build up the British Expeditionary Force, increasing stringency ... against British subjects ... Fifth Column activities</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not flag or fail</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defend our Island no matter what the cost may be, never surrender</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expresses urgency</strong></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Menace of tyranny</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appraisal Resources in the Text

*Affect*: enables us to express emotional states

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Example of Affect</th>
<th>Type of Affect</th>
<th>Positive/Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td><em>I feared</em></td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td><em>my hard lot</em></td>
<td>Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td><em>be led into</em></td>
<td>Unhappiness</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td><em>express the sympathy of the House</em></td>
<td>Unhappiness</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td><em>have suffered bereavement or who are still anxious</em></td>
<td>Unhappiness</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td><em>shall not be content</em></td>
<td>Unhappiness</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td><em>I am very sorry for them,</em></td>
<td>Unhappiness</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td><em>which we should like to do</em></td>
<td>Unhappiness</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td><em>another class, for which I feel not the slightest sympathy</em></td>
<td>Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td><em>until we are satisfied, and more than satisfied</em></td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td><em>this malignancy</em></td>
<td>Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td><em>every kind of novel stratagem and every kind of brutal and treacherous maneuver</em></td>
<td>Unhappiness</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Judgment:** enables us to relate our attitudes toward people and the way in which they behave—their character and how they measure up in reference to a set of institutionalized norms or expectations. **Judgment:** construing moral evaluations of behavior, how people should and should not behave.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Example of Judgment</th>
<th>Type of Judgment</th>
<th>Positive/Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td><em>in our long history</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td><em>have to capitulate</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td><em>be led into</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td><em>an ignominious and starving captivity</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td><em>Wars are not won by evacuations</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td><em>I will pay my tribute to these young airmen</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td><em>cast back and disturbed</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td><em>such an opportunity for youth</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td><em>these young men, going forth</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td><em>Two instances of every morn</em></td>
<td>Social sanction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td><em>to guard</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td><em>their native land</em></td>
<td>Social sanction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td><em>and all that we stand for</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td><em>Two instances of noble</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td><em>our gratitude</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td><em>the brave men</em></td>
<td>Social sanction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td><em>ready to give life and all for their native land</em></td>
<td>Social sanction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td><em>a defensive war</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td><em>We have our duty</em></td>
<td>Social sanction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td><em>its gallant Commander-in-Chief</em></td>
<td>Social esteem, capacity</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Example of Judgment</td>
<td>Type of Judgment</td>
<td>Positive/Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Lord Gort</td>
<td>Vocative implies social esteem, capacity</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>this Island</td>
<td>Social esteem normality</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>have our discussions free</td>
<td>Social sanction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>they will be read the next day by the enemy</td>
<td>Social sanction</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>enemy aliens and suspicious characters</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>British subjects who may become a danger or a nuisance</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>enemies of Nazi Germany</td>
<td>Social sanction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>I feel not the slightest sympathy</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>put down Fifth Column activities</td>
<td>Social sanction</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>many Continental tyrants</td>
<td>Social esteem; exclusion</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>originality of malice, the ingenuity of aggression</td>
<td>Social sanction, negative; social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>every kind of novel stratagem and every kind of brutal and treacherous maneuver</td>
<td>Social sanction</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>we shall prove ourselves once again</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>their native soil</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>subjugated and starving</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>carry on the struggle</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appreciation:** enable us to construe how we value things

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Example of Appreciation</th>
<th>Type of Appreciation</th>
<th>Positive/Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td><em>our long history</em></td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td><em>The great French Army</em></td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td><em>their native land</em></td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td><em>a noble chance</em></td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td><em>a noble knight</em></td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td><em>a defensive war</em></td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td><em>gallant Commander-in-Chief</em></td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td><em>give effective security</em></td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td><em>have our discussions free</em></td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td><em>novel methods will be adopted</em></td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Negative although usually positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td><em>the originality of malice</em></td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Negative although usually positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td><em>malice</em></td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td><em>the ingenuity of aggression</em></td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Negative although usually positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td><em>aggression</em></td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td><em>no idea is so outlandish that</em></td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td><em>with a steady eye</em></td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td><em>the solid assurances</em></td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td><em>the menace of tyranny</em></td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td><em>their native soil</em></td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td><em>like good comrades</em></td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td><em>fall into the grip of the Gestapo</em></td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Engagement:** enabling external voices to be present in the discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Example of Engagement</th>
<th>Type of Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td><em>Wars are not won by evacuations</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td><em>But there was a victory inside this deliverance</em></td>
<td>Disclaim, counter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td><em>which should be noted</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td><em>I take occasion to express the sympathy of the House</em></td>
<td>Proclaim, endorse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td><em>if it be the desire of the House</em></td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td><em>views freely expressed in all parts of the House</em></td>
<td>Proclaim, concurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td><em>with their knowledge of so many different parts of the country</em></td>
<td>Proclaim, concurrence; inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td><em>will be readily acceded to by His Majesty's Government</em></td>
<td>Proclaim, concurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td><em>subject to the supervision and correction of the House</em></td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td><em>I have, myself full confidence</em></td>
<td>Proclaim, inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td><em>every man of them</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td><em>the will of Parliament and the nation</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Amplification**: general resources for grading; allows writers/speakers to adjust the degree of their evaluation, either up or down, to denote how strong or weak their feeling is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Example of Amplification</th>
<th>Type of Amplification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td><em>the greatest</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td><em>military disaster</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td><em>in our long history</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td><em>But it certainly seemed</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Two instances of the whole of (the French First Army and the British Expeditionary Force north of the Amiens-Abbeville gap)</td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td><em>would be broken up</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td><em>have to capitulate</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td><em>hard and heavy tidings</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td><em>The whole root and core and brain of the British Army</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td><em>the great British Armies</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td><em>seemed about to perish</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td><em>an ignominious and starving captivity</em></td>
<td>Augmentation; Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td><em>must be very</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td><em>The great French Army</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td><em>by the onrush of a few thousands of armored vehicles</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td><em>by the skill and devotion of a few thousand airmen</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td><em>in all the world</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td><em>in all the history of war</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td><em>going forth</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Two instances of <em>every morn</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Example of Amplification</th>
<th>Type of Amplification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td><em>these instruments of colossal and shattering power</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td><em>as do all the brave men</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td><em>in so many ways and on so many occasions</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td><em>are ready, and continue ready</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td><em>to all who have suffered bereavement</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td><em>in the sharpest form</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td><em>reconstitute and build up the British Expeditionary Force</em></td>
<td>Augmentation, Repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td><em>into such a high state of organization</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td><em>that the fewest possible numbers</em></td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td><em>the largest possible potential</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td><em>very convenient</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td><em>know there are a great many people</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td><em>who are the passionate enemies of Nazi Germany</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td><em>we cannot, at the present time and under the present stress</em></td>
<td>Hedge; mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td><em>draw all the distinctions</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td><em>to put down Fifth Column activities</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td><em>with a strong hand</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td><em>and we shall use those powers</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td><em>subject to the supervision and correction of the House</em></td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td><em>without the slightest hesitation</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td><em>until we are satisfied, and more than satisfied</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td><em>that this malignancy in our midst</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td><em>has been effectively stamped out</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Example of Amplification</td>
<td>Type of Amplification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>and this time more generally</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>when an absolute guarantee against invasion, still less against serious raids, could have been given to our people</td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>it is that chance which has excited and befooled</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>that if all do their duty, if nothing is neglected, and if the best arrangements are made, as they are being made</td>
<td>Hedge; Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>outlive the menace of tyranny, if necessary for years, if necessary alone</td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>At any rate, that is what we are going to try to do</td>
<td>Hedge; Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>That is the resolve</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>every man of them</td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>the will of Parliament and the nation</td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>will defend to the death</td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>aiding each other like good comrades to the utmost of their strength</td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Repeated instances of we shall . . .</td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>which I do not for a moment believe</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>subjugated and starving</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>the New World, with all its power and might</td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Modality**: the intermediate zone between positive and negative polarities, between yes and no

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Modal</th>
<th>Type of Modality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td><em>It would be my hard lot</em></td>
<td>Modulation: obligation or this one: probability?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td><em>Men might be re-embarked</em></td>
<td>Modalization: probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td><em>The British Expeditionary force would be broken up</em></td>
<td>Modalization: probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td><em>We must be very careful</em></td>
<td>Modulation: obligation (implied imperative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td><em>There was a victory... which should be noted</em></td>
<td>Modulation: obligation (implied imperative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td><em>May it not</em></td>
<td>Modalization: usuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td><em>There has never...</em></td>
<td>Modalization: usuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td><em>We have to reconstitute</em></td>
<td>Modulation: obligation (implied imperative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td><em>We must</em></td>
<td>Modulation: obligation (implied imperative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td><em>That... offensive effort may</em></td>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td><em>It will be very convenient</em></td>
<td>Would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td><em>And the government would benefit</em></td>
<td>Modulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td><em>We have found it necessary</em></td>
<td>Modulation: obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td><em>Should the war be transported</em></td>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td><em>I would observe</em></td>
<td>Modulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td><em>We must never forget</em></td>
<td>Modulation: obligation; modulation: usuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td><em>If... this Island were... our Empire would</em></td>
<td>Modulation: obligation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We Shall Fight on the Beaches, by Winston Churchill

House of Commons, June 4, 1940

1. From the moment that the French defenses at Sedan and on the Meuse were broken at the end of the second week of May, only a rapid retreat to Amiens and the south could have saved the British and French Armies who had entered Belgium at the appeal of the Belgian King; but this strategic fact was not immediately realized.

2. The French High Command hoped they would be able to close the gap, and the Armies of the north were under their orders.

3. Moreover, a retirement of this kind would have involved almost certainly the destruction of the fine Belgian Army of over 20 divisions and the abandonment of the whole of Belgium.

4. Therefore, when the force and scope of the German penetration were realized and when a new French Generalissimo, General Weygand, assumed command in place of General Gamelin, an effort was made by the French and British Armies in Belgium to keep on holding the right hand of the Belgians and to give their own right hand to a newly created French Army which was to have advanced across the Somme in great strength to grasp it.

5. However, the German eruption swept like a sharp scythe around the right and rear of the Armies of the north.

6. Eight or nine armored divisions, each of about four hundred armored vehicles of different kinds, but carefully assorted to be complementary and divisible into small self-contained units, cut off all communications between us and the main French Armies.

7. It severed our own communications for food and ammunition, which ran first to Amiens and afterwards through Abbeville, and it shore its way up the coast to Boulogne and Calais, and almost to Dunkirk.

8. Behind this armored and mechanized onslaught came a number of German divisions in lorries, and behind them again there plodded comparatively slowly the dull brute mass of the ordinary German Army and German people, always so ready to be led to the trampling down in other lands of liberties and comforts which they have never known in their own.

9. I have said this armored scythe-stroke almost reached Dunkirk-almost but not quite.
10. Boulogne and Calais were the scenes of desperate fighting.

11. The Guards defended Boulogne for a while and were then withdrawn by orders from this country.

12. The Rifle Brigade, the 60th Rifles, and the Queen Victoria's Rifles, with a battalion of British tanks and 1,000 Frenchmen, in all about four thousand strong, defended Calais to the last.

13. The British Brigadier was given an hour to surrender.

14. He spurned the offer, and four days of intense street fighting passed before silence reigned over Calais, which marked the end of a memorable resistance.

15. Only 30 unwounded survivors were brought off by the Navy, and we do not know the fate of their comrades.

16. Their sacrifice, however, was not in vain.

17. At least two armored divisions, which otherwise would have been turned against the British Expeditionary Force, had to be sent to overcome them.

18. They have added another page to the glories of the light divisions, and the time gained enabled the Graveline water lines to be flooded and to be held by the French troops.

19. Thus it was that the port of Dunkirk was kept open.

20. When it was found impossible for the Armies of the north to reopen their communications to Amiens with the main French Armies, only one choice remained.

21. It seemed, indeed, forlorn.

22. The Belgian, British, and French Armies were almost surrounded.

23. Their sole line of retreat was to a single port and to its neighboring beaches.

24. They were pressed on every side by heavy attacks and far outnumbered in the air.

25. When, a week ago today, I asked the House to fix this afternoon as the occasion for a statement, I feared it would be my hard lot to announce the greatest military disaster in our long history.
26. I thought-and some good judges agreed with me—that perhaps 20,000 or 30,000 men might be re-embarked.

27. But it certainly seemed that the whole of the French First Army and the whole of the British Expeditionary Force north of the Amiens-Abbeville gap would be broken up in the open field or else would have to capitulate for lack of food and ammunition.

28. These were the hard and heavy tidings for which I called upon the House and the nation to prepare themselves a week ago.

29. The whole root and core and brain of the British Army, on which and around which we were to build, and are to build, the great British Armies in the later years of the war, seemed about to perish upon the field or to be led into an ignominious and starving captivity.

30. That was the prospect a week ago.

31. But another blow which might well have proved final was yet to fall upon us.

32. The King of the Belgians had called upon us to come to his aid.

33. Had not this Ruler and his Government severed themselves from the Allies, who rescued their country from extinction in the late war, and had they not sought refuge in what was proved to be a fatal neutrality, the French and British Armies might well at the outset have saved not only Belgium but perhaps even Poland.

34. Yet at the last moment, when Belgium was already invaded, King Leopold called upon us to come to his aid, and even at the last moment we came.

35. He and his brave, efficient Army, nearly half a million strong, guarded our left flank and thus kept open our only line of retreat to the sea.

36. Suddenly, without prior consultation, with the least possible notice, without the advice of his Ministers and upon his own personal act, he sent a plenipotentiary to the German Command, surrendered his Army, and exposed our whole flank and means of retreat.

37. I asked the House a week ago to suspend its judgment because the facts were not clear, but I do not feel that any reason now exists why we should not form our own opinions upon this pitiful episode.

38. The surrender of the Belgian Army compelled the British at the shortest notice to cover a flank to the sea more than 30 miles in length.
39. Otherwise all would have been cut off, and all would have shared the fate to which King Leopold had condemned the finest Army his country had ever formed.

40. So in doing this and in exposing this flank, as anyone who followed the operations on the map will see, contact was lost between the British and two out of the three corps forming the First French Army, who were still farther from the coast than we were, and it seemed impossible that any large number of Allied troops could reach the coast.

41. The enemy attacked on all sides with great strength and fierceness, and their main power, the power of their far more numerous Air Force, was thrown into the battle or else concentrated upon Dunkirk and the beaches.

42. Pressing in upon the narrow exit, both from the east and from the west, the enemy began to fire with cannon upon the beaches by which alone the shipping could approach or depart.

43. They sowed magnetic mines in the channels and seas; they sent repeated waves of hostile aircraft, sometimes more than a hundred strong in one formation, to cast their bombs upon the single pier that remained, and upon the sand dunes upon which the troops had their eyes for shelter.

44. Their U-boats, one of which was sunk, and their motor launches took their toll of the vast traffic which now began.

45. For four or five days an intense struggle reigned.

46. All their armored divisions—or what was left of them—together with great masses of infantry and artillery, hurled themselves in vain upon the ever-narrowing, ever-contracting appendix within which the British and French Armies fought.

47. Meanwhile, the Royal Navy, with the willing help of countless merchant seamen, strained every nerve to embark the British and Allied troops; 220 light warships and 650 other vessels were engaged.

48. They had to operate upon the difficult coast, often in adverse weather, under an almost ceaseless hail of bombs and an increasing concentration of artillery fire.

49. Nor were the seas, as I have said, themselves free from mines and torpedoes.

50. It was in conditions such as these that our men carried on, with little or no rest, for days and nights on end, making trip after trip across the dangerous waters, bringing with them always men whom they had rescued.
51. The numbers they have brought back are the measure of their devotion and their courage.

52. The hospital ships, which brought off many thousands of British and French wounded, being so plainly marked were a special target for Nazi bombs; but the men and women on board them never faltered in their duty.

53. Meanwhile, the Royal Air Force, which had already been intervening in the battle, so far as its range would allow, from home bases, now used part of its main metropolitan fighter strength, and struck at the German bombers and at the fighters which in large numbers protected them.

54. This struggle was protracted and fierce.

55. Suddenly the scene has cleared, the crash and thunder has for the moment—but only for the moment—died away.

56. A miracle of deliverance, achieved by valor, by perseverance, by perfect discipline, by faultless service, by resource, by skill, by unconquerable fidelity, is manifest to us all.

57. The enemy was hurled back by the retreating British and French troops.

58. He was so roughly handled that he did not hurry their departure seriously.

59. The Royal Air Force engaged the main strength of the German Air Force, and inflicted upon them losses of at least four to one; and the Navy, using nearly 1,000 ships of all kinds, carried over 335,000 men, French and British, out of the jaws of death and shame, to their native land and to the tasks which lie immediately ahead.

60. We must be very careful not to assign to this deliverance the attributes of a victory.

61. Wars are not won by evacuations.

62. But there was a victory inside this deliverance, which should be noted.

63. It was gained by the Air Force.

64. Many of our soldiers coming back have not seen the Air Force at work; they saw only the bombers which escaped its protective attack.

65. They underrate its achievements.

66. I have heard much talk of this; that is why I go out of my way to say this.
67. I will tell you about it.

68. This was a great trial of strength between the British and German Air Forces.

69. Can you conceive a greater objective for the Germans in the air than to make evacuation from these beaches impossible, and to sink all these ships which were displayed, almost to the extent of thousands?

70. Could there have been an objective of greater military importance and significance for the whole purpose of the war than this?

71. They tried hard, and they were beaten back; they were frustrated in their task.

72. We got the Army away; and they have paid fourfold for any losses which they have inflicted.

73. Very large formations of German aeroplanes—and we know that they are a very brave race—have turned on several occasions from the attack of one-quarter of their number of the Royal Air Force, and have dispersed in different directions.

74. Twelve aeroplanes have been hunted by two.

75. One aeroplane was driven into the water and cast away by the mere charge of a British aeroplane, which had no more ammunition.

76. All of our types—the Hurricane, the Spitfire and the new Defiant—and all our pilots have been vindicated as superior to what they have at present to face.

77. When we consider how much greater would be our advantage in defending the air above this Island against an overseas attack, I must say that I find in these facts a sure basis upon which practical and reassuring thoughts may rest.

78. I will pay my tribute to these young airmen.

79. The great French Army was very largely, for the time being, cast back and disturbed by the onrush of a few thousands of armored vehicles.

80. May it not also be that the cause of civilization itself will be defended by the skill and devotion of a few thousand airmen?

81. There never has been, I suppose, in all the world, in all the history of war, such an opportunity for youth.

82. The Knights of the Round Table, the Crusaders, all fall back into the past—not only distant but prosaic; these young men, going forth every morn to guard their native land and all that we stand for, holding in their hands these instruments of
colossal and shattering power, of whom it may be said that every morn brought forth a noble chance and every chance brought forth a noble knight, deserve our gratitude, as do all the brave men who, in so many ways and on so many occasions, are ready, and continue ready to give life and all for their native land.

83. I return to the Army.

84. In the long series of very fierce battles, now on this front, now on that, fighting on three fronts at once, battles fought by two or three divisions against an equal or somewhat larger number of the enemy, and fought fiercely on some of the old grounds that so many of us knew so well—in these battles our losses in men have exceeded 30,000 killed, wounded, and missing.

85. I take occasion to express the sympathy of the House to all who have suffered bereavement or who are still anxious.

86. The President of the Board of Trade [Sir Andrew Duncan] is not here today.

87. His son has been killed, and many in the House have felt the pangs of affliction in the sharpest form.

88. But I will say this about the missing: We have had a large number of wounded come home safely to this country, but I would say about the missing that there may be very many reported missing who will come back home, some day, in one way or another.

89. In the confusion of this fight it is inevitable that many have been left in positions where honor required no further resistance from them.

90. Against this loss of over 30,000 men, we can set a far heavier loss certainly inflicted upon the enemy.

91. But our losses in material are enormous.

92. We have perhaps lost one-third of the men we lost in the opening days of the battle of 21st March, 1918, but we have lost nearly as many guns—nearly one thousand—and all our transport, all the armored vehicles that were with the Army in the north.

93. This loss will impose a further delay on the expansion of our military strength.

94. That expansion had not been proceeding as far as we had hoped.

95. The best of all we had to give had gone to the British Expeditionary Force, and although they had not the numbers of tanks and some articles of equipment which were desirable, they were a very well and finely equipped Army.
96. They had the first-fruits of all that our industry had to give, and that is gone.

97. And now here is this further delay.

98. How long it will be, how long it will last, depends upon the exertions which we make in this Island.

99. An effort the like of which has never been seen in our records is now being made.

100. Work is proceeding everywhere, night and day, Sundays and week days.

101. Capital and Labor have cast aside their interests, rights, and customs and put them into the common stock.

102. Already the flow of munitions has leaped forward.

103. There is no reason why we should not in a few months overtake the sudden and serious loss that has come upon us, without retarding the development of our general program.

104. Nevertheless, our thankfulness at the escape of our Army and so many men, whose loved ones have passed through an agonizing week, must not blind us to the fact that what has happened in France and Belgium is a colossal military disaster.

105. The French Army has been weakened, the Belgian Army has been lost, a large part of those fortified lines upon which so much faith had been reposed is gone, many valuable mining districts and factories have passed into the enemy’s possession, the whole of the Channel ports are in his hands, with all the tragic consequences that follow from that, and we must expect another blow to be struck almost immediately at us or at France.

106. We are told that Herr Hitler has a plan for invading the British Isles.

107. This has often been thought of before.

108. When Napoleon lay at Boulogne for a year with his flat-bottomed boats and his Grand Army, he was told by someone. “There are bitter weeds in England.”

109. There are certainly a great many more of them since the British Expeditionary Force returned.

110. The whole question of home defense against invasion is, of course, powerfully affected by the fact that we have for the time being in this Island incomparably
more powerful military forces than we have ever had at any moment in this war or the last.

111. But this will not continue.

112. We shall not be content with a defensive war.

113. We have our duty to our Ally.

114. We have to reconstitute and build up the British Expeditionary Force once again, under its gallant Commander-in-Chief, Lord Gort.

115. All this is in train; but in the interval we must put our defenses in this Island into such a high state of organization that the fewest possible numbers will be required to give effective security and that the largest possible potential of offensive effort may be realized.

116. On this we are now engaged.

117. It will be very convenient, if it be the desire of the House, to enter upon this subject in a secret Session.

118. Not that the government would necessarily be able to reveal in very great detail military secrets, but we like to have our discussions free, without the restraint imposed by the fact that they will be read the next day by the enemy; and the Government would benefit by views freely expressed in all parts of the House by Members with their knowledge of so many different parts of the country.

119. I understand that some request is to be made upon this subject, which will be readily acceded to by His Majesty's Government.

120. We have found it necessary to take measures of increasing stringency, not only against enemy aliens and suspicious characters of other nationalities, but also against British subjects who may become a danger or a nuisance should the war be transported to the United Kingdom.

121. I know there are a great many people affected by the orders which we have made who are the passionate enemies of Nazi Germany.

122. I am very sorry for them, but we cannot, at the present time and under the present stress, draw all the distinctions which we should like to do.

123. If parachute landings were attempted and fierce fighting attendant upon them followed, these unfortunate people would be far better out of the way, for their own sakes as well as for ours.
124. There is, however, another class, for which I feel not the slightest sympathy.

125. Parliament has given us the powers to put down Fifth Column activities with a strong hand, and we shall use those powers subject to the supervision and correction of the House, without the slightest hesitation until we are satisfied, and more than satisfied, that this malignancy in our midst has been effectively stamped out.

126. Turning once again, and this time more generally, to the question of invasion, I would observe that there has never been a period in all these long centuries of which we boast when an absolute guarantee against invasion, still less against serious raids, could have been given to our people.

127. In the days of Napoleon the same wind which would have carried his transports across the Channel might have driven away the blockading fleet.

128. There was always the chance, and it is that chance which has excited and befooled the imaginations of many Continental tyrants.

129. Many are the tales that are told.

130. We are assured that novel methods will be adopted, and when we see the originality of malice, the ingenuity of aggression, which our enemy displays, we may certainly prepare ourselves for every kind of novel stratagem and every kind of brutal and treacherous maneuver.

131. I think that no idea is so outlandish that it should not be considered and viewed with a searching, but at the same time, I hope, with a steady eye.

132. We must never forget the solid assurances of sea power and those which belong to air power if it can be locally exercised.

133. I have, myself, full confidence that if all do their duty, if nothing is neglected, and if the best arrangements are made, as they are being made, we shall prove ourselves once again able to defend our Island home, to ride out the storm of war, and to outlive the menace of tyranny, if necessary for years, if necessary alone.

134. At any rate, that is what we are going to try to do.

135. That is the resolve of His Majesty's Government—every man of them.

136. That is the will of Parliament and the nation.
137. The British Empire and the French Republic, linked together in their cause and in their need, will defend to the death their native soil, aiding each other like good comrades to the utmost of their strength.

138. Even though large tracts of Europe and many old and famous States have fallen or may fall into the grip of the Gestapo and all the odious apparatus of Nazi rule, we shall not flag or fail.

139. We shall go on to the end, we shall fight in France, we shall fight on the seas and oceans, we shall fight with growing confidence and growing strength in the air, we shall defend our Island, whatever the cost may be, we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender, and even if, which I do not for a moment believe, this Island or a large part of it were subjugated and starving, then our Empire beyond the seas, armed and guarded by the British Fleet, would carry on the struggle, until, in God's good time, the New World, with all its power and might, steps forth to the rescue and the liberation of the old.
APPENDIX C

ANALYSIS OF THE KENNEDY TEXT
Analysis of the Kennedy Text

John Fitzgerald Kennedy

Inaugural address, Friday, January 20, 1961

1. Vice President Johnson, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chief Justice, President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, President Truman, reverend clergy, fellow citizens (judgment: social esteem, positive), we observe today not a victory of party, but a celebration (affect: positive, happiness) of freedom (affect: positive, security; appreciation: valuation, positive)—symbolizing an end, as well as a beginning (appreciation: valuation, positive)—signifying renewal (appreciation: valuation, positive), as well as change.

2. For I have sworn (amplification: enrichment, engagement: proclaim) before you and Almighty God the same solemn oath (judgment: social esteem, positive; appreciation: valuation, positive) our forebears prescribed (amplification: enrichment) nearly a century and three quarters ago.

3. The world is (engagement: proclaim) very (amplification: augmentation) different now.

4. For man holds in his mortal hands (amplification: enrichment; engagement: proclaim) the power to abolish (amplification: enrichment) all (amplification: augmentation) forms of human poverty and all (amplification: augmentation) forms of human life.

5. And yet the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought (judgment: social esteem, positive; appreciation: valuation, positive) are still at issue (engagement: proclaim) around the globe—the belief that the rights of man (affect: positive, satisfaction; appreciation: valuation, positive) come not from the generosity of the state, but from the hand of God.

6. We dare not forget (amplification: enrichment; engagement: proclaim) today that we are the heirs of that first revolution (affect: positive, security; appreciation: valuation, positive).

7. Let the word go forth (engagement: proclaim) from this time and place, to friend and foe alike (amplification: augmentation), that the torch has been passed (amplification: enrichment) to a new generation of Americans (judgment: social esteem, positive)—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.
8. Let every nation know (engagement: proclaim), whether it wishes us well or ill (amplification: augmentation) that we shall (amplification: augmentation; engagement: proclaim) pay any (amplification: augmentation) price, bear any (amplification: augmentation) burden, meet any (amplification: augmentation) hardship, support any (amplification: augmentation) friend, oppose any (amplification: augmentation) foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty (affect: positive, security; appreciation: valuation, positive).

9. This much we pledge (amplification: enrichment; engagement: proclaim)—and more (amplification: augmentation).

10. To those old allies (judgment: social esteem, positive) whose cultural and spiritual origins we share (judgment: social esteem, positive, we pledge (amplification: enrichment) the loyalty (appreciation: valuation, positive) of faithful friends (judgment: social esteem, positive).

11. United (judgment: social esteem, positive; affect: positive, happiness), there is little we cannot do (engagement: proclaim) in a host (amplification: augmentation) of cooperative ventures (appreciation: valuation, positive); divided (judgment: social esteem, negative) there is little we can do—for we dare not (amplification: enrichment; engagement: proclaim) meet a powerful (amplification: augmentation) challenge at odds and split asunder (judgment: social esteem, negative).

12. To those new States whom we welcome to the ranks of the free (affect: positive, security; appreciation: valuation, positive), we pledge (amplification: enrichment; engagement: proclaim) our word (appreciation: valuation, positive) that one form of colonial control (appreciation: valuation, negative; judgment: social esteem, negative) shall not have passed (amplification: augmentation; engagement: proclaim) away merely (amplification: mitigation) to be replaced by a far more (amplification: augmentation) iron tyranny (appreciation: valuation, negative; affect: negative, security)

13. We shall (amplification: augmentation) not always (amplification: mitigation) expect to find them supporting our view.

14. But we shall (amplification: augmentation; engagement: proclaim) always (amplification: augmentation) hope to find them strongly (amplification: augmentation) supporting their own freedom (affect: positive, security; appreciation: valuation, positive)—and to remember that, in the past, those who foolishly sought power by riding the back of the tiger ended up inside.
15. To those peoples in the huts and villages across the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery (amplification: enrichment; affect: unhappiness), we pledge (amplification: enrichment; engagement: proclaim) our best efforts (appreciation: reaction, positive) to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required—not because the Communists may be doing it (judgment: social esteem, negative), not because we seek their votes (judgment: social esteem, negative), but because it is right (judgment: social sanction, positive).

16. If a free society (affect: positive, security; appreciation: valuation, positive) cannot help the many (amplification: augmentation) who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.

17. To our sister republics south of our border (judgment: social esteem: positive), we offer (engagement: proclaim) a special pledge (appreciation: valuation, positive; amplification: enrichment)—to convert our good words (appreciation: reaction, positive) into good deeds (appreciation: reaction, positive)—in a new alliance for progress (judgment: social esteem, positive)—to assist free men and free governments (affect: positive, security; appreciation: valuation, positive) in casting off (amplification: enrichment) the chains of poverty (amplification: enrichment; appreciation: valuation, positive).

18. But this peaceful revolution of hope (amplification: enrichment; appreciation: valuation, positive) cannot become (engagement: proclaim) the prey of hostile powers (amplification: enrichment; appreciation: valuation, negative; judgment: social esteem, negative).

19. Let all our neighbors know (engagement: proclaim) that we shall join (amplification: augmentation; engagement: proclaim) with them to oppose aggression or subversion (appreciation: valuation, negative) anywhere (amplification: augmentation) in the Americas.

20. And let every other power know (engagement: proclaim) that this Hemisphere (engagement: proclaim) intends to remain the master of its own house.

21. To that world assembly of sovereign states, the United Nations, our last best hope in an age where the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace (judgment: social esteem positive), we renew our pledge (amplification: augmentation; engagement: proclaim) of support—to prevent it from becoming merely a forum for invective (amplification: mitigation; judgment: social esteem, negative)—to strengthen its shield of the new and the weak (judgment: social esteem, positive)—and to enlarge the area in which its writ may run (appreciation: valuation, positive).
22. Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our adversary (appreciation: valuation, negative) they are making themselves our enemy, we are not doing so, we offer not a pledge but a request (engagement: proclaim): that both sides begin anew the quest for peace (appreciation: valuation, positive), before the dark powers of destruction (appreciation: valuation, negative; amplification: enrichment) unleashed by science engulf (amplification: enrichment; affect: negative, insecurity) all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction (amplification: enrichment).

23. We dare not (amplification: enrichment; engagement: proclaim) tempt them with weakness (appreciation: valuation, negative).

24. For only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt (amplification: augmentation) can we be certain beyond doubt (amplification: augmentation) that they will never (amplification: augmentation) be employed.

25. But neither can two great and powerful (amplification: augmentation) groups of nations take comfort (affect: positive, security) from our present course—both sides overburdened by the cost of modern weapons, both rightly (judgment: social esteem, positive) alarmed (affect: insecurity) by the steady spread of the deadly atom (appreciation: valuation, negative; affect: negative, insecurity), yet both racing (amplification: enrichment) to alter that uncertain balance of terror (affect: negative, insecurity) that stays the hand (amplification: enrichment) of mankind's final war.

26. So let us begin anew (engagement: proclaim)—remembering on both sides that civility (judgment: social esteem, positive) is not a sign of weakness (appreciation: valuation, negative), and sincerity (judgment: social esteem, positive) is always (amplification: augmentation) subject to proof.

27. Let us never negotiate (engagement: proclaim) out of fear (affect: insecurity).


29. Let both sides explore (engagement: proclaim) what problems unite us (judgment: social esteem, positive) instead of belaboring (amplification: enrichment) those problems which divide us (judgment: social esteem, negative).

30. Let both sides formulate (engagement: proclaim), for the first time, serious and precise proposals (judgment: social esteem, positive; appreciation: reaction, positive) for the inspection and control of arms—and bring the absolute (amplification: augmentation) power to destroy other nations (judgment: social esteem, negative) under the absolute (amplification: augmentation) control of all nations (judgment: social esteem, positive).
31. Let both sides seek (engagement: proclaim) to invoke the wonders (judgment: social esteem, positive) of science instead of its terrors (affect: insecurity; judgment: social esteem, negative). Together let us explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the ocean depths, and encourage the arts and commerce.

32. Let both sides unite (engagement: proclaim) to heed in all corners of the earth (amplification: augmentation) the command of Isaiah—to “undo the heavy burdens . . . and to let the oppressed go free.”

33. And if a beachhead of cooperation (appreciation: valuation, positive) may (modalization: usuality) push back the jungle of suspicion (appreciation: valuation, negative; amplification: enrichment), let both sides join (engagement: proclaim) in creating a new endeavor (appreciation: valuation, positive), not a new balance of power, but a new world of law (judgment: social esteem, positive; appreciation: valuation, positive), where the strong are just (judgment: social sanction, positive) and the weak secure (affect: security) and the peace preserved.

34. All this will not be finished in the first 100 days.

35. Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this Administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet (amplification: augmentation).

36. But let us begin (engagement: proclaim).

37. In your hands, my fellow citizens (judgment: social esteem, positive), more than in mine, will rest (engagement: proclaim) the final success (appreciation: reaction, positive) or failure (appreciation: reaction, negative) of our course.

38. Since this country was founded, each generation of Americans (judgment: social esteem, positive) has been summoned (amplification: enrichment) to give testimony to its national loyalty (appreciation: valuation, positive).

39. The graves of young Americans (judgment: social esteem, positive) who answered the call to service (judgment: social esteem, positive) surround the globe (amplification: augmentation).

40. Now the trumpet summons us again (engagement: proclaim; amplification: enrichment)—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need; not as a call to battle, though embattled (affect: negative, insecurity) we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle (amplification: enrichment; affect: negative, dissatisfaction), year in and year out (amplification: augmentation), “rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation”—a struggle against the common enemies (engagement: proclaim) of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself (judgment: social esteem, negative; affect: unhappiness).
41. Can we forge (amplification: enrichment) against these enemies a grand and global alliance (appreciation: valuation, positive), North and South, East and West (amplification: augmentation), that can assure a more fruitful life for all mankind (judgment: social esteem, positive; appreciation: valuation, positive)? Will you join in that historic effort (appreciation: valuation, positive)?

42. In the long (amplification: augmentation) history of the world, only a few generations have been granted (amplification: enrichment) the role of defending freedom (affect: positive, security; appreciation: valuation, positive) in its hour of maximum danger (affect: insecurity).

43. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it.

44. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any (amplification: augmentation) other people or any (amplification: augmentation) other generation (engagement: disclaim).

45. The energy (appreciation: valuation, positive), the faith (appreciation: valuation, positive), the devotion (appreciation: valuation, positive) which we bring to this endeavor will light (amplification: enrichment) our country and all (amplification: augmentation) who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world (amplification: enrichment).

46. And so, my fellow Americans (judgment: social esteem, positive): ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

47. My fellow citizens of the world (judgment: social esteem, positive): ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom (affect: positive, security; appreciation: valuation, positive) of man.

48. Finally, whether you are citizens of America or citizens of the world, ask of us the same high standards of strength and sacrifice (judgment: social esteem, positive; appreciation: valuation, positive) which we ask of you.

49. With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth (engagement: proclaim) to lead the land we love (judgment: social esteem, positive; affect: happiness; appreciation: valuation, positive), asking His blessing and His help, but knowing (engagement: proclaim) that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.
### Table 24

*Analysis of Kennedy’s Speech Against the Benchmark Features of an Effective Vision*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features of a Vision</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Realized by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues a challenge:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“big, hairy, audacious goal”; defines success;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>Goals:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empowers people and calls forth their best efforts; is ambitious, often calling for sacrifice, change and growth; extrinsic and intrinsic motivators.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>powerful challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td><strong>Sacrifice:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Convert good words into good deeds; assist free men and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Forge . . . a grand and global alliance; assure a more fruitful life for all mankind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>We shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe . . . to ensure the survival and success of liberty</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>strength and sacrifice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision as destination:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>road map; paints a target; helps navigate through crises.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Celebration of freedom; beginning; renewal; change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Success and survival of liberty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>Loyalty; host of cooperative ventures;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td><em>A new world of law</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depicts shared values:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contains values/high ideals that are worthwhile and important to people; moral overtones.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Freedom; beginning; renewal; change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought; rights of man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>We are the heirs of that first revolution</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Our ancient heritage; human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>liberty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>because it is right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>national loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>freedom of man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared religious values:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Almighty God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>from the hand of God</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>The command of Isaiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>[quotation from Romans 12:12] rejoicing in hope . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>The energy, the faith, the devotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Asking His blessing, His help; God’s work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features of a Vision</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Realized by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depicts shared hopes and dreams, evokes emotion: move others from self-interest to collective-interest; “us-ness”; “we” vs. “I”; inspires commitment/enthusiasm; identifies a common enemy.</td>
<td></td>
<td>We/us-ness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Names members of the audience; includes my fellow citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>friend and foe alike; this nation; we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>every nation; us; we; any friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>those allies; we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>united; we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>new states; we; ranks of the free; we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>peoples in the huts and villages; we; our; we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>a free society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>our sister republics; our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>all our neighbors; we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>master of [our] house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>United Nations; our; we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>both sides [brings the USSR into us-ness and the expands to] all humanity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>we; our arms; we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>two great and powerful groups of nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-33</td>
<td>let us [U.S. and the USSR] begin anew; both sides sequence; all nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>this administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>my fellow citizens; our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>each generation of Americans; national loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>young Americans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>us; we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>we; global alliance; you [become part of we]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>few generations [such as ours]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>I do not shrink [I am also part of we]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>any of us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>we; our country; all who serve it; the world [now included in the we]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Americans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>my fellow citizens of the world [we citizens now expanded to the world]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>together; we; man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>citizens of America; citizens of the world [are all part of we]; us; we; you [are also part of we]; our; our deeds; us; we; His; His; God’s our own [brings God into we]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features of a Vision</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Realized by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common enemy:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 foe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 [Nations that] wish us ill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 colonial control; tyranny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 those who sought power by riding the back of the tiger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 communists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 aggression or subversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 every other power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 our adversary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 [one of the] two great and powerful groups of nations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spans timelines:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draws from the past,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the present and the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future; exposes .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the painful reality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of their present condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and demands they</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fashion a response;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interprets reality for followers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 the same solemn oath . . . forefathers . . . nearly a century and three-quarters ago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 the world is different now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 yet the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12 we pledge [that we will do]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14 we shall/shall not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-22 we pledge; we renew our pledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-33 let; let us; let both sides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contains imagery:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive, not negative;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crystal clear; vivid;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>highly-desirable future state; tangible; makes abstractions concrete;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoids tentativeness and qualifiers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 iron tyranny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 riding the back of tiger . . . end up inside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 those people in the huts and villages; the bonds of mass misery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 the chains of poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 instruments of war; instruments of peace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 dark powers of destruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the oceans’ depths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 beachhead of cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 the graves of young Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 the trumpet summons us again</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 the glow from that fire; light the world</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features of a Vision</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Realized by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suggests means to</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>host of cooperative ventures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implement: Contains</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Prevent the United Nations from becoming merely a forum . . . strengthen its</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies/plan for</td>
<td></td>
<td>shield . . . enlarge the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieving the vision,</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>begin anew the quest for peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audacious but</td>
<td>24, 26</td>
<td>[keep our arms] sufficient beyond doubt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achievable, has a</td>
<td></td>
<td>begin anew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>destination.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>explore what problems unite us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>formulate proposals . . . for the control of arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>[answer] the call to service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>[answer] the call to bear the burden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>forge . . . an alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>defend freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>[bring] energy, faith and devotion . . . [to this endeavor]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>. . . what you can do for your country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>[live up to] high standards of strength and sacrifice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>[do] God’s work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expresses urgency</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>[acknowledges the availability of] dark powers of destruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>[notes the existing ability of either side to destroy the other]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Rightly alarmed; deadly atom; uncertain balance of terror; the hand of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>mankind’s final terrors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>[acknowledges] fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>urges us [to] begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the trumpet summons us . . . [to] a long twilight struggle,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>year in and year out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Analysis of Appraisal Resources

**Affect:** enables us to express emotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Example of affect</th>
<th>Type of Affect</th>
<th>Positive/Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Celebration</td>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>That first revolution</em></td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>The survival and success of liberty</em></td>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>United</em></td>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>The ranks of the free</em></td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>Iron tyranny</em></td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><em>Mass misery</em></td>
<td>Unhappiness</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><em>A free society</em></td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td><em>Take comfort</em></td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td><em>Alarmed</em></td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td><em>The deadly atom</em></td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td><em>Uncertain balance of terror</em></td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td><em>Fear</em></td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td><em>Fear</em></td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td><em>Terrors</em></td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td><em>The weak [are] secure</em></td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td><em>Embattled</em></td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td><em>A long twilight struggle</em></td>
<td>Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td><em>Tyranny, poverty, disease and war itself</em></td>
<td>Unhappiness</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td><em>Freedom</em></td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td><em>Its hour of maximum danger</em></td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td><em>The land we love</em></td>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Judgment:** enables us to relate our attitudes toward people and the way in which they behave – their character and how they measure up in reference to a set of institutionalized norms or expectations. Judgment: construing moral evaluations of behavior, how people should and should not behave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Example of Judgment</th>
<th>Type of Judgment</th>
<th>Positive/Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Fellow citizen</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>The same solemn oath</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>The same revolutionary beliefs</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>A new generation of Americans</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>Old allies</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>Faithful friends</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>whose cultural and spiritual origins we share</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>united</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>Divided</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>At odds and split asunder</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>Colonial control</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><em>Not because the Communists may be doing it</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><em>Not because we seek their votes</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><em>But because it is right</em></td>
<td>Social sanction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><em>Our sister republics south of our border</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><em>A new alliance for progress</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td><em>The prey of hostile powers</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td><em>(the UN) our last best hope</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td><em>Rightly alarmed</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td><em>civility</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td><em>What problems unite us</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td><em>Those problems which divide us</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Example of Judgment</td>
<td>Type of Judgment</td>
<td>Positive/Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Serious and precise proposals</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>The absolute power to destroy all nations</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Absolute control of all nations</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Wonders of science</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Terrors</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>A new world of law</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Just</td>
<td>Social sanction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>The peace preserved</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>My fellow citizens</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Each generation of Americans</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>The graves of young Americans</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Answered the call to service</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Tyranny, poverty, disease and war itself</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>A more fruitful life for all mankind</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>My fellow Americans</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>My fellow citizens of the world</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>The same high standards of strength and sacrifice</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>The land we love</td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appreciation:** enable us to construe how we value things

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Example of Appreciation</th>
<th>Type of Appreciation</th>
<th>Positive/Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Same solemn oath</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The same revolutionary beliefs</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The rights of man</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>That first revolution</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A host of cooperative ventures</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ranks of the free</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Our word</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Colonial control</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Iron tyranny</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Our best efforts</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A free society</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Free men and free government</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A special pledge</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Good words</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Good deeds</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>This peaceful revolution of hope</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The prey of hostile powers</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Those neighbors who would make themselves our adversaries</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Example of Appreciation</td>
<td>Type of Appreciation</td>
<td>Positive/Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The quest for peace</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The dark powers of destruction</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>The deadly atom</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Serious and precise proposals</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>A beachhead of cooperation</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>The jungle of suspicion</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>A new endeavor</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Not a new balance of power</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>A new world of law</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>National loyalty</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>A grand and global alliance</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>A more fruitful life for all mankind</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>That historic effort</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>energy</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>the faith</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>the devotion</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Same high standards of strength and sacrifice</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>The land we love</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Engagement**: enabling external voices to be present in the discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Example of Engagement</th>
<th>Type of Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>I have sworn</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>The world is very different now</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>The same revolutionary beliefs are at issue around the world</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>We dare not forget</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>Let the word go forth</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Let every nation know</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>This much we pledge and more</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>There is little we cannot do</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>We dare not</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>We pledge our word</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><em>We shall not</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><em>We shall</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><em>We offer</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td><em>Cannot become</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><em>Let all our neighbors know</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td><em>We renew our pledge</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td><em>We offer not a pledge but a request</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td><em>We dare not</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td><em>Let us begin anew</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td><em>Let us never negotiate out of fear</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td><em>But let us never fear to negotiate</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td><em>Let both sides explore</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td><em>Let both sides formulate</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td><em>Let us</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td><em>Let both sides unite</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Example of Engagement</td>
<td>Type of Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td><em>Let both sides join</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td><em>Let us begin</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td><em>Will rest</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td><em>Now the trumpet summons us again</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td><em>The common enemies of man</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td><em>Let us go forth</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td><em>Knowing</em></td>
<td>Proclaim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Amplification**: general resources for grading; allows writers/speakers to adjust the degree of their evaluation, either up or down, to denote how strong or weak their feeling is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Example of Amplification</th>
<th>Type of Amplification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>(oath our forbears)</em> prescribed</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Man holds in his mortal hands</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Abolish</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>All forms... all forms</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>We dare not forget</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>To friend and foe alike</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>This torch has been passed</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>Born in this century... Around the world</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>We shall</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Pay any cost</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Bear any burden</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Meet any hardship</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Support any friend</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Oppose any foe</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>We pledge</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>And more</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>A host of cooperative ventures</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>We dare not</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>Powerful</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>Shall not have passed</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>Merely to be replaced</em></td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>Far more</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><em>We shall not always</em></td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><em>Struggling to break the bonds of mass misery</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><em>A special pledge</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><em>Casting off the chains of poverty</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Example of Amplification</td>
<td>Type of Amplification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td><em>This peaceful revolution of hope</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td><em>Merely a forum for invective</em></td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td><em>the dark powers of destruction</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td><em>Unleashed</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td><em>Engulfed</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td><em>Sufficient beyond doubt</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td><em>Never</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td><em>Two great and powerful nations</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td><em>Racing to alter</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td><em>Stays the hand</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td><em>always</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td><em>Never</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td><em>Belaboring</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td><em>Absolute power, absolute control</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td><em>The jungle of suspicion</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td><em>1,000 days . . . lifetime</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td><em>Summoned</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td><em>The globe</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td><em>The trumpet summons us</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td><em>A long twilight struggle</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td><em>Year in and year out</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td><em>Can we forge</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td><em>North and South, East and West</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td><em>The long history of the world</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td><em>Granted</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td><em>Any other people or any other generation</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td><em>Energy . . . will light</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td><em>All who serve it</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td><em>The glow . . . light the world</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Modality:** the intermediate zone between positive and negative polarities, between yes and no

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Modal</th>
<th>Type of Modality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td><em>And if a beachhead of cooperation may push back</em></td>
<td>Modalization: usuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><em>not because the Communists may be doing it</em></td>
<td>Modalization: usuality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inaugural Address, by John Fitzgerald Kennedy

January 20, 1961

1. Vice President Johnson, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chief Justice, President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, President Truman, reverend clergy, fellow citizens, we observe today not a victory of party, but a celebration of freedom--symbolizing an end, as well as a beginning -- signifying renewal, as well as change.

2. For I have sworn before you and Almighty God the same solemn oath our forebears prescribed nearly a century and three quarters ago.

3. The world is very different now.

4. For man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life.

5. And yet the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe--the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state, but from the hand of God.

6. We dare not forget today that we are the heirs of that first revolution.

7. Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans--born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage--and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.

8. Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty.

9. This much we pledge--and more.

10. To those old allies whose cultural and spiritual origins we share, we pledge the loyalty of faithful friends.

11. United, there is little we cannot do in a host of cooperative ventures. Divided, there is little we can do--for we dare not meet a powerful challenge at odds and split asunder.
12. To those new States whom we welcome to the ranks of the free, we pledge our word that one form of colonial control shall not have passed away merely to be replaced by a far more iron tyranny.

13. We shall not always expect to find them supporting our view.

14. But we shall always hope to find them strongly supporting their own freedom--and to remember that, in the past, those who foolishly sought power by riding the back of the tiger ended up inside.

15. To those peoples in the huts and villages across the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required--not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right.

16. If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.

17. To our sister republics south of our border, we offer a special pledge--to convert our good words into good deeds--in a new alliance for progress--to assist free men and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty.

18. But this peaceful revolution of hope cannot become the prey of hostile powers.

19. Let all our neighbors know that we shall join with them to oppose aggression or subversion anywhere in the Americas.

20. And let every other power know that this Hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house.

21. To that world assembly of sovereign states, the United Nations, our last best hope in an age where the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace, we renew our pledge of support--to prevent it from becoming merely a forum for invective--to strengthen its shield of the new and the weak--and to enlarge the area in which its writ may run.

22. Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request: that both sides begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction.

23. We dare not tempt them with weakness.

24. For only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed.
25. But neither can two great and powerful groups of nations take comfort from our present course—both sides overburdened by the cost of modern weapons, both rightly alarmed by the steady spread of the deadly atom, yet both racing to alter that uncertain balance of terror that stays the hand of mankind's final war.

26. So let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof.

27. Let us never negotiate out of fear.

28. But let us never fear to negotiate.

29. Let both sides explore what problems unite us instead of belaboring those problems which divide us.

30. Let both sides, for the first time, formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms—and bring the absolute power to destroy other nations under the absolute control of all nations.

31. Let both sides seek to invoke the wonders of science instead of its terrors. Together let us explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the ocean depths, and encourage the arts and commerce.

32. Let both sides unite to heed in all corners of the earth the command of Isaiah—to “undo the heavy burdens ... and to let the oppressed go free.”

33. And if a beachhead of cooperation may push back the jungle of suspicion, let both sides join in creating a new endeavor, not a new balance of power, but a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved.

34. All this will not be finished in the first 100 days.

35. Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this Administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet.

36. But let us begin.

37. In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than in mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course.

38. Since this country was founded, each generation of Americans has been summoned to give testimony to its national loyalty.
39. The graves of young Americans who answered the call to service surround the globe.

40. Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need; not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, "rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation"—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.

41. Can we forge against these enemies a grand and global alliance, North and South, East and West, that can assure a more fruitful life for all mankind? Will you join in that historic effort?

42. In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger.

43. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it.

44. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation.

45. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.

46. And so, my fellow Americans: ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

47. My fellow citizens of the world: ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man.

48. Finally, whether you are citizens of America or citizens of the world, ask of us the same high standards of strength and sacrifice which we ask of you.

49. With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.
APPENDIX D

ANALYSIS OF THE KING TEXT
Analysis of the King Text

*I Have A Dream* by Martin Luther King, Jr.

Washington D.C. on August 28, 1963

1. Five score years ago, a great American (appreciation: valuation, positive; judgment: social esteem, positive; engagement: entertain), in whose symbolic shadow we stand (amplification: enrichment) signed the Emancipation Proclamation.

2. This momentous decree (amplification: augmentation; appreciation: valuation, positive) came (engagement: proclaim) as a great beacon light of hope (amplification: augmentation; appreciation: valuation, positive) to millions (amplification: augmentation) of Negro slaves who had been seared in the flames of withering injustice (amplification: enrichment; judgment: social esteem, negative).

3. It came (engagement: proclaim) as a joyous daybreak (amplification: enrichment; affect: happiness) to end the long night of captivity (amplification: enrichment; affect: unhappiness; appreciation: valuation, negative).

4. But one hundred years later, we must face (amplification: enrichment) the tragic fact (affect: unhappiness) that the Negro is still (amplification: augmentation) not free (judgment: social esteem negative; engagement: proclaim).

5.-7. Optional statements expanding on current situation

8. So we have come here today to dramatize an appalling condition (affect: dissatisfaction; appreciation: reaction, negative; engagement: proclaim).

9. In a sense we have come to our nation's capital (amplification: enrichment; appreciation: valuation, positive) to cash a check.

10.-12. Expansion of the check metaphor

13. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation (appreciation: valuation, positive; judgment: social esteem, positive), America has given the Negro people a bad check (appreciation: valuation, negative) which has come back marked "insufficient funds."

14. But we refuse to believe (engagement: proclaim) that the bank of justice is bankrupt.

15.-16. Expansion of we refuse to believe
We have also come to this hallowed spot (judgment: social sanction, positive; appreciation: valuation, positive) to remind America of the fierce urgency (amplification: augmentation) of now.

Expansion of now

But there is something that I must (modulation: obligation) say to my people who stand on the warm threshold which leads into the palace of justice (amplification: enrichment; appreciation: valuation, positive).

In the process of gaining our rightful place (judgment: social esteem, positive) we must (modulation: necessity) not be guilty of wrongful deeds (judgment: social esteem, negative).

Expansion of conduct expected of the listener-followers

We cannot walk alone (engagement: proclaim).

And as we walk, we must make the pledge (amplification: augmentation) that we shall (amplification: augmentation) march ahead.

We cannot turn back (engagement: proclaim).

There are those who are asking the devotees of civil rights, "When will you be satisfied?" we can never (amplification: augmentation; engagement: proclaim) be satisfied as long as our bodies, heavy with the fatigue of travel (amplification: enrichment), cannot gain lodging in the motels of the highways and the hotels of the cities.

Expansion of cannot be satisfied

I am not unmindful that some of you have come here out of great trials and tribulations (judgment: social sanction, positive; amplification: augmentation).

Expansion of trials and tribulations

Continue to work with the faith (appreciation: valuation, positive) that unearned suffering is redemptive (judgment: social sanction, positive).

Go back to Mississippi, go back to Alabama, go back to Georgia, go back to Louisiana, go back to the slums and ghettos of our northern cities (appreciation: valuation, negative), knowing that somehow this situation can and will be (amplification: augmentation) changed.

Let us not wallow (amplification: enrichment; judgment: social esteem, negative) in the valley of despair (affect: unhappiness).
49. I say to you today (engagement: proclaim), my friends, that in spite of the difficulties and frustrations of the moment (amplification: mitigation), I still have a dream.

50.-58. Expansion of I have a dream

59. This is (engagement: proclaim) our hope (affect: happiness).

60. This is (engagement: proclaim) the faith (appreciation: valuation, positive) with which I return to the South.

1.-63. Expansion on faith

64. This will be the day when all of God's children (amplification: augmentation; judgment: social) will be able to sing with a new meaning, "My country, 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty, of thee I sing.

65. Land where my fathers died, land of the pilgrim's pride, from every mountainside, let freedom ring."

66. And if America is to be a great nation, this must (modulation: necessity) become true (engagement: proclaim).

67. So let freedom ring (engagement: proclaim) from the prodigious hilltops (appreciation: valuation, positive) of New Hampshire.

68.-75. Expansion of let freedom ring sequence

76. When we let freedom ring, when we let it ring from every village and every hamlet, from every state and every city (amplification: augmentation), we will be able (engagement: proclaim) to speed up that day when all of God's children, Black men and White men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics (amplification: augmentation) will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual (appreciation: reaction, positive) “Free at last! free at last! thank God Almighty we are free at last!”
Table 24

*Analysis of King’s Speech Against the Benchmark Features of an Effective Vision*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features of a Vision</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Realized by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues a challenge:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“big, hairy, audacious goal”; defines success; empowers people and calls forth their best efforts; is ambitious, often calling for sacrifice, change and growth; extrinsic and intrinsic motivators.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>... the Negro is granted his citizenship rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29-37</td>
<td>King addresses Afro-Americans and tells them what is required of them: not be guilty of wrongful deeds; [do not drink] from the cup of bitterness and hatred; conduct our struggle on the high plan of dignity and discipline; [no] physical violence; meet physical force with soul force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-48</td>
<td>Continue to work; go back to . . .; [do not] wallow in despair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52-59</td>
<td><em>I have a dream</em> sequence—King describes a future America where all are equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td><em>If America is to be a great nation, this [freedom] must be true</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision as destination:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>road map; paints a target; helps navigate through crises.</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td><em>I have a dream</em> sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68-77</td>
<td><em>Let freedom ring</em> sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depicts shared values:</strong> contains values/high ideals that are worthwhile and important to people; moral overtones.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>A great American</em> (Lincoln)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Emancipation Proclamation</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>Constitution, Declaration of Independence</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>Inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td><em>Justice</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td><em>Equality</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td><em>Our rightful place</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td><em>The American dream</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68-77</td>
<td><em>Freedom</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious values: moral overtones</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td><em>Righteousness</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td><em>redemptive</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td><em>Valley of despair</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td><em>Every valley shall be exalted . . . glory of the Lord</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61-63</td>
<td><em>Faith</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td><em>Pray together</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td><em>All of God’s children</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td><em>Thank God Almighty</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

430
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features of a Vision</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Realized by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depicts shared hopes and dreams, evokes emotion:</strong> move others from self-interest to collective-interest; “us-ness”; “we” vs. “I”; inspires commitment/enthusiasm; identifies a common enemy.</td>
<td>68-77</td>
<td>Emotion: <em>Let freedom ring</em> (Afro-American spiritual song)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>Inclusivity/us-ness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King distinguishes between White American and American Negros, citizens of color but speaks to all Americans save when he specifically addresses Whites (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Commitment/enthusiasm: <em>Every American</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>All men</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20, 65</td>
<td><em>All of God’s children</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42-45</td>
<td><em>[those who experienced] tribulations and narrow cells, police brutality, creative suffering</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68-75</td>
<td>King names several U.S. states (<em>New Hampshire, New York, etc.</em>) <em>All God’s children, Black men and White men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td><em>Commitment/enthusiasm:</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Common enemy:</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>Poverty</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Appalling condition</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td><em>Segregation</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td><em>Racial injustice</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td><em>Injustice and oppression</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td><em>[judgment] by color of skin</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td><em>Interposition and nullification</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td><em>Jangling discords</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spans timelines:</strong> draws from the past, the present and the future; exposes others to the painful reality of their present condition and demands they fashion a response; interprets reality for followers.</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td><em>Past:</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Five score years ago . . . the architects of our republic wrote . . . they were signing a promissory note</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>Present:</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td><em>America has given the Negro people a bad check</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14-15</td>
<td><em>But we refuse to believe . . .</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-17</td>
<td><em>We have come . . .</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td><em>This is no time</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19-21</td>
<td><em>Now is the time</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td><em>1963 is not an end but a beginning</em> (King transitions to the future)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features of a Vision</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Realized by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>The Negro will be content . . . will have a rude awakening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>There will be neither rest nor tranquility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-59</td>
<td>I still have dream (sequence)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-68</td>
<td>Let freedom ring (sequence)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contains imagery:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive, not negative;</td>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>We refuse to believe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crystal clear; vivid;</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Rise from the dark . . . to the sunlit path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>highly-desirable</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lift our nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future state; tangible;</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Invigorating autumn of freedom and equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makes abstractions</td>
<td>29-33</td>
<td>Must not [do] wrongful deeds [or] bitterness and hatred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concrete; avoids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tentativeness and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualifiers.</td>
<td>25-27</td>
<td>Rude awakening, neither rest nor tranquility, shake the foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggests means to implement:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contains strategies/plan for achieving the vision, audacious but achievable, has a destination</td>
<td>29-37</td>
<td>[do not] not be guilty of wrongful deeds; [do not drink] from the cup of bitterness and hatred; conduct our struggle on the high plan of dignity and discipline; [no] physical violence; meet physical force with soul force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-48</td>
<td>Continue to work . . . go back to . . . do not wallow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>King addresses Afro-Americans:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-41</td>
<td>King addresses White Americans saying Afro-Americans can never be satisfied until . . . and then lists thing White American can help change (equal lodging in motels and hotels, ghettos, votes, justice, righteousness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expresses urgency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>remind America of the fierce urgency of now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>there is no time to engage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-21</td>
<td>now is the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>It would be fatal to overlook the urgency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>The whirlwinds of revolt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Affect:** enables us to express emotional states

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Example of Affect</th>
<th>Type of Affect</th>
<th>Positive/Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>as a joyous daybreak</em></td>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>the long night of captivity</em></td>
<td>Unhappiness</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>the tragic fact</em></td>
<td>Unhappiness</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>an appalling condition</em></td>
<td>Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>the valley of despair</em></td>
<td>Unhappiness</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td><em>hope</em></td>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Judgment:** enables us to relate our attitudes toward people and the way in which they behave—their character and how they measure up in reference to a set of institutionalized norms or expectations. Judgment: construing moral evaluations of behavior, how people should and should not behave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Example of Judgment</th>
<th>Type of Judgment</th>
<th>Positive/Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>a great American</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>withering injustice</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>not free</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><em>this sacred obligation</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><em>This hallowed spot</em></td>
<td>Social sanction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td><em>our rightful place</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td><em>wrongful deeds</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td><em>great trials and tribulations</em></td>
<td>Social sanction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td><em>unearned suffering is redemptive</em></td>
<td>Social sanction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td><em>wallow</em></td>
<td>Social esteem</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appreciation: enables us to construe how we value things

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Example of Appreciation</th>
<th>Type of Appreciation</th>
<th>Positive/Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>a great American</em></td>
<td>Appreciation: valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>This momentous decree</em></td>
<td>Appreciation: valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>a great beacon light of hope</em></td>
<td>Appreciation: valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>the long night of captivity</em></td>
<td>Appreciation: valuation</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>an appalling condition</em></td>
<td>Appreciation: reaction</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>our nation's capital</em></td>
<td>Appreciation: valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><em>this sacred obligation</em></td>
<td>Appreciation: valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><em>a bad check</em></td>
<td>Appreciation: valuation</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><em>this hallowed spot</em></td>
<td>Appreciation: valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td><em>the warm threshold which leads into the palace of justice</em></td>
<td>Appreciation: valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td><em>the faith</em></td>
<td>Appreciation: valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td><em>the slums and ghettos of our northern cities</em></td>
<td>Appreciation: valuation</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td><em>the faith</em></td>
<td>Appreciation: valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td><em>the prodigious hilltops of New Hampshire</em></td>
<td>Appreciation: valuation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td><em>the old Negro spiritual</em></td>
<td>Appreciation: reaction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Engagement**: enabling external voices to be present in the discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Example of Engagement</th>
<th>Type of Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a great American</td>
<td>Engagement: entertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>This momentous decree came</td>
<td>Engagement: proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It came as a joyous daybreak</td>
<td>Engagement: proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>the tragic fact that the Negro is still not free</td>
<td>Engagement: proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>an appalling condition</td>
<td>Engagement: proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>we refuse to believe</td>
<td>Engagement: proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>We cannot walk alone</td>
<td>Engagement: proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>We cannot turn back</td>
<td>Engagement: proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>we can never be satisfied</td>
<td>Engagement: proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>I say to you today</td>
<td>Engagement: proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>This is our hope</td>
<td>Engagement: proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>This is the faith</td>
<td>Engagement: proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>this must become true</td>
<td>Engagement: proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>let freedom ring</td>
<td>Engagement: proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>we will be able to speed up that day</td>
<td>Engagement: proclaim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Amplification**: general resources for grading; allows writers/speakers to adjust the degree of their evaluation, either up or down, to denote how strong or weak their feeling is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Example of Amplification</th>
<th>Type of Amplification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>in whose symbolic shadow we stand</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>This momentous decree</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>a great beacon light of hope</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>millions</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>who had been seared in the flames of withering injustice</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>a joyous daybreak</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>the long night of captivity</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>we must face</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>the Negro is still</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>our nation's capital</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><em>the fierce urgency</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td><em>the warm threshold which leads into the palace of justice</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td><em>we must make the pledge</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td><em>we shall march ahead</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td><em>we can never</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td><em>heavy with the fatigue of travel</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td><em>great trials and tribulations</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td><em>can and will be changed</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td><em>wallow</em></td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td><em>in spite of the difficulties and frustrations of the moment</em></td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td><em>all of God's children</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td><em>from every village and every hamlet, from every state and every</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td><em>all of God's children, Black men and White men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants, and Catholics</em></td>
<td>Augmentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Modality**: the intermediate zone between positive and negative polarities, between yes and no

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Modal</th>
<th>Type of Modality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td><em>there is something that I must say</em></td>
<td>Modulation: obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td><em>we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds</em></td>
<td>Modulation: necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td><em>we must make the pledge</em></td>
<td>Modulation: obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td><em>this must become true</em></td>
<td>Modulation: necessity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I Have A Dream by Martin Luther King, Jr.

Washington, DC, August 28, 1963

1. Five score years ago, a great American, in whose symbolic shadow we stand signed the Emancipation Proclamation.

2. This momentous decree came as a great beacon light of hope to millions of Negro slaves who had been seared in the flames of withering injustice.

3. It came as a joyous daybreak to end the long night of captivity.

4. But one hundred years later, we must face the tragic fact that the Negro is still not free.

5. One hundred years later, the life of the Negro is still sadly crippled by the manacles of segregation and the chains of discrimination.

6. One hundred years later, the Negro lives on a lonely island of poverty in the midst of a vast ocean of material prosperity.

7. One hundred years later, the Negro is still languishing in the corners of American society and finds himself an exile in his own land.

8. So we have come here today to dramatize an appalling condition.

9. In a sense we have come to our nation's capital to cash a check.

10. When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir.

11. This note was a promise that all men would be guaranteed the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

12. It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note insofar as her citizens of color are concerned.

13. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, America has given the Negro people a bad check which has come back marked “insufficient funds.”

14. But we refuse to believe that the bank of justice is bankrupt.
15. We refuse to believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of opportunity of this nation.

16. So we have come to cash this check—a check that will give us upon demand the riches of freedom and the security of justice.

17. We have also come to this hallowed spot to remind America of the fierce urgency of now.

18. This is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling off or to take the tranquilizing drug of gradualism.

19. Now is the time to rise from the dark and desolate valley of segregation to the sunlit path of racial justice.

20. Now is the time to open the doors of opportunity to all of God's children.

21. Now is the time to lift our nation from the quick sands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood.

22. It would be fatal for the nation to overlook the urgency of the moment and to underestimate the determination of the Negro.

23. This sweltering summer of the Negro's legitimate discontent will not pass until there is an invigorating autumn of freedom and equality.

24. Nineteen sixty-three is not an end, but a beginning.

25. Those who hope that the Negro needed to blow off steam and will now be content will have a rude awakening if the nation returns to business as usual.

26. There will be neither rest nor tranquility in America until the Negro is granted his citizenship rights.

27. The whirlwinds of revolt will continue to shake the foundations of our nation until the bright day of justice emerges.

28. But there is something that I must say to my people who stand on the warm threshold which leads into the palace of justice.

29. In the process of gaining our rightful place we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds.

30. Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred.
31. We must forever conduct our struggle on the high plane of dignity and discipline.

32. We must not allow our creative protest to degenerate into physical violence.

33. Again and again we must rise to the majestic heights of meeting physical force with soul force.

34. The marvelous new militancy which has engulfed the Negro community must not lead us to distrust of all White people, for many of our White brothers, as evidenced by their presence here today, have come to realize that their destiny is tied up with our destiny and their freedom is inextricably bound to our freedom.

35. We cannot walk alone.

36. And as we walk, we must make the pledge that we shall march ahead.

37. We cannot turn back.

38. There are those who are asking the devotees of civil rights, "When will you be satisfied?" we can never be satisfied as long as our bodies, heavy with the fatigue of travel, cannot gain lodging in the motels of the highways and the hotels of the cities.

39. We cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro's basic mobility is from a smaller ghetto to a larger one.

40. We can never be satisfied as long as a Negro in Mississippi cannot vote and a Negro in New York believes he has nothing for which to vote.

41. No, no, we are not satisfied, and we will not be satisfied until justice rolls down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream.

42. I am not unmindful that some of you have come here out of great trials and tribulations.

43. Some of you have come fresh from narrow cells.

44. Some of you have come from areas where your quest for freedom left you battered by the storms of persecution and staggered by the winds of police brutality.

45. You have been the veterans of creative suffering.

46. Continue to work with the faith that unearned suffering is redemptive.
47. Go back to Mississippi, go back to Alabama, go back to Georgia, go back to
Louisiana, go back to the slums and ghettos of our northern cities, knowing
that somehow this situation can and will be changed.

48. Let us not wallow in the valley of despair.

49. I say to you today, my friends, that in spite of the difficulties and frustrations
of the moment, I still have a dream.

50. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream.

51. I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true
meaning of its creed: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are
created equal."

52. I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia the sons of former
slaves and the sons of former slave owners will be able to sit down together at
a table of brotherhood.

53. I have a dream that one day even the state of Mississippi, a desert state,
weltering with the heat of injustice and oppression, will be transformed into
an oasis of freedom and justice.

54. I have a dream that my four children will one day live in a nation where they
will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their
character.

55. I have a dream today.

56. I have a dream that one day the state of Alabama, whose governor's lips are
presently dripping with the words of interposition and nullification, will be
transformed into a situation where little Black boys and Black girls will be
able to join hands with little White boys and White girls and walk together as
sisters and brothers.

57. I have a dream today.

58. I have a dream that one day every valley shall be exalted, every hill and
mountain shall be made low, the rough places will be made plain, and the
crooked places will be made straight, and the glory of the Lord shall be
revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.

59. This is our hope.

60. This is the faith with which I return to the South.
61. With this faith we will be able to hew out of the mountain of despair a stone of hope.

62. With this faith we will be able to transform the jangling discords of our nation into a beautiful symphony of brotherhood.

63. With this faith we will be able to work together, to pray together, to struggle together, to go to jail together, to stand up for freedom together, knowing that we will be free one day.

64. This will be the day when all of God's children will be able to sing with a new meaning, “My country, 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty, of thee I sing.

65. Land where my fathers died, land of the pilgrim's pride, from every mountainside, let freedom ring.”

66. And if America is to be a great nation, this must become true.

67. So let freedom ring from the prodigious hilltops of New Hampshire.

68. Let freedom ring from the mighty mountains of New York.

69. Let freedom ring from the heightening Alleghenies of Pennsylvania!

70. Let freedom ring from the snow capped Rockies of Colorado!

71. Let freedom ring from the curvaceous peaks of California!

72. But not only that; let freedom ring from Stone Mountain of Georgia!

73. Let freedom ring from Lookout Mountain of Tennessee!

74. Let freedom ring from every hill and every molehill of Mississippi.

75. From every mountainside, let freedom ring.

76. When we let freedom ring, when we let it ring from every village and every hamlet, from every state and every city, we will be able to speed up that day when all of God's children, Black men and White men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual, “Free at last! free at last! thank God Almighty, we are free at last!”
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