

ARGUMENTATIVE STRATEGIES IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

MARIANA TURLACU
University of Bucharest

The aim of this study is to identify and to analyze the argumentative strategies used by politicians in order to express their disagreement and to sustain their point of view in debates or political speeches. The interest is pointed towards establishing the argumentative function of each strategy and its efficiency at the level of the argumentative discourse.

1. Introduction

As part of a larger research project which studies the expression of disagreement as strategic maneuvering, the present work concentrates upon the interactional approach of argumentation. The interactional approach is based on the dialogical character of argumentative discourse which is always conceived as to be addressed to someone.

This work treats argumentation as a means of resolving a difference of opinion in the area of political discourse.

Politics is one of the fields where differences of opinion occur; these fields may vary from familiar, private life, to public life.

The process of argumentation is always built on a certain subject, more or less important, and oriented towards a certain public, more or less restrained. It is far from being a closed system because it is continuously enriched with arguments brought by the parts involved in the process, aspect which underlines its dynamic and interactional character: "Contrairement à ce qui se passe dans une démonstration, où les procédés démonstratifs jouent à l'intérieur d'un système isolé, l'argumentation se caractérise par une interaction constante entre tous ses éléments" (Perelman, Tyteca 1958: 255, *apud* Tuțescu 1998: 117). The process of argumentation takes place as a consequence of advancing a personal idea or of a common opinion which can or cannot be accepted. A certain aspect can be argued as a consequence of direct or indirect interaction. Besides the interactional, dialogical character of argumentation, another important feature of the process is its opposing character. Many theoreticians plead for the contradictory aspect of the argumentative interaction saying that argumentation only occurs when a discursive opposition intervenes: "Une situation langagière commence à devenir argumentative lorsque s'y manifeste une opposition de discours" (Plantin 2005:63). When advancing argumentation it means that the speaker engages in a discussion with those who doubt or who do not agree with his point of view.

Although argumentation, as demonstration, ends with the demonstration of a thesis, the process is different because argumentation has as starting point a conflict situation based on disagreement and contradiction (Tuțescu 1998: 127). The interactional perspective presents

not only the conflictual content, but, in the same time, it has the role of showing how disagreement is negotiating the differences of opinion.

2. Confictual disagreement

Kakava defines disagreement as “an oppositional stance (verbal or non-verbal) to an antecedent verbal (or non-verbal) action”. (Kakava 1993: 36, *apud* Angouri, Locher 2012: 1549)

We consider disagreement an assertive reactive act because it represents a rejection reaction of the illocutionary content of another act expressed before by a different speaker. On the other hand, disagreement is a complex speech act because it functions both with its illocutionary assertive force and with its argumentative force. This relational view allows analyzing disagreement from the perspective of the negotiation of relationships. “Disagreement” is strongly related to interpersonal interaction as it entails opposing opinions and it challenges the participants to do their best in defending their point of view no matter if their actions will contribute to face-aggravating, face-maintaining or face-enhancing effects.

There are studies which reveal the negative connotation of disagreement and studies which consider this act as being a desirable characteristic of democratic debates as put by Haggith (1993, *apud* Angouri 2012: 1567).

The focus in this paper is the oppositional way in which disagreement functions and the way in which it influences the relationship between the participants and the outcome of the discussion. “Disagreements constitute particular speech events through which interlocutors judge the behavior of their communicative partner(s) in order to manage their social positions” (Langlotz, Locher 2012: 1591). Disagreement is often related to confrontation and conflict being evaluated as having negative effects. According to Maria Sifianou (2012), disagreement can be defined as the “expression of a view that differs from that expressed by another speaker”. She completes her definition with the one belonging to Waldron and Applegate (1994) cited in her work; disagreement is “a form of conflict [...] taxing communication events”.

Conflictual disagreements are linked to negative emotional reactions as irritation, annoyance, anger when one feels offended, threatened or treated rudely.

Disagreement is considered to be an aggressive act threatening the face of the one whose opinion is put under doubt.

Disagreement can occur as a reaction to:

- a) a viewpoint already expressed by another speaker

(1) **Barack Obama:** *Candy, what Governor Romney said just isn't true. He wanted to take them into bankruptcy without providing them any way to stay open. And we would have lost a million jobs.*
(<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/10/16/transcript-second-presidential-debate/#ixzz2CaTNfchM>)

On the occasion of the second presidential debate held on the 16th October 2012, president Obama expresses his disagreement towards a previous declaration of his political adversary, Mitt Romney. Although he is present, the speaker prefers avoiding the direct confrontation and addresses himself to the moderator of the show, Candy Crowley, denying the accusation brought by his opponent: *Candy, what Governor Romney said just isn't true.*

b) A virtual viewpoint assigned to an absent speaker who could have advanced it in another situation:

(2) **Barack Obama:** *But when Governor Romney and his friends in Congress tell us we can somehow lower our deficits by spending trillions more on new tax breaks for the wealthy, well, what'd Bill Clinton call it? You do the arithmetic, you do the math. I refuse to go along with that. And as long as I'm President, I never will.* (<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/09/06/transcript-obama-speech-at-dnc/#ixzz2CaMIFeDY>)

This example illustrates the speaker's reaction to a point of view advanced in a different context by another speaker. It is part of the speech held by president Obama at the Democratic National Convention in the absence of his adversary, Mitt Romney. The speaker's discursive strategy is reintroducing in context the affirmations belonging to his opponent so as to express his disagreement. For that matter, he evokes an authority – Bill Clinton – who is sure to have a critical opinion towards what Mitt Romney and his party intend to do, and makes use of the rhetorical question to induce the opposition. An even more explicit negation is the verb “to refuse”: *I refuse to go along with that.*

c) an imaginary viewpoint (a convention, a general opinion).

3. Conflict and politics

A political discourse can be represented in the framework of the pragma-dialectical approach to argumentation as a dispute, or a critical discussion, in which the protagonist descends his standpoints. Often the participants involved in this particular type of discourse are dominated by the rhetorical purpose of their presentations forgetting to pay as much attention to the dialectical purpose. At the level of confrontational debates or speeches, the protagonists define their positions as incompatible and antithetic and each participant is trying to convince the public of the acceptance of his point of view. The different viewpoints encountered in political discussions have the role of helping people decide on whom to vote or helping legislators to choose the best ideas. “Disagreement occurs at all levels of democracy” and it has been argued to “enflame passions, motivate manipulation and split communities” (Bello 2012: 782).

4. Argumentative confrontations

An important contribution treating argumentation in relationship with “controversy” and “confrontation” belongs to van Eemeren and Bart Garssen (2008). The theoretical contributions gathered in their work classify the argumentative strategies by means of which the confrontation of viewpoints is solved in an interactional manner. “Controversy” has to do with “confrontation” and with “tenacious efforts to put an end to the confrontation by means of argumentation” (van Eemeren, Garssen 2008: 2). The authors define controversy as “a difference of opinion that has become a *persistent conflict*”. The distinctive feature of controversy is the difficulty or even the impossibility of resolving the difference of opinion.

According to Dascal, there are three types of debates: a) *the discussion* (ruled based rational procedure); b) *the dispute* (extra-rational factors); c) *the controversy* (rational but

with no rules). Although all the three types of debates start from a certain given problem and manifest themselves through disagreement, their objectives are different: a discussion will have as desired result establishing the truth, a dispute is concerned with winning and a controversy with persuading the adversary or the public to accept a certain position. Crawshay-Williams holds that “controversy arises when there is disagreement between the defender of a statement and an attacker of this statement concerning the criteria according to which the statement is to be tested” (Dascal 2001; Crawshay-Williams 1957, *apud* van Eemeren, Garssen 2008: 18-20).

5. Argumentative strategies

According to Mariana Tuțescu (1998: 223), an argumentative strategy is “un ensemble d’actes de langage basé sur une logique discursive et sous-tendu par une force et un but argumentatifs”. The aim of this work is to identify and analyze only those conflict and refutative strategies used by politicians in order to express their disagreement and to sustain their point of view in debates or political speeches. There are several argumentative strategies identified in speeches belonging to the American president Barack Obama and to the French president Nicolas Sarkozy during their presidential campaigns from 2012. For this aim to be attained, a specific corpus has been created. I have selected several transcripts belonging to the American and the French presidents illustrating the same genre: the electoral debate. The analysis is focused only on those excerpts where the act of disagreement takes place in order to identify the linguistic means of expressing disagreement, to notice the effects these choices have on the public, to evaluate the effectiveness and reasonableness of the political argumentation and to establish the discursive strategies the speakers use the most in order to win the public.

5.1. Rhetorical interrogations

An interrogation has the role of suspending the truth value of a sentence. When asking a question or a rhetorical question, the speaker brings forward his doubt concerning a certain utterance and orients his question in the same sense as a negation.

J.-Cl. Anscombe and O. Ducrot (1981) have advanced the idea that, in an argumentative coordination, an interrogative sentence like “Is P...?” (“Est-ce que P...?”) is oriented towards a negative conclusion $\sim P$ (non-P) (Anscombe, Ducrot 1981, *apud* Tuțescu 1998: 237).

A rhetorical question has a very important argumentative value. According to Anscombe and Ducrot (1981) cited by Tuțescu (1998), rhetorical questions have a negative argumentative aspect. When a speaker makes use of a rhetorical question, he intends only to remind or underline the answer to that question because it is assumed to be known by everyone. The question functions as the assertion of the content suggested, being taken as a well known truth. The argumentative value of the question is used in order to accomplish the act of argumentation.

The argumentative theory of the interrogation presupposes three aspects: a) the assertion of P; b) the expression of doubt concerning P; c) the obligation to give an affirmative or a negative answer (P or $\sim P$) or to choose a modal answer (“maybe”, “probably”, “certainly”). Rhetorical questions incite also to giving an answer with the difference that the speaker is the voice of his interlocutor. He presents his interlocutor as demanding himself if P or $\sim P$ is true. The interlocutor is identified both with the one having to choose from P and $\sim P$ and with the one expressing his doubt concerning P.

The excerpts analyzed reveal two cases in which rhetorical questions function:

a) Rhetorical questions followed by explicit negative answer:

(3) **Barack Obama:** *And Governor Romney's says he's got a five-point plan? Governor Romney doesn't have a five-point plan. He has a one-point plan. And that plan is to make sure that folks at the top play by a different set of rules. That's been his philosophy in the private sector, that's been his philosophy as governor, that's been his philosophy as a presidential candidate.*

(<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/10/16/transcript-second-presidential-debate/#ixzz2CaTb3S70>)

By the rhetorical question the speaker is taxing what Mitt Romney said, he recalls the content and does not give credit to what his opponent is promising, being ironic towards his opponent's political speech. The argumentative orientation of the question is obviously negative and it is shortly followed by the negation "... doesn't have ...". He strengthens his point of view by adding the offensive "one-point plan" which is strongly opposed to a "five-point plan" declared by Romney. This seems to underline on the one hand the incapacity and on the other hand the dissimulation of the one pretending to have a good plan.

(4) **Barack Obama:** *And so the question is: Does anybody out there think that the big problem we had is that there was too much oversight and regulation of Wall Street? Because if you do, then Governor Romney is your candidate. But that's not what I believe.*

(<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/10/03/transcript-first-presidential-debate/#ixzz2ELU2YuZE>)

The speaker announces the question ("And so the question is") so as to focus as much attention as possible on his disapproval concerning his opponent's acts. The argumentative value of the rhetorical question is enhanced by the allusion of the bad choice that is associated with the possible election of Mitt Romney. The question is followed by an explicit rejection "That's not what I believe". The negation can be interpreted both as Obama's refusal of Romney's policies and as the refusal of the idea that the public could think the way his opponent thinks.

b) Rhetorical questions functioning independently:

Nicolas Sarkozy: *Quand Monsieur Axel Kahn, aujourd'hui, cet après midi, candidat socialiste dans le 7ème arrondissement de Paris compare le rassemblement du Trocadéro d'hier pour la fête du travail au congrès de Nuremberg. Est-ce l'esprit de rassemblement ? Avez-vous condamné ce propos profondément choquant ? Je continue. Quand le syndicat de la magistrature, des magistrats qui s'engagent pour vous soutenir en violation de toutes les règles syndicales et qui prônent une politique judiciaire de laxisme qui est le contraire de ce qu'attendent les Français, est-ce l'esprit de rassemblement ?* (<http://presidentielle2012.ouest-france.fr/decryptage>)

Sarkozy makes obvious his position towards his opponent's declaration suggesting, by means of analogy, the exaggeration of the previous statements. He brings rational arguments in his favor and attacks Hollande's silence related to an absurd declaration of one member of

his party who tried to compare a simple celebration with the Nuremberg congress which is known to have a million people and also a negative connotation, being related to Hitler's despotism. The rhetorical question repeated two times: "Est-ce l'esprit du rassamblement?" (*Is this the spirit of gathering?*) is charged with argumentative value and negatively oriented "This is not the spirit of gathering". The repetition of the rhetorical question reveals the certainty of the speaker and his determination in revealing the truth. Sarkozy gains the image of the president people would wish for their country: honest, stable, decided, objective.

(5) *Nicolas Sarkozy: La France est le pays d'Europe qui, avec la Suède, a les impôts les plus lourds. Est-ce que vous avez conscience que nous sommes dans un monde ouvert ? Il y a une différence entre nous. Vous voulez moins de riches, moi je veux moins de pauvres.*

François Hollande: Et à la fois plus de pauvres et des riches plus riches.
Nicolas Sarkozy: Ce n'est pas exact et ce n'est pas une plaisanterie. La France est en Europe et dans un espace ouvert. Qu'est-ce que vous voulez Monsieur Hollande ? Que tout le monde s'en aille ? Que plus personne ne puisse payer des impôts ici ? La France est, avec la Suède, le pays où les impôts sont les plus lourds. Vous voulez continuer à les augmenter ? Vous voulez faire croire quoi ? Vous avez défini une personne riche comme gagnant 4000 euros [...]. (<http://presidentielle2012.ouest-france.fr/decryptage>)

This excerpt illustrates the interaction between the two participants Nicolas Sarkozy and François Hollande. The sequence "Il y a une difference entre nous" (*There is a difference between us*) reveals once again the antagonist relation existing between the two presidential candidates and hides the speaker's irony. Sarkozy announces his refusal of Hollande's proposal for 75% taxes for the rich. The speaker's concern is not only the fee's value but the concept of being rich which for Hollande is a person gaining 4000 Euros. Sarkozy's argumentation is based on a series of accusatory rhetorical questions. Although the speaker addresses his questions to his adversary, every question involves in the same time the public. The argumentative orientation of the questions is negatively connoted and reveals the speaker's disagreement that can be rephrased as following: "Mister Hollande wants to grow taxes so as nobody could pay them and everybody leaves the country" (*Qu'est-ce que vous voulez Monsieur Hollande ? Que tout le monde s'en aille ?*). Being an interpersonal action, the interrogation supposes the modification of the interlocutor's epistemic universe. The public is being warned about the absurd and dangerous plans the socialist candidate has in order to influence their final voting decision.

5.2. Polemic negations

Just like interrogations, negations have argumentative and polyphonic aspect. Negations have a contrastive role; they are linguistic movements opposed to previous statements.

Recent studies have made the distinction between descriptive negation and polemic negation. Mariana Tuțescu (1998: 254) cites O. Ducrot (1973) who defines the descriptive negation as "l'affirmation d'un contenu négatif" and the polemic negation as "un acte de négation, la réfutation d'un contenu positif exprimé antérieurement par un énonciateur différent du locuteur ou l'instance énonciative qui produit cet acte". Polemic negation is an argumentative strategy that supposes the existence of certain content and of a contrastive content corresponding to the first.

Polemic negation has a binary structure: a first part of the sentence in which the previous informational content is negated and a second part in which the information is corrected. This type of negation has an accentuated dialogical character combined with the polyphonic and refutative ones.

There are theoreticians as P. Attal (1984) who considers the descriptive negation a level one negation (counter-argumentative) and the polemic negation a level two negation (argumentative) and theoreticians who consider the opposite. According to H. Nølke (1993), the polemic negation is primary and the descriptive negation derives from it. Every negation is the expression of a rejection; it has argumentative value and triggers a polemic dialogue (Attal 1984; Nølke 1993, *apud* Tuțescu 1998: 257– 265).

(6) **Barack Obama:** *This is the choice we now face. This is what the election comes down to. Over and over, we have been told by our opponents that bigger tax cuts and fewer regulations are the only way; that since government can't do everything, it should do almost nothing. If you can't afford health insurance, hope that you don't get sick.*

(<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/09/06/transcript-obama-speech-at-dnc/#ixzz2CaMg3HSf>)

Obama criticizes his opponent and makes an ironic allusion negating a previous informational content (“government can't do everything”) and correcting it by a second minimizing content (“it should do almost nothing”). The polemic negation here has a shocking role for the public; it is used in order to transmit strong emotions and to threaten the positive face of the other.

(7) **Barack Obama:** *For example, I know that people think I'm not passionate enough. That I'm too cool. That I'm too detached. But as I was going through my daily routine – sitting alone in my study – (laughter) – meditating, thinking about how to win the future – (laughter) – I pondered this critique, and calmly rejected it – (laughter and applause) – as thoroughly illogical. (Laughter.) And for all those who think I golf too much, let me be clear. I'm not spending time on the golf course – I'm investing time on the golf course.*

(<http://politicalhumor.about.com/od/barackobama/a/Obamas-Gridiron-Speech.htm>)

In this excerpt, Obama rejects the accusation of being superficial. He refuses to consider that he wastes time on the golf course; he completes the negation by adding that in fact he is “investing” time.

(8) **François Hollande:** *Il n'y a eu que 300 cas concernés.*
Nicolas Sarkozy: *Non, 300 femmes qui ont retrouvé la liberté.*

(<http://presidentielle2012.ouest-france.fr/decryptage>)

Reaching the subject of Muslims living in France, Sarkozy insists on the accusation that Hollande has not had the courage to sign the interdiction for wearing the veil for Muslim women. Hollande makes the excuse that only 300 cases were involved, but for Sarkozy they are not simple cases. The president rejects Hollande's belief and corrects him by saying that those are not just cases, they are human beings that regained their freedom (“No, there are 300 women who have regained their freedom”).

(9) **Nicolas Sarkozy:** *Deuxièmement, fermer Fessenheim, c'est 8000 éoliennes en Alsace pour remplacer Fessenheim. Il ne nous faut pas le nucléaire ou le renouvelable, il nous faut le nucléaire et le renouvelable.*
(<http://presidentielle2012.ouest-france.fr/decryptage>)

Sarkozy uses the polemic negation as an argument against Hollande's intention of closing the nuclear power station of Fessenheim that he considers a reckless decision. A so important disappearance would require 8000 wind turbines installed in Alsace. There are two parts of the polemic negation: the first is represented by the opposition expressed by means of the negation "il ne nous faut pas" / "we do not need" and the second part consists in correcting the information by replacing the conjunctions "ou / et" ("or / and"). Sarkozy refuses to choose from the nuclear and the renewable, he wants to have them both: "Il ne nous faut pas le nucléaire ou le renouvelable, il nous faut le nucléaire et le renouvelable" / "We do not need the nuclear or the renewable, we need the nuclear and the renewable".

5.3. *Refutation*

The act of refutation is strictly related to conflict situations. Refutation is based on the principle of contradiction and its operator is the negation.

Since Aristotle, there is a distinction between two types of refutation: *counter-argumentation* (the rejection of the interlocutor's conclusion) and *objection* (the absence of the argument or the use of a false premise). As the other two strategies, refutation is also a reactive act, responding to a previous act. "Si la relation existant entre le contenu d'une réfutation et celui de l'assertion précédente est une relation de contradiction, cela signifie qu'il existe entre les interlocuteurs un désaccord" (Tuțescu 1998 : 270).

J. Moeschler's (1982) contribution is remembered in M. Tuțescu's work. The theoretician establishes four necessary conditions for the good functioning of the act of refutation: a) the condition of propositional content (the existence of the content of refutation – the proposition P having a contradictory relation with the content Q previously asserted); b) the condition of argumentation (the obligation of justifying the opposition, sustaining it by arguments); c) the condition of reflective sincerity (the interlocutor has to believe that the speaker believes in the falsity of the object of refutation); d) the interactional condition (the interlocutor has the obligation to evaluate the act of refutation) (Moeschler 1982, *apud* Tuțescu 1998: 271–273).

Three refutative strategies are mentioned by V. Allouche (Allouche 1992, *apud* Tuțescu 1998: 275–276), but the examples and the analysis are personal:

- *the refusal* (an opposition to the interlocutor's demand)

(10) **François Hollande:** *Hélas, ce sont les plus modestes qui ont payé vos largesses. Je voudrais savoir quel est le niveau des prélèvements obligatoires puisque vous...? Répondez à ma question.*
Nicolas Sarkozy: *Je n'ai pas à répondre à votre question. Contestez-vous que nous avons les impôts les plus élevés d'Europe? Le contestez-vous?*
(<http://presidentielle2012.ouest-france.fr/decryptage>)

François Hollande is demanding an answer to his question wanting to compromise his adversary by accusing him of having made the poor pay big taxes. Sarkozy rejects his opponent's demand ("Je n'ai pas à répondre à votre question"). The rule of sustaining a point

of view is violated because the speaker refuses to bring arguments. More than that, he uses rhetorical questions to pass his adversary the obligation to answer: “Contez-vous que nous avons les impôts les plus élevés d'Europe? Le contestez-vous?”

- *The opposition* (strategy that involves the power of the participants).

(11) *Nicolas Sarkozy: La France est le pays d'Europe qui, avec la Suède, a les impôts les plus lourds. Est-ce que vous avez conscience que nous sommes dans un monde ouvert? Il y a une différence entre nous. Vous voulez moins de riches, moi je veux moins de pauvres.*

François Hollande: Et à la fois plus de pauvres et des riches plus riches.

Nicolas Sarkozy: Ce n'est pas exact et ce n'est pas une plaisanterie.

(<http://presidentielle2012.ouest-france.fr/decryptage>)

The sequence “Il y a une différence entre nous” accentuates the opposition existing between the participants and hides the speaker’s irony. It is well known that the two are adversaries, so they are situated in an antagonistic relation, voicing that difference is only a manner of manifesting power and superiority.

The next line, belonging to Nicolas Sarkozy, is a case of rejection, another refutative strategy. The speaker refuses to accept what his opponent says and qualifies his assertion as a lie or as a joke: “Ce n'est pas exact et ce n'est pas une plaisanterie”.

- *The rejection* (a refusal of the assertion, a linguistic negation)

(12) *Obama: Production is up.*

Romney: is down.

Obama: No, it isn't.

(<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/10/16/transcript-second-presidential-debate/#ixzz2CaW0tabB>)

This example illustrates how antonymy functions as a rejection strategy. Having a contradictory discussion related to the difficult financial period France is going through, the two participants have two opposed viewpoints. Romney rejects Obama’s point of view that production is up by using the antonym “down”. Obama does not abandon the discussion and uses the negation “No, it isn’t” to reject his opponent’s assertion.

(13) *Obama: Bob, let me just respond. Nothing Governor Romney just said is true, starting with this notion of me apologizing. This has been probably the biggest whopper that's been told during the course of this campaign. And every fact checker and every reporter who's looked at it, Governor, has said this is not true.*

(Barack Obama and Mitt Romney at Hofstra University in Hempstead, N.Y. on Oct. 16, 2012.)

Obama brings into attention the propositional content with which he disagrees: his opponent’s opinion that at the beginning of his presidency he had an “apology tour”. Romney considered that the president was so weak that he began travelling Middle East and criticizing America. Obama denies this accusation rejecting the notion of “apologizing” (“Nothing Governor Romney just said is true”) and classifying it as “whopper”.

(14) **François Hollande:** *C'est tout à fait différent d'inviter tous les parlementaires uniquement de droite. Uniquement de droite. Plusieurs fois. Vous voulez que je vous donne les dates ? Nous les avons.*
Nicolas Sarkozy: *Ce n'est pas exact, j'ai invité tous les parlementaires de la majorité et de l'opposition.* (<http://presidentielle2012.ouest-france.fr/decryptage>)

Sarkozy reacts to the accusation of being partial, inviting to the Elysée Palace only the members of his political orientation and not the majority. The speaker rejects the accusation by means of negation (“Ce n'est pas exact”) followed by the justification in favor of his refutation (“J'ai invité tous les parlementaires de la majorité et de l'opposition”).

5.4. *Metaphor*

Metaphor is a figure of speech based on an analogy between two terms having the role of borrowing traits from one term and transferring them to the other. It functions like an incomplete comparison and besides its aesthetic function, metaphor has an important argumentative function, but this is not the case for every metaphor. M. Le Guern (1981) makes the distinction between poetic metaphor (aesthetic role) and argumentative metaphor (persuasive role).

When using metaphors, the speaker charges the statement he makes with the meaning he desires, according to his intentions. The intentioned meaning is decoded by the addressee according to a system of implications and suppositions.

Metaphors are evaluative statements. Associating them with a certain positive or negative element implies a subjective evaluation: “les métaphores à rôle argumentatif ont un trait constant: les sèmes mobilisés dans le processus de sélection sémique sont des sèmes évaluatifs, des «subjectivèmes»” (Tuțescu 1998: 282– 285).

(15) **Obama:** *And we do have a difference, though, when it comes to definitions of small business. Under – under my plan, 97 percent of small businesses would not see their income taxes go up. Governor Romney says, well, those top 3 percent, they're the job creators, they'd be burdened. But under Governor Romney's definition, there are a whole bunch of millionaires and billionaires who are small businesses. Donald Trump is a small business. Now, I know Donald Trump doesn't like to think of himself as small anything, but – but that's how you define small businesses if you're getting business income. And that kind of approach, I believe, will not grow our economy.*

(<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/10/03/transcript-first-presidentialdebate/#ixzz2ELU2YuZE>)

President's Obama first argumentative strategy is to underline the opposition that exists between him and his political adversary “we do have a difference” so as to underline how reckless is Romney's decision to lower taxes for businesses belonging to people like Donald Trump. The metaphor associating Donald Trump's name with small businesses that will enjoy small taxes is used to attack Romney's way of perceiving things. The analogy is completed with the speaker's own decoding: “I know Donald Trump doesn't like to think of himself as small anything” so as to be more persuasive and effective.

6. Conclusion

Political democratic debates or speeches represent a field where disagreement occupies an important place. Differences of opinion appear as a consequence of the battle for power which

creates conflict situations. Those disputes can be solved by means of argumentation. Despite the negative connotation of disagreement, there are theoreticians who consider this act a way of reaching agreement or finding better solutions to problems.

A frequently encountered situation at the level of the analysis of political confrontations is the abandonment of the subject causing tension due to tertiary intervention (e.g. the moderator of the debate).

Related to the analyzed sources, we can conclude that at the level of the American political debate and speech, the speakers use a great number of negations (descriptive, polemic, metalinguistic) in order to respond to accusations. In the case of the French political speech, the most used strategy of argumentation is the rhetorical question.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Angouri, Jo, Miriam A. Locher, 2012, "Theorising Disagreement", *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44, p. 1549–1553.

Angouri, Jo, 2012, "Managing disagreement in problem solving meeting talk", *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44, p. 1565–1579.

Bello, Jason, 2012, "The dark side of disagreement? Revisiting the effect of disagreement on political participation", *Electoral Studies*, 31, Elsevier, p. 782–795.

Langlotz, Andreas, Miriam A. Locher, 2012 "Ways of communicating emotional stance in online disagreements", *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44, p. 1591–1606

Plantin, Christian, 2005, *L'argumentation – Histoire, théories, perspectives*, Paris, PUF.

Sifianou, Maria, 2012, "Disagreements, face and politeness", *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44, p. 1554–1564.

Tuțescu, Mariana, 1998, *L'Argumentation. Introduction à l'étude du discours*, București, Editura Universității din București.

Van Eemeren, Frans H., Bart Garssen (eds), 2008, *Controversy and Confrontation*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Websites:

<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/10/03/transcript-first-presidential-debate/#ixzz2ELU2YuZE>

<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/10/16/transcript-second-presidential-debate/#ixzz2CaTNfchM>

<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/09/06/transcript-obama-speech-at-dnc/#ixzz2CaMIFeDY>

<http://présidentielle2012.ouest-france.fr/decryptage>

ARGUMENTATIVE STRATEGIES IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

(Résumé)

Au niveau de la communication interpersonnelle il y a toujours de l'accord et du désaccord. Le désaccord est le point de déclenchement de la communication conflictuelle qui peut être résolu par la négociation ou maintenu, tout en conduisant à la contradiction et à la confrontation. On a identifié quelques stratégies argumentatives préférentielles utilisées par les politiciens pour exprimer leur désaccord, pour rejeter un point de vue exprimé par quelqu'un d'autre telles : les interrogations rhétoriques, les négations polémiques, la réfutation et la métaphore.