

The Language of F. D. Roosevelt's 'Pearl Harbour Address to the Nation' Persuasive Call to Arms Discourse: A Rhetorical Criticism

¹ Asst. Lect. Ghaidaa Fahmie Yousif ; ²Asst. Lect. Inas Malik Mnaathar

Abstract

The aim of this work is to analyze the representative speeches of F. D. Roosevelt with a view to getting some meaningful insight into the political oratory (call to arms) in general and of the speaker in particular. The focus of this work is on identifying various linguistic strategies used in 'Pearl Harbour Address to the Nation' for realizing various persuasive strategies, intentions and sub-intentions. For doing so, a model of analysis has been developed to include Aristotelian and Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory. This is to understand F. D. Roosevelt's rhetoric and politeness strategies, which they have used in persuading the masses and influencing their decisions. Hence, this work makes some meaningful observations about persuasive strategies and speech delivery styles of the said orator. In terms of findings, the analysis found that the major intention of the speech and speaker was to persuade the audience to change / affect their view or to take some action as intended by the orator (i.e., persuade the congress to declare war against Japan). Besides that, various strategies have been used to realize these sub/intentions. However, some of these strategies, intentions sub-intentions have been found interlinked, as they have mostly been found occurring together.

Keywords: Call to Arms Discourse, Rhetoric, Politeness, Political Speeches

1. Introduction

Public speech and rhetoric remained a neglected art for centuries. In the modern age it again caught the attention of the scholars and orators. The main reason of this sudden popularity of the study of public speech and persuasive use of language is the democratization of most of the countries and globalization in the field of trade and commerce. Public speech plays very important role in getting a person elected as a public representative. Hence, this art became very necessary for political leaders specially to motivate people in

Thi-Qar University/ College of Education for Humanities/ Department of English 1
General Directorate of Education, Iraq, Thi-Qar.²
gaidaah1979@gmail.com , inas_mnaathar@yahoo.com

times of wars (i.e., call to arms speeches). Call to arms is "the battlefield for the conflict for power and legitimacy between different ideologies, with language playing a vital role." (Katea, 2018:1).

A lot of research has been done in the area of political discourse analysis. Most of these researches used the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis and tried to explore the speeches in terms the factors like dominance, inequality, and subjugation (Long 2011; Alfayez 2009; Murlikrishnan 2011) and a few others tried to use a mixture of Aristotelian and Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory. So, there is still scope of researching the public speeches of select powerful politicians, with a view to understanding their rhetoric and politeness strategies, which they have used in persuading the masses and influencing their decisions.

Accordingly, the present work focuses on the study of deliberative public speech, which affects audience's attitude and behavior regarding going to war. Public speech has been an area of study of discourse analysts and rhetoricians. However, their approaches and research goals were generally different. The researchers see the scope of meaningfully using the existing knowledge for developing a suitable model of persuasive deliberative speech. Therefore, two questions make the base of this work: Can the use of certain strategies make the public speech more persuasive? If yes, then what are those strategies and how are they used and arranged in different parts of a speech? Thereof, the present research may be very fruitful for the practitioners of public speech and the spoken discourse analysts.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST)

Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST) was originally developed by Bill Mann and Sandy Thompson for computer based text generation, and since then it has been used in various projects in Computational Linguistics, Text Linguistics, and Discourse Analysis (Mann et al 1999). This theory identifies and studies different devices which are used in a text for coherence and structural relations. It would be proper to discuss this theory in a little more detail.

RST has been successfully used in the researches in various areas, such as, Computational Linguistics, Discourse Analysis, Psycholinguistics, and Theoretical Linguistics. In Computational Linguistics RST was applied for text generation, parsing, summarization, argument evaluation, machine translation, essay scoring, etc. RST is used not only to generate coherent text with the appropriate discourse markers (Grote et al. 1997b), but also to generate the appropriate intonation in speech synthesis (Grote et al. 1997a). In Discourse Analysis RST has been used by Fox (1987), who compares written and spoken discourse, and examines the relationship between rhetorical structure and anaphoric relations. Virtanen (1995) used RST to analyze a complaint letter while Benwell (1999) analyzed spoken tutorial discourse in Physics and English literature, with an adapted version of RST.

2.1.1. Coherence

Coherence is viewed as the "absence of non-sequiturs and gaps" in the text and every part of the coherent text has a plausible reason for its presence in the place where it is in the text (Mann 1999). RST focuses upon these reasons and connecting devices in the text.

2.1.2. Structure

RST analyzes a text by posing a number of possibilities of structure, identifying and studying various types of building blocks of the texts. The structural components and their relationships are studied at two levels: the first one dealing with nuclearity relations, also called coherence relations and the second one dealing with schemas.

2.1.3. Nucleus-Satellite Relations (RST)

RST studies a text in terms of the structural patterns of two spans – ‘nucleus’ and ‘satellite’. These two spans are virtually adjacent although exceptions can be found. A text has the structures of claim and evidence. Claim has the centrality in the text hence it is called ‘nucleus’. Evidence is secondary and supports the claim hence it is called ‘satellite’. Most likely in a text, we have definite orders of all such relations.

Mann and Thompson (1988: 243-281) gave a definitive set of relations, which are widely used in RST. For example, for the relation of establishing background, the text whose understanding is being facilitated is the nucleus and its satellite is the text for facilitating understanding. For the relationship of Elaboration, the basic information makes the Nucleus and the additional information makes the Satellite. The relationship, in which the ideas favoured by the author are contrasted with the ideas disfavoured by the author, is called Antithesis. In the relationship named Concession, the situation affirmed by author makes the nucleus, and the situation which is apparently inconsistent but also affirmed by author, makes the satellite. In the same way, he explains some more relationships in terms of nucleus and satellite, such as, Evidence, Enablement, Condition, etc. (ibid).

If a relation does not have a particular span of text, which is more central to the author’s purposes, it is called Multinuclear. An example of this phenomenon is the neutral Contrast relation, in which one alternate is balanced against the other contrast. Some other such relations are Joint, List, and Sequence. All these relations simply have a chain of spans. (ibid).

The speakers of public speech need to be acquainted with some major rhetorical devices used in the public speech for persuasive effects. These devices include various tropes like metaphor, antithesis, parallelism, sound bites, three part statements, etc. These devices have their own psychological and rhythmical effects and contribute positively towards persuasion if strategically used.

2.2. Aristotelian Theory of Rhetoric

Aristotle was the first great scholar who studied the persuasive use of language systematically. He identified various techniques of persuasive speaking in the form of his theory of Dialectic and Rhetoric. Dialectic, an art of philosophical disputation, was in the form of intellectual debate in which one speaker used to state the thesis and the other contestant used to refute it mostly by using ‘yes/no’ questions answered by the proposer of the thesis (ibid: 28). The respondent could lead the interlocutor into indefensible position by showing contradictions and by drawing analogies (ibid). Both Dialectic and Rhetoric shared certain similarities. Both try to defend their argument and attack the arguments of others. Both function on the basis of what is probable in the given situation, and take into consideration commonly held public opinions (Aristotle: 1354a in Kennedy 2007: 28). Both use arguments to support their position yet there are certain dissimilarities between Dialectic and Rhetoric. While Dialectic proceeds by questions and answers, Rhetoric uses a

continuous exposition. Unlike Rhetoric, there is no such division as introduction, narration and epilogue in Dialectic. Dialectic has only proofs and refutations. Rhetoric uses proofs (*Logos*) but Rhetoric also uses two additional means of persuasion, namely, trustworthiness and character of the speaker (*Ethos*) and appeal to emotions of the audience (*Pathos*) (ibid: 28).

2.2.1. Trustworthiness (*Ethos*)

Ethos has been defined as the trustworthiness and character of the speaker. It deals with "the effect or appeal of the speaker's character" (Foss 1996: 29). *Ethos* is determined by three characteristics: moral character or integrity, intelligence and good will. The orator should speak in such a way that he should establish his trustworthiness as we believe fair-minded and trustworthy people readily and quickly (Kennedy 2007: 38-39). He can do this by referring to his past good actions and appealing to authority.

Aristotle's theory limits it to the effect of character as conveyed by the words of mouth. He fails to recognize the importance of authority, influence, appearance and setting and context of speech. These factors play very important role in persuading the audience (ibid: 22). People come to listen to the orator because they believe that the person is important, knowledgeable and trustworthy. By using the techniques of Aristotle, the speaker can enhance his character and trustworthiness.

2.2.2. Emotions (*Pathos*)

"*Pathos* concerns appeals designed to generate emotions in the audience" (Foss 1996: 29). Emotions affect the judgment of the audience (Kennedy 2007: 39). In anger, people's reaction is not the same as when they are happy. If a speaker wants to put the audience in a particular frame of mind by arousing a particular emotion, he needs to know all the three aspects of that particular emotion — the state of mind when people

Cicero also corroborates the importance of appeal to emotions. He notes down in his treatise titled *Brutus* the two 'principal qualities' of an orator – "to be neat and clear in stating his subject and warm and forcible in moving" the passions. The speaker who arouses the passions and emotions is more effective than the one who informs and amuses.

2.2.3. Logic (*Logos*)

Appeal to logic is a powerful tool of persuasion as man is rational creature and wants some proof before believing in something. A speech without logical data and proofs looks insincere and this diminishes trustworthiness of the speaker.

Aristotle describes two basic tools of logical persuasion in the second book of *Rhetoric*. These two modes of logical persuasion, namely, Paradigm (i.e., examples) and Enthymeme (i.e., actions) are common to all three forms of Rhetoric. These modes make the core of the logical persuasion.

2.3. Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory

Since politeness is an embellishment highly valued in society, it becomes very important in persuasive use of language. One who is polite is able to persuade his target audience more easily than one who is not so polite. Coulmas sees politeness as the practice of organizing linguistic action so that it is seen as inoffensive and conforming to current social expectations regarding the trouble-free management of communication (2005: 84). The communicators use certain strategies in their communication 'to maintain the social equilibrium and the friendly relations' (Leech 1983: 82). Thus politeness is a desire of not shocking and hurting others,

but gratifying and pleasing others. Altruism and egoism mingle here. The desire to please and to create a favorable impression can perhaps be satisfied by a mask better than by the real face (Watts 2003: 33).

Brown and Levinson (1987) gave a theory of politeness which is based on management of 'face'. 'Face' may be defined as every individual's feeling of self-worth or self-image. It refers to the positive social value a person claims for himself (Goffman 1967: 5 cited in Thomas 1995: 168). This image can be damaged, maintained or enhanced through interaction with other people of society. The notion of being embarrassed or humiliated is associated with 'losing face'. The maintenance of face is nothing else but giving respect to others and not harming their public and self-image. The face is enhanced by appreciation, thanking and praise. Brown and Levinson categorize 'face' into two kinds – negative face and positive face. A person's desire of not getting impeded by others is known as negative face.

Negative face is maintained by the actions like showing deference, formality and the concern for other person's time, money and effort. Positive face is a desire of getting respect, co-operation, praise, and acceptance by others. Positive face is maintained by the actions like showing love, acceptance, reassurance, encouragement and familiarity. The act of harming the public image and self-image of a person is known as Face Threatening Act (FTA) and the strategies used for minimizing the face threat are called Face Saving Act (FSA). The face saving act for a person's negative face shows deference, emphasizes the importance of others time or concerns, and even includes an apology for the imposition or interruption. This is called negative politeness. While a face saving act which is concerned with a person's positive face shows solidarity and emphasizes common interests of the speaker and the hearer both. It is called positive politeness.

Some actions like orders, requests, suggestions, advice, reminding, threats, warnings, threaten the negative face as they put some pressure on the hearer (Brown and Levinson 1987: 65-58). The acts like offers and promises show the speaker's positive future act towards the hearer and put some pressure on hearer to accept or reject them. The acts like lust, compliment and envy, which show speaker's desire towards the hearer or his goods, put some pressure on the hearer as he needs to protect the speaker's desire or give it to the speaker.

There are some acts that threaten hearer's positive face want. These acts indicate the speaker's avoiding care of hearer's feelings and needs. These acts involve speaker's negative assessment of some aspect of hearer's positive face expressed through disapproval, criticism, contempt, ridicule, complaints, reprimands, accusations, contradictions, disagreements and challenges. The hearer's positive face is also threatened through expressing violent emotions, irreverence, mention of taboo topics, bringing of bad news about hearer or good news about speaker, raising of dangerously emotional or divisive topics like politics, race, religion, blatant non-cooperation in an activity like making non-sequiturs or showing non-attention, interrupting hearer's talk, use of address terms and other status-marked identifications in initial encounters.

Brown and Levinson suggest the strategies for performing face threatening acts. An individual may choose to do a face threatening act or may not choose to do it. If he wants to perform face threatening act, there are mainly four possibilities of performing it

This type of Face threatening is done directly and without any redressive act and is called bald-on-record strategy. The face threatening act done baldly is the least polite.

This theory of politeness has some relevance in the study of persuasion in public speech. The public speakers use these strategies for showing their attitudes and manners and relation with the audience. However, persuasion in a public speech involves many more strategies which go beyond politeness theory. This simplicity in labelling of

Strategies give the researcher required freedom in identifying the linguistic strategies.

2.4. Major intentions

A public speaker has a major intention in his speech. The word major intention has been used to denote the purpose of a public speech. This purpose may be to persuade, to dissuade, to praise, to blame, to falsify, to prove, to describe, etc. In a forensic speech, the major intention of the speaker is to prove or to falsify something. In an epideictic speech, the major intention of the speaker is to praise or to criticise an individual or an institution. Similarly in a deliberative speech, the major intention of the speaker is to persuade the audience. For example, in the speech of election campaign, the major intention of the speaker is to persuade the masses to vote in favour of the speaker. For fulfilling this major intention, the speaker has many sub-intentions in different parts of the speech and these sub-intentions revolve around the major intention. The major intention in all the speeches under study is to persuade the audience for some or the other action. However, there may be many more major intentions depending upon the nature of speech.

2.5. Sub-intentions

In various parts of a speech, the public speaker has various sub-intentions. The word 'sub-intention' has been used to denote the ad hoc purpose of the speaker in a particular part of a speech. The cumulative effect of realization of the sub-intentions is seen in the form of realization of the major intention in a particular speech. For instance, in the opening part of the speech, the sub-intention of an orator is generally to connect to the audience. In the subsequent parts there may be many more sub-intentions, such as, establishing trustworthiness and enhancing character, stating the issue, elaborating the issue, enhancing the issue, appealing to emotions, suggesting action, boosting appeal to action, appeal to logic, and concluding the speech. These sub-intentions may slightly vary in various speeches but in most political speeches the similarity of pattern has been observed. However, two or more sub-intentions may be simultaneously present in some units of a speech.

2.6. Strategies

A strategy may be defined as linguistic and paralinguistic efforts made by an orator to fulfill a particular sub-intention in certain units of his speech. The speakers use various strategies in order to fulfil the sub-intentions mentioned earlier. For example, in the opening section of the speech, most of the speakers have the sub-intention of connecting to the audience. For realizing his intention, the speaker may use different strategies, such as, greeting, thanking, sharing goal, showing association, etc. Similarly for appealing to emotion, the speaker may use the strategies like using emotionally charged words, emotive metaphors, mentioning emotive incidents, etc.

3. Methodology and Data Analysis

The analytical framework of this research has partially been modelled upon Aristotelian Theory of Rhetoric, and Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory. Since all these two theories have been discussed in detail in the first chapter, we are mentioning only those factors which influenced the present model of analysis. Using Aristotelian Theory of Rhetoric, the speech analysts identify and analyze Aristotle's three means of persuasion, namely *Ethos*, *Pathos* and *Logos*, given in the second book of his famous treatise *On Rhetoric*.

By *Ethos*, Aristotle means the trustworthiness of the speaker, which he establishes by different techniques. Aristotle finds *Pathos* or appeal to emotion very important and powerful tool of persuasion in a public speech. *Logos* is the use of logical arguments which a speaker gives with the help of paradigms and enthymemes.

Aristotle's three means of persuasion have been found relevant for the present study. However, there is still scope for improvement upon this theory. These three means of persuasion seem very broad categories which need further elaboration. Various techniques or strategies which result in ethos, pathos, and logos, need to be identified. Thus, there is a need of looking at public speech from a different perspective, taking into consideration the contemporary needs and developments in the area of public speech as things tend to change in due course of time. These three means of persuasion have been used as three sub-intentions of the speaker, which contribute in realizing the major intention of persuasion in a speech.

The second theory that helped in developing this model is Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory, in which the concept of persuasive strategies in the present work has been modelled upon 'strategies', and 'metastrategies' as used in their Politeness Theory. Brown and Levinson used the terms for saving face, and enhancing face as discussed in detail in the previous chapter. However, in the present model the term 'strategy' has been used to denote linguistic efforts done by a speaker in order to realize his persuasive intention. The researchers also identify the intentions/sub-intentions and strategies used in the selected speech. Hence, the speech has been analyzed in terms of intentions and strategies. The idea of relating major intention, sub-intentions and strategies has been modelled upon John M.

4. Discussion and Analysis

In order to get a meaningful insight into the structure of the speech under study, the sub-intentions and strategies have been studied in a sequence. The intention behind doing so is to understand the use of certain rhetorical strategies that make the speech of call to arms more persuasive on one hand, and on the other hand, to study the patterns of the intentions and strategies to understand the structure of a persuasive political speech in general. Therefore, some examples have been quoted from the speech in this study for a better understanding of the definition of these sub-intentions and strategies.

4.1. Connecting to the audience

This sub-intention generally occurs in the opening part of the speech, when the speaker tries to connect to the audience. However, a skilled orator uses the connecting strategies at various places in his speech to make sure that the audience are well connected to him throughout his speech. If the speaker does not build a good rapport with the audience and fails to connect to them, his speech will not be attentively listened to and his intended purpose will be defeated. For fulfilling this sub-intention, the speaker uses various strategies in his speech.

4.2. Sharing goal

In this strategy, the speaker shows that his goal and interests are the same as that of the audience. By doing so, he builds a strong rapport with the audience and the speaker and the audience come on the same platform as they have common interests. To enhance this strategy, Roosevelt elaborates the issue by using the strategy of describing the components. He states that the attack was preplanned several days in advance and Japan's false statements and expressions of hope for continued peace were only for deceiving America.

It will be recorded that the distance of Hawaii from Japan makes it obvious that the attack was deliberately planned many days or even weeks ago. During the intervening time, the Japanese government has deliberately sought to deceive the United States by false statements and expressions of hope for continued peace.

The issue is amplified by showing the contrast between Japan’s hypocrisy of holding a dialogue for maintenance of peace and preplan of attacking America. The issue is also amplified by contrasting Japan’s false statements and expressions of hope for continued peace with its purpose of deceiving America.

4.3. Showing association

It is the second important strategy the orators use for connecting to the audience. In this strategy, the speaker shows affiliation to the race, class, caste, place, gender, or age group of the audience. This strategy is very effective, as it easily relates the speaker to the audience and brings both of them on a common platform. This strategy is generally used with the strategy of sharing goal. F.D. Roosevelt uses this strategy for connecting to the audience. For this purpose he uses first person inclusive pronouns ‘we’ ‘ourselves’ and ‘us’. The strategy of sharing goal and showing association has also been used when the speaker shows his concern for the safety of his countrymen.

I believe that I interpret the will of the Congress and of the people when I assert that we will not only defend ourselves to the uttermost, but will make it very certain that this form of treachery shall never again endanger us.

Furthermore, the use of the first person singular pronoun ‘I’ shows that Roosevelt was authoritative and somewhat dominating in his approach. The sense of domination is softened with the use of the first person inclusive pronouns. By using the first person inclusive pronouns, the speaker shares the responsibility of the consequences that may result from Roosevelt’s decision of attacking Japan. One more strategy, Roosevelt associates himself with the audience by invoking a feeling of nationalism and patriotism. He directly and indirectly indicates that the speaker and the audience have the same feeling of nationalism and patriotism and they have a common intention of punishing Japan for the attack on Pearl Harbor.

4.4. Name or designation

It is a popular strategy in formal oratory. In this strategy, the speaker addresses to the audience by mentioning their, names, designations, and group identities. It is a direct approach for calling the attention and connecting to the audience. F. D. Roosevelt has used this strategy in his ‘Pearl Harbor Address to the Nation’. Please see the examples in Table (1)

No.	Examples	Sub- Intention	Strategies
1.	Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Senate, and of the House of Representatives:	Connecting	Addressing by name or designation
2.	Yesterday, December 7th, 1941	Introducing the issue	Referring to the past (date)
3.	A date which will live in infamy		
	The United States of America was suddenly and deliberately attacked by naval and air forces of the Empire	Stating the issue	By using statement

	of Japan.		
--	-----------	--	--

Table (1)

The sub-intention of introducing the issue is related to giving the background of the major issues in the speech. The orator in the study has been found using the strategies of referring to history and contrasting the past with the present situation for introducing the issue. The orator uses the strategy of referring to history for introducing the issue by giving a historical background of the issue in the speech. This strategy establishes the seriousness of the issue and attracts ample attention of the audience.

The choice of the strategy for stating the issue depends upon the nature and sensitivity of the issue. If the issue is very logical and less sensitive, the speaker states it directly by using direct statement, and in case the topic is very sensitive, the indirect approach for introducing the topic is preferred.

On the other hand, the speaker amplifies the issue in the background of the appeal to emotions of anger and sorrow. For amplifying the issue and appealing to emotion of anger, the speaker uses the strategy of using emotionally charged words and events. December 7, 1941 has been termed as 'a date which will live in infamy'. It reminds the audience of their defeat and great losses at Pearl Harbor. Emotionally charged amplifying words like 'suddenly' and 'deliberately' arouse the audience's animosity against Japan and amplify the issue of the Japanese attack. The low pitch and slow pace used in the delivery of this unit lends gravity and seriousness to the orator's character. Roosevelt seems determinant and authoritative due to confidence and gravity in his tone.

4.6. Establishing trustworthiness and enhancing character

The sub-intention of establishing trustworthiness and enhancing character denotes the speaker's intention to establish himself as an honest man of character, who is trustworthy. Aristotle is of the view that this is very powerful means of persuasion in public speech. He has called it *ethos* in his book *On Rhetoric*. If the audiences are not convinced about the trustworthiness of the speaker, they will not be persuaded to believe in what the speaker says. For establishing trustworthiness, the speaker uses certain linguistic strategies such as showing hope and confidence. Fostering hope of the followers is a quality of a leader.

Roosevelt encourages and motivates his audience and countrymen by showing them hope of their absolute victory. The speaker motivates and encourages the audience by showing trust in American people. He almost assures the audience of their 'absolute victory' in their war against Japan. In his powerful voice Roosevelt motivates the Americans saying "No matter how long it may take us to overcome this premeditated invasion, the American people in their righteous might will win through to absolute victory". By using the word 'righteous might' Roosevelt also indicates that their war is holy. This gives a religious touch to his motivation. The history of religions is a witness that this myth of 'holy war' is capable of motivating people for war more than anything else.

Another strategy the speaker uses to enhance his character is the strategy of "religion". By doing so, Roosevelt like other people seeking help from God are thought to be saintly in character. Seeking help from God also creates the political ideology of 'holy war'. Later this ideology of 'holy war' resulted in massive destruction in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

4.7. Mentioning emotive incidents

In the strategy of mentioning emotive incidents, the speaker tries to stir the emotions of the audience by mentioning the events, incidents and stories in which some emotive incident is described. F. D. Roosevelt describes the emotive incident of Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in order to arouse the emotions of anger and sorrow in the audience, as in the following example:

I regret to tell you that very many American lives have been lost. In addition, many American ships have been reported torpedoed on the high seas between San Francisco and Honolulu.

Moreover, Roosevelt appeals to emotions of the audience by using emotionally charged words like 'torpedoed', 'very many', 'severe damage', etc. He stirs the emotion of sorrow and anger by using the strategy of mentioning sorrowful incident of the death of many American soldiers and the destruction of many American ships. It is also noteworthy that Roosevelt delivers sorrowful information in quite low pitch and intensity aggravating its emotive effect. The speaker's voice was quite heavy with sorrow and has the vibrations of anger and vengeance. This can be interpreted as a rhetorical political strategy to support his appeal for action. Roosevelt supports his appeal for action by mentioning "the unprovoked and dastardly attack by Japan on Sunday". This phrase also stirs the emotions of anger and revenge as the words like 'dastardly' are emotionally charged. Roosevelt concludes his speech by summarizing his speech in the following words:

I ask that the Congress declare that since the unprovoked and dastardly attack by Japan on Sunday, December 7th, 1941, a state of war has existed between the United States and the Japanese empire.

4.8. Direct suggestion

In his 'Pearl Harbor Address to the Nation', F.D. Roosevelt uses the strategy of direct suggestion, when he asks the Congress to declare war against Japan.

I ask that the Congress declare that since the unprovoked and dastardly attack by Japan on Sunday, December 7th, 1941 a state of war has existed between the United States and the Japanese empire.

In this sub-intention, the speaker proposes some action or belief for affecting the attitude and behaviour of the audience. The action may be suggested directly or indirectly. Indirectly it related to the amplification of the appeal to action. For boosting the appeal to action, the speaker uses various strategies like description and repetition. Roosevelt uses the strategy of describing component for elaborating the issue. Each example in the following lines gives one piece of information about the Japanese attack. This repetitive parallel sentence series gives the rhetorical effect that attacks are too numerous to leave any scope for doubting the destructive intention of the Empire of Japan. Please mark the following lines from Roosevelt's 'Pearl Harbour Address'.

Yesterday, the Japanese government also launched an attack against Malaya.
Last night, Japanese forces attacked Hong Kong.
Last night, Japanese forces attacked Guam.
Last night, Japanese forces attacked the Philippine Islands.
Last night, the Japanese attacked Wake Island.
And this morning, the Japanese attacked Midway Island.

On the one hand this repetition reinforces the issue and on the other hand it expands and exaggerates the information leading to intense emotive effect on the audience. Thereof, Logical deduction has been used for logical appeal. Roosevelt uses syllogistic deduction to prove Japan's surprise offensive. The conclusive statement is preceded by a series of proofs. The speaker leads the audience to a logical conclusion in the statement "Japan has, therefore, undertaken a surprise offensive extending throughout the Pacific area".

4.9. Presenting facts

For the sub-intention of appeal to logic, the speaker uses the strategy of presenting facts. This strategy gives credibility to the statements of the speakers and thus persuades the audience in believing in what the speaker says. F. D. Roosevelt presents the facts of Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in his speech.

Yesterday, the Japanese government also launched an attack against Malaya. Last night, Japanese forces attacked Hong Kong. Last night, Japanese forces attacked Guam. Last night, Japanese forces attacked the Philippine Islands. And this morning, the Japanese attacked Midway Island.

In this particular example we can see that the speaker uses "Enthymemes" as syllogistic arguments supported by at least one premise. These arguments present the argument in the form of common understanding. Aristotle stressed the use of enthymemes for logical appeals. This example also can be understood as Paradigms which are designed in the form of stories and anecdotes, which may be real or imaginary. With the help of these stories and anecdotes, the speaker tries to bring some point home or prove some argument. This sub-intention is very important because in this part the speaker ensures that the audiences take the intended action. For concluding the speech, the speaker may use the strategy of "fear" to threaten the audience from future suggested action(s) by Japan. This is to restating the central issue and restating the appeal to action.

5. Conclusion

The present work focuses on the study of one important deliberative type of public speech. It is the speech of war (call to arms speech). This type of discourse aims to affect audience's attitude and behavior regarding going to war. The analysis of F. D. Roosevelt's 'Pearl Harbor Address to the Nation' shows that F. D. Roosevelt is authoritative and powerful leader and an overly confident orator. In this deliberative speech analyzed, the major intention is to persuade the audience to change / affect their view or to take some action as intended by the orator. In which Roosevelt tries to persuade the congress to declare war against Japan.

In each of these quoted and analyzed examples it is found that the base of the major intention is the intended compliance of the audience to the orator's view point. This compliance is effected by orator's endeavour of affecting the attitude and decisions of the audience by using various persuasive strategies, intentions and sub-intentions. The realization of these various sub-intentions creates the cumulative effect of the realization of the major intention. It is found that various strategies to realize these intentions have been used. However, some of these strategies, intentions sub-intentions have been found interlinked, as they have mostly been found occurring together. Therefore, and because of these sub-intentions are not frequent and they can easily be covered under the given sub-intentions, they have not been separately studied.

For further research to understand the American call to arms discourse we suggest a comparative study of powerful American public speakers during the time of war. This is to get a comprehensive and meaningful insight into the American call to arms discourse, and to understand the structure of political speeches on the basis of the similarities in the use of persuasive strategies and speech delivery styles in their speeches.

References

- Benwell, B. (1999) "The Organisation of Knowledge in British University Tutorial Discourse: Issues, Pedagogic Discourse Strategies and Disciplinary Identity". In *Pragmatics*, 9 (4), (pp. 535- 565).
- Brown, P. & S. C. Levinson (1987) *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coulmas, F. (2005) *Sociolinguistics: The Study of Speakers' Choices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foss, S. K. (1996) *Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration & Practice* (2nd ed.). Illinois: Waveland Press.
- Fox, B. A. (1987) *Discourse Structure and Anaphora: Written and Conversational English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grote, B., E. Hagen, A. Stein & E. Teich (1997a). "Speech Production in Human-Machine Dialogue: A Natural Language Generation Perspective". In E. Maier, M. Mast and S. Luperfoy (Eds.), *Dialogue Processing in Spoken Language Systems*. (pp. 70-85). Berlin: Springer.
- Grote, B., N. Lenke & M. Stede. (1997b) "Ma(r)king Concessions in English and German". In *Discourse Processes*, 24, (pp. 87-117).
- Katea, H. (2018). *Understanding Discursive Persuasion in American and Iraqi Call to Arms Discourse: Discursive Strategies as Instruments of Persuasive Politics* (Doctoral dissertation, Bangor University).
- Kennedy, G. A (Trans.) (2007) *Aristotle On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*, (2nd Ed.) Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Leech, G. N. (1983) *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman.

Long, J. (2011) "Critical Discourse Analysis of Roosevelt's Pearl Harbor Speech". In

Journal of Kaili University, 4. Retrieved on 21 July 2020

< http://en.cnki.com.cn/Article_en/CJFDTotat-QDNS201104035.htm>

Mann, B. (1999) "An Introduction to Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST)"

Mann, W.C., & S.A. Thompson (1988) "Rhetorical Structure Theory: Toward a
Functional Theory of Text Organization. In *Text*, 8 (3) (pp. 243-281).

Muralikrishnan.T.R (2011) "Critical Discourse Analysis: Politics and Verbal coding".

In *Language in India*. Retrieved on 15th Feb. 2019

<http://www.languageinindia.com/may2011/muralikrishnan.pdf>

Roosevelt, F. D. (8th Dec.1941) "Pearl Harbor Address to the Nation" (Text and Speech)

Retrieved on 12 Aug. 2019 www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/fdrpearlharbor.htm

Watts, R. J. (2003) *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.