



# FOOTING IN POLITICAL SPEECH: MARGARET THATCHER AND THE SUPREME SOVIET ON MAY 28, 1991

**Jopi Nyman**

University of Joensuu

This paper shows that the use of personal pronouns in Margaret Thatcher's 1991 speech "Fundamentals, Principles & Politics" addressed to the members of the Supreme Soviet in Moscow connects questions of national representation with issues of global power politics. The paper applies Ensink's (1997) systematic model of the analysis of footing in political speeches to Thatcher's speech. Through a quantitative and qualitative analysis of deictic pronouns and non-deictic references in the speech, it was found that *we* and *you* in particular functioned as signals of participants' political roles constructed socially and these roles were varying rather than stable. It was also found that the use of deixis also indicated national issues: the speaker and her audience are representatives of their nations and respective power blocs. The analysis also revealed that the speech represented such roles as being opposed to each other.

**Keywords:** footing, political speech, Margaret Thatcher

## 1 INTRODUCTION

On certain formal occasions such as state visits and international meetings one of the functions of the political speech is to represent nation, and the speech never merely presents the views of a single

individual who addresses a listening audience. As both the speaker and the audience of the political speech are more complex entities than mere speaking and listening heads, it has been pointed out that the analysis of such speech acts demands models that depart from the traditional communication model and take into account the social context of the speech situation and its particular participant roles.

To address the question of representation, in this paper I will apply the concept of footing coined by Erving Goffman (1979) and developed by Stephen Levinson (1986) to one political speech, Margaret Thatcher's "Fundamentals, Principles & Policies", presented to the members of the Supreme Soviet in Moscow on 28 May 1991. This speech shows how a British politician addresses the Russian government in the late-communist perestroika period. My specific method is based on the model proposed by the Dutch linguist Titus Ensink (1997), who has argued that footing is most explicitly present in deixis. In his study of the speech presented by the Dutch Queen Beatrix to the Knesset, the parliament of Israel, Ensink analysed the use of deictic formulations, particularly personal pronouns, and found that their use is highly representative. Thus, the article has two interrelated aims. First, I will show that the use of personal pronouns in the speech connects questions of national representation with issues of global power politics. Second, I will apply Ensink's model of the analysis of footing in political speeches to Thatcher's speech.

## 2 DEFINING TERMS: FOOTING, DEIXIS, REPRESENTATION

The concept of footing plays a central role in the analysis of communicative speech situations. Developed by the social analyst Erving Goffman, the rather vague (and general) term appears to have something to do with situations in which "[p]articipant's

alignment, or set, or stance, or posture, or projected self is somehow at issue” (1979: 4). Through examples ranging from President Nixon’s comments on a female journalist’s dress during a press conference to the Gumperzes’ analysis of teacher-pupil interaction, Goffman argues that the role of the participant in a speech situation is never merely neutral but constructed socially and contextually. This is evident in his comments on changes in footing:

A change in footing implies change in the alignment we take up to ourselves and the others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance. A change in our footing is another way of talking about a change in our frame of events. This paper is largely concerned with pointing out that participants over the course of their speaking constantly change their footing, these changes being a persistent feature of natural talk. (Goffman 1979: 5)

To achieve his aim of promoting a social understanding of speech situations, Goffman (1979) criticizes the traditional mechanical communication model that defines its participants as ‘speakers’ and ‘hearers.’ Goffman, and several theorists after him, emphasize that social encounters often involve more than the two roles, and that conversations are not the only mode of talk. Thus the notion of the hearer should be replaced with that of the audience where several different roles can be found (1979: 12–14); similarly, the speaking individual is not merely an “I” but the words are uttered “in the name of ‘we’” (1979: 17). Thus Goffman distinguishes between different aspects of production format, including such roles for the speaker as **animator** (speaker as a talking machine), **author** (selector of words), and **principal** (whose words and views are uttered). Seidlhofer clarifies the role division in the following manner by referring to the opening speech by the Queen to the British parliament:

[She] is a typical animator: she has not written the speech herself, but she lends expression to it, serves as its mouthpiece, produces talk. Whoever **has** formulated the speech, selected the sentiments and the words, that is to say, created the talk, is the author. But this speech

writer is not the originator, the person responsible for these ideas, the one who is committed to them, and whose position is being staked out by the speech: that is not the author's, but the principal's role. (Seidlhofer 1995: 207; emphasis original)

In other words, footing phenomena concern shifts from one role to another, and in any sequence of talk their presence shows that the speaker does not merely function as herself but plays more than one role. According to Levinson's reading of Goffman (1986: 168), at the linguistic level, changes in footing can be seen as changes in participation.

While Levinson considers Goffman's model a notable advance (1986: 168–169), he also pays attention to its deficiencies, especially to its lack of empirical back-up, unclear definition of categories, and failure to separate single **utterance-events** from more general **speech-events**. What Levinson suggests (1986: 170–174) is a more developed model to analyse the interaction, including both speaker- and hearer-related roles, i.e., production and reception roles. According to Ensink (1997: 9–10), it is possible to present the realization of the roles as defined by Levinson in the form of questions. These questions, coined by Ensink, will also function as the basis of the research questions of this article. Table 1 below shows the questions dealing with production roles and Table 2 those clarifying reception roles. These questions will guide my analysis of the speech presented by Margaret Thatcher.

TABLE 1. Questions defining production roles (Ensink 1997: 10).

---

P1	Is the person a direct participant in the situation?
P2	Is the person directly involved in the physical transmission of the message?
P3	Has the person a motive or desire to communicate the message?
P4	Is the person responsible for or involved in devising the form or format of the message?

---

TABLE 2. Questions defining reception roles (Ensink 1997: 10).

R1	Is the person a direct participant in the situation, having a ratified role?
R2	Is the person directly addressed by the speaker and/or his message?
R3	Is the person intended to be a/the receiver of the information of the message?
R4	Does the person have immediate access to the channel so as to be able to receive the message directly?

In his discussion of the questions determining production roles, Ensink points out that all four questions can “be answered either affirmatively or negatively” (1997: 9). For example, an ordinary conversation with two participants gives an affirmative answer to all four questions in Table 1. Different answers to the questions reveal that the speech situation is somewhat different. The same holds for the questions defining reception roles.

Goffman, however, while emphasizing the role of language in the speech situation, remains rather vague about the linguistic markers of footing, of participant roles. Levinson, however, refers to the role of deixis in this respect. According to Levinson, it is through the use of demonstratives, personal pronouns and specific adverbs (time and place) that language is related to its use: “deixis concerns the ways in which languages encode or grammaticalize features of the context of utterance or speech event, and thus also concerns ways in which the interpretation of utterances depends on the analysis of that context of utterance” (1983: 54). Thus the personal pronoun *you* may function as a direct way of addressing the audience or refer to some larger group it represents. Similarly, such words as *this*, *today* and *here* are also contextually defined.

Levinson also argues (1988: 182–183) that first and second person pronouns function as prototype categories of a certain kind, and that the dyadic form of conversation is, if not universal in informal talk, at least so common that the participant roles of ‘speaker’ and ‘addressee’ render others as non-participants. While there are other ways of marking participant roles grammatically

(and different languages have different formulae), personal pronouns appear to form a central group in this respect, and have proved to be useful in analyzing footing (see Ensink, 1997: 13). To quote Wortham: “Personal pronouns [...] refer to individuals and groups and thus contribute denoted content to what the participants are talking about. But they successfully refer by indexing some person or group that occupies a particular interactional role in the narrating event. I refers by indexing the person speaking in the narrating event” (1996: 333). Thus, to be able to address the questions of reference and representation in political speech, I will pay particular attention to the use of personal pronouns as markers of person deixis. In so doing, I will also be able to benefit from Ensink’s analysis relying on the same method.

Finally, the term political speech needs to be defined. In this paper I will follow Ensink (1997), who defines the term in the strict sense as formal speeches uttered by politicians that are to be distinguished from political discourse in general. It has been argued that their analysis is most efficient when linguistic and political phenomena are connected with each other. Schäffner (1997: 3–4) has pointed out that there are two possible alternatives: one can start from the micro-level, the language of the speech and examine what purposes its structures (choice of words, syntax) aim at, or one can start at the macro-level and proceed towards the linguistic structures that are utilized to achieve the aims of the communication situation. In my analysis of the speech by Margaret Thatcher, I will focus on the micro-level, especially the use of deictic personal pronouns, and relate the findings of the analysis to more general issues of politics.

## 3 MATERIAL AND METHOD

### 3.1 DATA: DESCRIPTION AND FEATURES

The material of this speech consists of a speech given by the British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher to the members of the Supreme Soviet in Moscow 1991. The text of the speech “Fundamentals, Principles & Policies” is freely available on the Internet at the website [www.margaretthatcher.com](http://www.margaretthatcher.com). The text was downloaded and edited into machine readable form. With the help of the OUP’s WordSmith language analysis programme, the following numerical data concerning the speech was found (see Table 3 below):

TABLE 3. Quantitative description of the data

---

Words	2,974
Paragraphs	62
Sentences	156
Sentence length (words)	19.02

---

The length of the speech is 2,974 words and it has 62 paragraphs. It consists of 156 sentences and the average sentence length is 19.02 words. The average sentence length is quite close to the average sentence length in written English in general, and it is very close to the average length of a Margaret Thatcher speech (see Nyman 2004).

### 3.2 METHOD: ENSINK’S MODEL

Since the aim of the study was to find out about footing and representation in political speech and to test the applicability of Ensink’s (1997) model, the analysis followed the method developed by Ensink. In his analysis of the 1995 speech by the Dutch Queen Beatrix presented to the Israeli Parliament Knesset, Ensink located formulations related to the Queen, the Knesset, and what they represent (Holland, Israel, and the Jewish people). These were then categorized into two groups on the basis of whether they contain

deictic elements (especially personal pronouns) or non-deictic references.

My analysis follows that presented by Ensink although the model has been somewhat simplified. First, all references in the text to Margaret Thatcher, the Supreme Soviet, and to the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union (or more generally to the West and the East) were selected. Since Margaret Thatcher no longer was the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, it was decided that the analysis includes both references to the UK and the West in general. At the next stage these references were divided into two groups on the basis whether they were deictic formulations or non-deictic descriptions. Then it was examined whether the formulation refers to the particular category or not. Sometimes the reference remained slightly ambiguous; some of these cases are particularly interesting, however, and will be commented on in discussing the results of the analysis. Since the role of personal pronouns has been emphasized in earlier research, the analysis of deixis was limited to them. In all examples below, the symbol P refers to paragraph in the text.

Table 4 shows how the analysis was carried out. Following Ensink's model, all personal pronouns, explicit addresses and non-deictic descriptions were entered into the table. If they included an explicit or implicit reference to the speaker (Margaret Thatcher; MT), the audience (The Supreme Soviet; SS), or to the nations/peoples they represented (Soviet Union, East) and Great Britain, West), they were marked with the symbol + . The ambiguous cases where tight classification remained impossible were indicated with the symbol ?. In the case of non-deictic descriptions, analysis remained at sentence level: if the sentence referred (either explicitly or implicitly) to any of the four topics, it was taken into account as one reference. Each sentence was analysed individually, which to some extent increased the number of non-deictic descriptions since occasionally a whole set of sentences dealt with the same topic. In the case of deictic pronouns, all instances were analysed.

TABLE 4. Example of method.

P	Deictic pronouns/ Addressees (Add)	Non-deictic descriptions	MT	SS	SU/ East	GB/ West
1	<i>Thank you for</i>			+		
	<i>giving me the privilege of addressing</i>		+			
	<i>members of the Supreme Soviet.</i>		Add			
		<i>within the Soviet Union itself and between East and West</i>			+	
					+	+

## 4 RESULTS

In discussing the results, I will first discuss some general findings concerning the use of personal pronouns (Section 4.1) and then present answers to the questions P1-4 and R1-4 mentioned above (Section 4.2).

### 4.1 PRONOUNS AND THEIR USE

It was found that there were slightly more non-deictic formulations (N=97) in the text than there were deictic personal pronouns (N=89) which can also be seen in Table 5. In addition to deictic pronouns, two references to addressees were found. The number of first-person pronouns is higher in the text (N=57) than that of second-person pronouns (N=32). The addressees were explicitly mentioned twice.

TABLE 5. Number of deictic and non-deictic formulations in data.

Deictic Formulations	N
Deictic pronouns in all	89
I/me/my	35
We/us/our	22
Your/your	32
Addressees	2
Non-deictic formulations	97

The data was further examined to find out whether the use of personal pronouns is limited to the speaker or addressee, or whether it involves issues of representation. Table 6 shows the results concerning the first-person pronouns. It should be noted that the same pronoun can be used in both referential and representative manner.

TABLE 6. Reference and representation in first-person pronouns.

Pronoun	Reference to speech event	Representative	General
I/me/my	35	3	-
We/us/our	1	22	3

The case of the singular *I/me/my* is quite clear. They always refer to the speech event and the speaker. It is in rare cases that they extend beyond the speaker, but three such instances were found: once MT for instance talks about “*my country*” (P15) and once she considers herself a representative of the West (P32). With reference to the plural *we/us/our*, the use of these pronouns in this speech is mainly representative, referring to Britain or the West in general, but in some cases the audience is at least implicitly included in the general sense inclusive of both the speaker and the audience: “*we all profoundly hope not*” (P49). Yet it is very seldom that the speaker wishes to construct a communal sense of we-ness that would include her and her audience: the only clear instance occurs when the speaker addresses her audience: “*Ladies and Gentlemen, we have seen great progress*” (P48).

The case of the second-person *you/your* was also analysed. The results of this analysis can be found in Table 7.

TABLE 7. Reference and representation in second-person pronouns.

Pronoun	Speech event	Representative	General
You/your	2	30	6

The table shows that it is only twice that the pronoun refers to the members of the Supreme Soviet listening to the speech (P1, P5). Since the pronoun is most often used representatively to denote all Russians, the speech is addressed to the whole nation. There is however, a highly interesting and highly ambiguous chain of *you*-pronouns used in a general sense that emerges towards the end of the speech (P61), which will be commented upon later.

## 4.2 FOOTING

Tables 1 and 2 presented two sets of questions guiding the analysis. Some of them can be answered quite easily. P1 and P2 relate to Margaret Thatcher. The answer to P1 is affirmative: she is a direct participant in the situation. The answer to P2 is also affirmative: she is directly involved in the physical transmission of the message. Yet Ensink (1997: 13) points out that in the case of political speeches, the answer to P2 may be more complex, since they involve several audiences. Indeed, the text of such a speech often circulates in written form intended for the use of the media.

In the same vein, the fact that the political speech has several audiences also complicates the analysis of reception roles. In the case of R1, the Supreme Soviet as the official ruling body of the Soviet Union is a direct participant and has a ratified role. They are also addressed directly by Margaret Thatcher (R2). Yet the answer to R3, as Ensink (1997: 13) also notes, is more complex. While the members of the Supreme Soviet are intended to be the recipients of the message, they also represent the people of the Soviet Union

more generally. Elected for four-year terms from the population at larger, and from the different Republics, they represent the Soviet Union (and the East) more generally. This can be seen in the words of Thatcher that she offers as advice which should not be mistaken to be addressed to the members of the Supreme Soviet only: “*It is not for me to tell you what to do*” (see example 1, P3 below).

It may also be mentioned that in the case of Margaret Thatcher, as in the case of Queen Beatrix (Ensink 1997: 13), the audience was worldwide and the speech drew attention in various parts of the polarized world of the early 1990s through different media. Regardless of the fact that in 1991 she no longer officially spoke for her country, having left Downing Street a year before, the British interest is particularly strong and the speech recasts her for speaking for her nation on several occasions. She is, indeed, an icon of Britain and cannot be separated from it.

Due to this multi-layered nature of the audience, the question R4 is also complex. The members of the Supreme Soviet are able to receive the message directly – provided that they understand English. If this is not the case, the text will exist as a translation or as a media report. Similarly, the audience in the United Kingdom and the West in general will have to rely on mediated versions of the speech.

This situation of different audiences and the use of personal pronouns as markers of deixis can be represented in Figure 1 below (based on Ensink’s figure in 1997: 14).

The horizontal box shows the two parties of the event, Margaret Thatcher and the Supreme Soviet, who function as the speaker and audience during the event. The two vertical boxes show the peoples they represent: thus the speaker Margaret Thatcher represents the UK and the West, and the audience, the Supreme Soviet, the Soviet Union and the East. Their roles also include the general *we* and *you*. The text of the speech makes it quite clear that the speaker and the audience also represent the political poles (East and West) that are also present in the text as *we* and *you* in general.

	<b>MT</b> <i>I/we during event</i>	<b>SS</b> <i>you during event</i>	<i>we during event</i>
	UK/West <i>we in general</i>	SU/East <i>you in general</i>	<i>we in the most general sense</i>

FIGURE 1. Personal pronouns and their reference.

The opening paragraphs of the speech may function as an example of the way in which footing works. The following example shows how the scheme in Figure 1 works in practice, with deictic expressions underlined:

- (1) *Thank you for giving me the privilege of addressing **members of the Supreme Soviet**. How improbable such an occasion would have seemed even two years ago. It is a measure of how great have been the changes which have taken place – both within the Soviet Union itself and between East and West. (P1)*

*I propose to speak frankly because that is my habit and I know no other way. Also I shall be dealing with fundamentals, with principles and policies in which I believe deeply. (P2)*

*But I shall also speak from the point of view of someone who wishes the people of the Soviet Union well: who wants to see reform succeed, indeed would like it to accelerate, because I believe it would bring to the people of the Soviet Union the Western standard of living to which they aspire. There is enormous interest outside the Soviet Union in the changes taking place here. And great sympathy for the Soviet people in the hardship and burdens which change on this scale inevitably entails. (P3)*

*It is not for me to tell you what to do. That would be intrusive and interfering. I can only tell you what I believe in; that it works; and that it brings to people in democracies dignity, prosperity and the right to choose and change their government by free and fair elections at regular intervals. (P4)*

*If today **you** decide to learn something from British experience, it would not be for the first time. **You** may recall that Alexander Pushkin's Yevgeny Onegin learned all his knowledge of political economy from **us** British. I quote: (P5)*

The speech opens with Margaret Thatcher thanking the Supreme Soviet for allowing her to come to address its members. In Paragraph 1, she uses both *you* and *me*, thus locating the speech in its immediate context. The paragraph also includes non-deictic references to both the Soviet Union and East and West which are represented in the speech event through its participants. Paragraph 2 shows a clear use of *I* during the event, but the reference to *my habit* also suggests that the speaker is known more generally to have a reputation of some kind. In P2–P3, we can also find a version of a block, defined by Wilson (1990: 63) as repetitive use of pronoun thrice or more often in similar syntactic position in consecutive sentences, which seeks to underline her sincerity. In Paragraph 3, the first instance of *I* refers, of course, to the speaker but the non-deictic description that defines the point of view of the speaker is a representative one, linking the speaker to a more general view in the West. The same paragraph also includes several descriptions referring to both the Soviet Union and the West. In Paragraph 4, the use of *you* in the first sentence is curious and can be characterized as being representative: the speaker representing the West does not wish to tell the East what it should do (but still tells them what she wants). The final description of the benefits of democracy refers to the West in general. In Paragraph 5, the speaker addresses all of Russians with a general *you*, wishing that they might learn from her speech, also including the audience listening to her directly. Yet the next *you* addresses the audience at the event more specifically. The paragraph also includes a use of *we* referring explicitly to the speaker's nation. Thus, Paragraphs 1–5 show that the speaker and audience participate in different roles, showing most of the roles shown in the figure and that there is an ideological difference between *I/we* and *you*.

What may be added as examples is the forms of general *we*, which can also be found elsewhere in the speech. Example 2 below shows Margaret Thatcher's use of a general *we* ('all humans'):

(2) *Most of us learn best by doing.* (P30)

The results of the analysis of the whole speech, including the occurrences of both deictic pronouns and non-deictic descriptions, can be seen in Table 8. The numbers also include the ambiguous cases where the reference remains implicit. On the basis of this analysis, a number of points can be made.

TABLE 8. Occurrences of deictic pronouns and non-deictic descriptions in data.

Referent	Number of references
MT	70
SS	50
SU/East	123
GB/West	91

First, the results show that the speech aims at being representative, since the majority of references can be found in the columns SU/East and GB/West. While the speaker is also referred to quite often, it should be noted that apart from such simple instances where the speaker refers to herself, many of the references to *we* in general and to the West also include the speaker, thus referring to both issues at the same time. This can be seen in such formulations as Examples 3 and 4. Both examples position the speaker carefully as belonging to the West and exclude the Russians. It should be noted that no instance of the speaker-exclusive *we* (see Wilson 1990: 48–49) was found in this speech although it is quite common in political language in general and has also been used by MT to exclude Russians (Wilson 1990: 62–63). In the following examples the speaker is distanced from the hearers by using the phrase in the West to mark her footing:

- (3) *In the West **we** applaud the progress which has been made in political reform in the Soviet Union. (P39)*
- (4) ***We** in the West regard the three Baltic States as in a totally different category from the other republics. (P54)*

Occasionally the form, however, is used in a wider sense to include the people of the Soviet Union. This can be seen in Examples 5 and 6:

- (5) *May **I** add that **we** should not underestimate how vulnerable the new democracies of Eastern Europe feel and so how important it is to reassure **them**. (P51)*
- (6) *If ever – and **we** all profoundly hope not – but if ever there was an attempt to turn the clock back in the Soviet Union, then there would inevitably be fears for peace and stability in Europe. (P49)*

While the first person singular *I* is most often used in the speech to refer to the speaker's own views and to organize discourse, it occurs more often in the text than plural forms. As a sign of its personal reference, some examples where the speaker's own egocentric formulations appear to be voiced can be found in the text. As Example 8 shows, on one occasion in the text, the pronoun *I* is used in a representative manner and is linked to the general British *our* in the second part of the sentence:

- (7) *But in **my** country that question would not be asked of government, because **our** businesses are free to trade the world over. (P15)*

Second, the representative emphasis can also be seen in the fact that the Supreme Soviet appears to function as representative of the whole nation and the Socialist world in general, and the link is systematic all through the speech. Yet the movement from a fairly infrequent *you* as a sign of addressed audience to a general *you* is conducted in a very delicate manner. See Example 8, below, where the passage starts with a representative *you* (all Russians) extending beyond the present audience and then continues to address the

audience as *you* (audience) and presents an example. Finally, after the quoted passage it transforms into a general didactic statement addressed to all of *you*:

- (8) *If today **you** decide to learn something from British experience, it would not be for the first time. **You** may recall that Alexander Pushkin's Yevgeny Onegin learned all his knowledge of political economy from **us** British. I quote: (P5) [...]*

*So **you** have a good precedent and some excellent advice! (P7)*

In general, the text often treats the members of the Supreme Soviet as representatives of their nation. This can be seen in Examples 9 and 10, below, where the addressed *you* clearly includes a national reference:

- (9) ***You** will justifiably ask **me** what the West will do to help and support the reforms which **you** are undertaking. Frankly, judged against the importance of **your** own efforts, **your** own decisions and **your** own determination, outside help will be comparatively marginal. (P32)*
- (10) *All these make it easier to pursue **your** reforms at home because they provide stability beyond **your** borders. (P50)*

Similarly, the distinction between *us* and *you* is also utilized by the text to emphasise differences between the participants. The following passage (Example 11) also shows how the speaker's choice of contrasting pronouns promotes polarization by using what Hoey (1983: 116–117) has referred to as the principle of Matching Contrast:

- (11) ***Your** Communist system was based on central control of the whole economy and of society. Instructions went from the top down through the Party about everything. **Our** free system is based on limiting the powers of government and giving maximum power to the people. (P10)*

A similar example can be found earlier in the speech where the speaker seeks to convey to her audience the message that she will restrain from presenting didactic messages as a matter of courtesy. Example 12 contrasts *I* with *you*. It also repeats the central verb to tell.

- (12) *It is not for **me** to tell **you** what to do. That would be intrusive and interfering. **I** can only tell **you** what **I** believe in. (P4)*

The pronoun *you* can also be used generically, to include everyone, also the speaker. The text, however, includes a very interesting sequence of statements that problematizes the position of the speaker, as revealed in the use of block in Example 13 (cf. Wilson 1990: 63). It remains ambiguous in this block whether the speaker and what she represents are included in *you*, apart from the final non-deictic description describing the moral state of the world in general. It should also be noted that had the speaker selected *we* rather than *you*, she would be unambiguously included, but the selection of the second-person pronoun masks the statement as a universal truth regardless of its concrete message to all of Russians:

- (13) ***You** may use brute force to crush a nation: but **you** cannot destroy its identity and pride. **You** can forbid individuals to employ their talents to better their families: but in the end some will be more equal than others. **You** can fight a war against truth by every means at **your** disposal: but ultimately truth will win the battle of ideas. (P61)*

The questions P3 and P4 have not yet been addressed. The answer to P3 appears to be affirmative: the speaker has a motive and desire for communication. This motive appears to be political and can be seen explicitly in her speech that seeks to direct the Russians onto the right path. This aim can be seen in various ways, ranging from her use of her own views as a model that can be taken (Example 14) and her praise of political change (Example 15) to hidden threats (Example 16). Example 16 also reveals that international tension

is not a thing of the past but nuclear weapons do have a role to play:

(14) *I can only tell you what **I** believe in; that it works; and that it brings to people in democracies dignity, prosperity and the right to choose and change their government by free and fair elections at regular intervals. (P4)*

(15) *But let **me** start by congratulating **you** on how much has already been achieved. (P7)*

*The changes in **your** country and in Eastern Europe have been enormous. **I** believe President Gorbachev deserves great praise for **his** part in bringing them about. (P8)*

(16) ***I** must make clear that, in **my** view, **our** defence forces must include nuclear weapons – even though fewer than now – because they have proved their ability to keep the peace in Europe, even in times of great political tension. (P57)*

The speaker's desire to promote her message can also be seen in the fact that in discussing the political situation in the Soviet Union she is not content with reporting but provides judgmental interpretations. This can be seen in Example 17:

(17) *Today's difficulties in **your** country arise because too much still remains of the old system. And there are too many powerful vested interests hostile to change. (P25)*

The answer to P4 cannot be provided entirely on the basis of the text of the speech but more information regarding its production is needed. The text has been presented by a powerful political actor, whose views it presents and reflects by personalizing them as the use of *I* in the following example shows:

(18) ***I** can only tell **you** what **I** believe in. (P4)*

Yet, as a Member of Parliament, the speaker may have consulted professional members of her team and used the services of its

professional writers. To use the terms of Goffman (1979), while Margaret Thatcher may not necessarily be the sole author of the speech, she performs fully in the role of principal as the speech props up her position by presenting a set of political ideas (cf. Seidlhofer 1995: 207).

## 5 CONCLUSION

In this paper I have analysed the use of deictic pronouns and non-deictic formulations as markers of footing in one speech presented by Margaret Thatcher to the Supreme Soviet. By using the model presented by Ensink, it was found that the use of pronouns in this speech is highly representative: *we* and *you*, in particular, function as signals of participants' political roles constructed socially. In the case of "Fundamentals, Principles & Politics", it was also discovered that they also indicate national issues: the speaker and her audience are representatives of their nations and respective power blocs. The use of *we* as a representative form confirms what Wilson (1990: 63) has found typical of Margaret Thatcher's use of first-person plural forms: they seek to convey positive associations. In this speech, the positive associations evoked tend to be linked with the representatives of the West in general.

The analysis has also revealed that the speech represents the roles of its participants as being opposed to each other in terms of ideology. Due to the choice of method used in this analysis, and the limited focus on personal pronouns, larger questions concerning ideological choice and polarization cannot be answered. In further studies the linguistic construction of Otherness can be examined in more detail by using other methods such as critical discourse analysis.

## REFERENCES

- Ensink, T. 1997. The footing of a royal address: An analysis of representativeness in political speech, exemplified in Queen Beatrix' address to the Knesset on March 28, 1995. In C. Schäffner (ed.) *Analysing political speeches*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 5–32.
- Goffman, E. 1979. Footing. *Semiotica* 25: 1–2, 1–29.
- Hoey, M. 1983. *On the surface of discourse*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Levinson, S. 1986. Putting linguistics on a proper footing: explorations in Goffman's concept of participation. In P. Drew & A. Wootton (eds) *Erving Goffman: Exploring the interaction order*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 161–227.
- Levinson, S. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nyman, J. 2004. The language of Margaret Thatcher: quantitative aspects and a Key Words analysis. In M. Nenonen (ed.) *Papers from the 30<sup>th</sup> Finnish Conference of Linguistics, Joensuu, May 15–16, 2003*. Joensuu: University of Joensuu, 166–177.
- Schäffner, C. 1997. Editorial: political speeches and discourse analysis. In C. Schäffner (ed.) *Analysing political speeches*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1–4.
- Seidlhofer, B. 1995. *Approaches to Summarization: Discourse analysis and language education*. Tübingen: Günter Narr.
- Thatcher, M. 1991. "Fundamentals, Principles & Policies." Speech to the Supreme Soviet, Moscow, 28 May 1991. Accessed September 2003. Available online: <http://www.margareththatcher.com>.
- Wilson, J. 1990. *Politically speaking: The pragmatic analysis of political language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Wortham, S. E. F. 1996. Mapping participant deictics: A technique for discovering speakers' footing. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25, 331–348.