POLITICKÉ VEDY / POLITICAL SCIENCES

Author(s) / Autor(i):	**Zuzana Měřičková**
Article / Článok:	Emotions and Discourse: The Analysis of British Prime Ministers´ Speeches on Terrorism
Publisher / Vydavateľ:	**Fakulta politických vied a medzinárodných vzťahov – UMB Banská Bystrica** / Faculty of Political Sciences and International Relations – UMB Banská Bystrica
DOI:	https://doi.org/10.24040/politickevedy.2021.24.2.174-193

EMOTIONS AND DISCOURSE: THE ANALYSIS OF BRITISH PRIME MINISTERS´ SPEECHES ON TERRORISM[1]

Zuzana Měřičková*

ABSTRACT

Emotions are inseparable part of speeches of political leaders, however, they often continue to be omitted from discourse analysis, even though they can influence the political behaviour of citizens. The literature analysing emotions in discourse in speeches made by British leaders is still limited and this article attempts to fill this gap. It analyses the presence and evocation of emotions in 50 speeches in total delivered by the Prime Ministers of the United Kingdom, using the NVivo software for qualitative analysis. The article analyses speeches delivered between 9/11 and 2019 by Tony Blair, Gordon Brown, David Cameron and Theresa May. It finds that all of the analysed Prime Ministers use emotions in their speeches, both positive and negative. Even though each Prime Minister uses these emotions to a different extent, they all attempt to influence public opinion and gain support for counterterrorism policies. This demonstrates that Prime Ministers may be contributing to the problem by manipulating emotions and creating fear and hate in society.

Key Words: Discourse, Emotions, United Kingdom, Terrorism

Introduction

The United Kingdom (the UK) is one of the leading countries in the War on Terrorism and it participates in the military operations against terrorism in Afghanistan, as well as in Iraq and against the Islamic State. However, there is not enough literature that analyses the discourse in the UK and focuses on the rhetoric of Prime Ministers of the UK from the beginning of the War on Terrorism, up to the present. This article aims to cover this gap in the research and analyses all the discourses on terrorism of the Prime Minister of the UK from **Tony Blair** to **Theresa May** with the focus on the presence of emotions and attempts to invoke

* Mgr. Zuzana Měřičková is a PhD Candidate at the Metropolitan University Prague, Dubečská 900/10, 100 31 Prague 10, Czech Republic, e-mail: zuzana.merickova@mup.cz.

emotions in their audiences. In this analysis we attempt to answer the question: What emotions are present in speeches of selected Prime Ministers of the UK and what emotions are they attempting to invoke in the audience? Both parts of the question ask which emotions are invoked in the audience (how the audience is affected). The first part of the question focuses on emotions that are directly mentioned in the speech, the second part of the question asks for the emotions that are invoked in the audience indirectly (for example stressing the fact that foreign fighters are returning on the British soil may invoke fear in the audience). To answer this question, we coded the collected speeches in the NVivo programme for qualitative analysis. The purpose of the paper is to identify emotions in the PMs' speeches, since the invocation of emotions in the audience may lead to manipulation of public opinion and gaining support for the War on Terrorism and other counterterrorism policies. If we are able to identify such manipulation, we may be able to be more careful about its consequences.

This introductory chapter firstly presents key background information on the War on Terrorism and also on the UK and terrorism. Secondly, it proceeds to the role of discourse and emotions in the discourse and the need to study them, including a brief literature review. Then it proceeds to present data and methodology, explaining both the data selection process and the coding in NVivo. The following chapter covers the results of the analysis and presents the findings for each of the selected Prime Ministers – **Tony Blair**, **Gordon Brown**, **David Cameron** and **Theresa May**. **Boris Johnson** was not included in the analysis because by the time of collecting the data and conducting the analysis he was in the office for a short time. Lastly, the article will proceed to concluding remarks.

1. Background

Terrorism is a form of political violence that has been present since historical times, however it was not until the 9/11 terrorist attacks in New York and Washington that terrorism gained wide attention from both academics and political leaders. Since 9/11 we can see a rise in academic literature on terrorism as well as an increasing number of common references to terrorism in political speeches, media, as well as public debate. With the beginning of the War on Terrorism in 2001, terrorism was often seen as one of the biggest, and even existential, threat to our way of life. It has been already 19 years since the War on Terrorism started and it still continues. Terrorism is still part of lives of (not only) western citizens who experienced war in Afghanistan, war in Iraq, war

against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria and several terrorist attacks both in distant areas as well as close to their homes in Europe and the US. Since 9/11 the discourse on terrorism became well established in several countries and probably will not go away in the foreseeable future.

As already stated above, the UK took part in the war in Afghanistan, war in Iraq as well as the war against the Islamic State. She also suffered from four terrorist attacks on her soil that led to multiple deaths since 9/11 – 2017 London attack, 2017 Manchester attack, and 2005 London bombings and several other attacks with low or none casualties (Global Terrorism Database, United Kingdom). All of these events – both wars that needed justification and terrorist attacks that needed response – led to addresses from politicians to the public and contributed to the increased presence of discourse on terrorism that attempt to legitimize the counterterrorism measures introduced by the government. The need to study the discourse is more elaborated in the following session.

1.1 The role of a discourse

After introducing the background, it is also necessary to introduce the importance of studying discourse. This article contributes to the Critical Terrorism Studies which see terrorism as a socially constructed phenomenon and not something that exists on its own and which can be objectively studied (Heath-Kelly, 2016, p. 137). The meaning of terrorism is created by rhetoric and use of language. It is language which presents the labels and describes some violence as terrorism and some as not. This is the reason why it is so important to pay attention to the discourse because it has the power to create or destroy threats and justify policies to deal with these threats, including war, and gain public support for them.

The importance of studying the discourse is demonstrated by the "going public" model, which says that presidents take their policy and legislation proposals directly to the public to gain their support and thus get some leverage against the opposition when discussing the proposal in parliament (Erisen and Villalobos, 2014, pp. 471, 472). **Barret** confirms in his analysis that presidents use the strategy of going public increasingly often and that it indeed improves their chances for success in passing proposed legislation (Barrett, 2004). Speeches made by political leaders, especially in the democratic world, provide the tool of communication with the public and is thus important for the political space (Martin, 2013, p. 461). Being an important tool that provides the means of communication between elected leaders and the public who the leaders are

responsible to, it is important to study the tool that has the power to influence many aspects of the political space – from who is elected to which legislation is adopted and which was approved and legitimised.

Rhetoric and study of discourse is also important for the analyses of emotions whose role is explained in the following section. **Loseke** argues that visual images cannot invoke any emotions without being given any meaning and this meaning is given to them only via discourse. Without the role of a language the strong emotions that can even lead to a support for war cannot be invoked in the audience. He argues that it is by use of "emotional codes" – such as hero, villain or victim, that leads to emotional feeling in the audience (Loseke, 2009: 500 - 501).

Some authors have already studied the discourse of political leaders related to terrorism in the UK, however there is not a study that would cover such a wide period of time – from the beginning of the War on Terrorism until the present. Many works also do not focus on emotions in British rhetoric – the exception is **De Castella** and **McGarty´s** analyses of the use of emotions in both the US and the UK to justify the War on Terrorism. However, they focus only on the short time period between 2001 and 2003 and thus cover only one political leader from each country – **George W. Bush** and **Tony Blair**. (De Castella and McGarty, 2011). **Kenneth Payne** analyses the rhetoric of **Tony Blair** and **Gordon Brown** that was presented in the response to the narrative of al Qaeda. He thus only focuses on two British leaders and rhetoric relevant only to al Qaeda and its propaganda (Payne, 2009). **Holland** analyses how **Tony Blair** used the rhetoric to "sell" the War in Iraq to British public (Holland, 2011). **Kettell** also analyses only **Blair´s** rhetoric on the War on Terrorism, however he focuses on longer time period – 2001 to mid-2007 (Kettell, 2013). **Jarvis** then focused on the discourse on terrorism presented by **Blair´s** successor **Gordon Brown** (Jarvis, 2010). Before I move to the results of my analysis, I firstly present also the role of emotions and importance of its analyses.

1.2 The role of emotions

Researchers increasingly realize the need to study not only discourse but also emotions which can influence the public and help the political leader to gain support for his political agenda. **Erisen** and **Villalobos** claim that presidents often invoke emotions in their speeches so they can influence the public opinion to their advantage. They analyse how American presidents throughout the time invoke

the feelings of hope, fear and anger to manipulate the public opinion and increase support for their proposed policies (Erisen and Villalobos, 2014).

Erisen and **Villalobos** also present several studies that prove that political speeches can influence emotions of the public and can lead to changes in voting or support of proposed policies. They also claim that the goal of this rhetoric is that the public reactions are based more on emotional rather than rational responses, which leads to less criticism of proposed agenda (Erisen and Villalobos, 2014: 473). The fact that emotions in presidential speeches are aimed at manipulating public opinion is demonstrated by the lower presence or even complete absence of emotions when presidents are speaking to Congress rather than directly to the public (Erisen and Villalobos, 2014, p. 483).

When analysing emotions present in political speeches one emotion is highlighted by researchers to be particularly used for the manipulation of public opinion and support for policies and political parties and leaders – fear. Some even label the manipulation of public to feel this emotion as a "politics of fear" (De Castella et al., 2009: 2). **De Castella**, **Mc Garty** and **Musgrove** link the politics of fear especially to counter-terrorism when leaders attempt to make the public feel that they are in constant danger from terrorist threat so they would support the proposed counter-terrorism measures and policies. However, emotions are not necessarily used only for manipulation. They are present in speeches, especially in rhetoric of democratic leaders, to bind connection with the public and gain the attention. Emotions are means of communication and their presence does not have to automatically mean something bad. On the other hand, emotions can be easily manipulated and used for propaganda and self-interest of political leaders (Martin, 2013, pp. 473-474). This only stresses the need to study emotions in political rhetoric more carefully to see how is it used and in which cases it serves as a communicative tool and in which it is abused for self-interest and political manipulation.

Emotions are used in presidential speeches that justify the War on Terrorism where they replaced war justifying rhetoric based on more rational arguments (Loseke, 2009: 498). As an example of emotional rhetoric to gain public support for a war, **Loseke** analyses **Bush´s** rhetoric after 9/11 which creates the emotional story of evil terrorists versus good civilised world (Loseke, 2009). **De Castella** and **McGarty** analyse the presence of emotions, particularly fear and anger, in speeches of **George W. Bush** and **Tony Blair** between 2001 and 2003 before the War in Afghanistan and War in Iraq. They argue that both leaders used emotions more excessively when the public approval of their policies decreased

(De Castella and McGarty, 2011). While this list of literature is not exhaustive it should demonstrate the importance of studying emotions in political rhetoric and also the increased interest of academics in that topic.

2. Methodology and Data

The article analyses speeches of the Prime Ministers of the UK that focus on terrorism. The period between 9/11 terrorist attacks and the 24th July 2019 was selected as a time frame. The former date was chosen as an important milestone in terrorism studies and also in way the public, politicians, opinion and media focus on terrorism and talk about it. The later date was chosen because of the goal to analyse the terrorism discourse in the UK until present. 24th July 2019 is recent enough to be seen as current and it marks the end of **Theresa May´s** time in the office (GOV.UK a). The article does not include **Boris Johnson** because he has been in the office for a very short time - only six months, while for the other Prime Ministers the article analyses longer period (the whole time in the office for **Gordon Brown**, **David Cameron** and **Theresa May** and more than a half of **Tony Blair´s** time in the office as the Prime Minister).

The data for all Prime Ministers were collected from official governmental websites. The article is only interested in speeches, and it excludes interviews and press conferences because the topic selection is influenced by the interviewer or the people asking questions. In total, 648 speeches for **Tony Blair**, 917 for **Gordon Brown**, 625 for **David Cameron** and 313 for **Theresa May** were collected – however the actual numbers were slightly lower, because some of these were mistakenly labelled as speeches even though they consist of interviews or press conferences, which were excluded in NVivo analytical programme.

The article analyses only the speeches concerning terrorism. There were 138 speeches for **Tony Blair** that included at least one word "terrorist" or similar words such as "terror" or "terrorism," 50 such speeches for **Gordon Brown**, 113 for **David Cameron** and 60 for **Theresa May**. Since the article analyses only speeches that focus on terrorism it does not include speeches that only mentioned terrorism a few times in the dataset. Only the speeches with at least 0,5% coverage of terrorism were included in the analysis. The 0,5% may seem initially too low but the maximum coverage of the term "terrorism" and related words was 3,49% for **Blair**, 0,91% for **Brown**, 1,73% for **Cameron** and 1,48% for **May**. The 0,5% line was identified as the most appropriate, so the data set did

not include speeches irrelevant to terrorism but does not exclude any relevant speeches. The final dataset of analysed speeches on terrorism includes 22 speeches for **Tony Blair**, 5 speeches for **Gordon Brown**, 13 speeches for **David Cameron** and 10 speeches for **Theresa May** – so totally 50 analysed speeches for Prime ministers between 9/11 and 24th July in total. The list of all analysed speeches can be found at the end of the article.

The analysis was conducted in the NVivo programme for qualitative analysis which was also used for creation of appropriate dataset from the collected speeches as was explained above. The speeches were coded inductively, thus the categories were not created before the coding but are based on the speeches. The parts of the text that contained emotions, or would invoke emotions in audience were identified and they were coded into following nodes[2]: "us versus them", "determination", "fear", "hate" "emotional words", "victims' innocence", "solidarity", "nationalism", "calming", "exceptionalism", "safe", "hero", "patience". Some of the nodes has the name of emotion they invoke (e.g., "fear"), other have name of the entity by which the Prime Minister attempt to invoke the emotion (e.g., "victims' innocence"). "Emotional words" presents the last type of node and it contains parts of the speeches that are presented in emotional rather than neutral tone (in this node, there are coded sentences that contains words such as "tragedy", "brutality" or "murder"). One part of the text could be coded into more categories. The parts of the speech that consisted of a coherent idea were coded and thus one coding unit is often longer than one sentence because breaking the part into pieces could lead to loss of the idea that was being presented to the public. No coding unit is however shorter than one sentence or longer than one paragraph.

The analysis focuses on invocation of both positive and negative emotions. The positive emotions invoke pleasant feelings, such as happiness, safety, or the feelings of victory, in the audience. The negative emotions invoke unpleasant feelings, such as fear or hate, in the audience. The potential limit of the analysis is that it was coded by single coder and thus may be more reflexive and subjective – and therefore biased by the coder´s theoretical background. The next session presents the findings of the analysis.

---

[2] Node = code in NVivo terminology

3. Findings

This section is divided into four sub-sections. Each sub-section focuses on character of the speeches delivered by one of the analysed Prime Ministers. All the nodes coded in NVivo are summarized in the Table 1.

3.1 Tony Blair

The first analysed Prime Minister is **Tony Blair** who was in the office between 1997 and 2007 and this article covers the period of his time in office between 9/11 and 27 June 2007 when **Gordon Brown** replaced him in the position (GOV.UK b). During the almost six years´ long period of **Tony Blair´s** time in the office that I focused on in the analysis, the Western world was shocked by the 9/11 attacks in the New York City and Washington D.C., **Blair** supported **George W. Bush´s** War on Terrorism that was declared in reaction to these attacks and joined in the invasion of Afghanistan and advocated the invasion of Iraq and joined the Coalition of the willing with the US and other countries as well. The UK also experienced high casualty terrorist attack on London underground in 2005 (Global Terrorism Database, United Kingdom). These events may explain why **Tony Blair** delivered more speeches on terrorism than any of his successors´ 22 speeches during six years.

Firstly, I focus on the positive emotions invoked in **Blair´s** speeches. The most often invoked emotion was the determination with 114 references. His speeches were aimed at making people determined to fight terrorism and supporting his policies. He made people believe that the UK would fight the terrorists, protect British citizens and win the War. He invoked the feeling of determination by telling people that the UK would act against terrorism and would response to such a threat, and by presenting policies and strategies to rebuild Afghanistan and Iraq, because he connected stability and democracy in these countries with the reduction of terrorist threat to the UK.

Another positive emotion is that of safety, which was invoked 16 times and was supposed to make people feel safer and not afraid of the threat of terrorism. These references related to measures adopted in the UK to protect people from further terrorist attack. However, on two occasions he also stressed that this war would be longer and thus it took time to solve the terrorist problem and asked people to be patient. The emotion of safety and also of pride and nationalism is also present in references (15 in total) to the "heroes" of the War on Terrorism. These included not only the soldiers who were fighting in Afghanistan and Iraq

but also the emergency services which did their best to save people during terrorist attacks on British soil and also in their allied countries – such as emergency services in New York after the 9/11 attacks. These emotions may lead to the increased support of soldiers and their deployment abroad, and also support of the emergency services' public opinion.

Blair also attempted to calm the negative emotions that the citizens might have towards Muslims, especially after the 9/11 attacks and the beginning of the War on Terrorism. In 21 references, he stressed that the War is against the Islamist fundamentalist who do not represent the true Islam and that the enemy is al Qaeda and **Bin Laden** and not Muslims in general, thus reducing the possibility of support for right wing extremists and for attacks on Muslim citizens in the United Kingdom.

Other emotions that Blair invoked in his speeches are those of solidarity (29 references) and already mentioned nationalism (23 references). These emotions are somewhere between the positive and negative emotions invoked by **Blair´s** speeches because they make people feel proud of their country, their values and of who they are but at the same time they made them feel sad and sorry for people who died or were injured in terrorist attack both in the UK and in the countries of their allies. This may, once again, lead to the support of the UK policies.

Now, the article proceeds to the negative emotions present in **Blair´s** speeches. One of them is the hate that people should feel towards the enemy, in order to support the War on Terrorism. He framed the War on Terrorism as "us versus them", good versus evil and civilised versus uncivilised world conflict. The UK and their allies were portrayed as those who have the right values and fight this War only because they have to protect themselves. They are the ones who are acting in the name of justice and fight only because they have to. While terrorists, namely al Qaeda and its leader **Bin Laden**, and Taleban who protects them, were portrayed as killers whose acts can never be justified. The hate is also emphasized by the remarks of the innocence of the victims killed by the terrorist so the attacks seem as even more unjustified and brutal. The hate and feelings invoking the hate was coded in three separate nodes which together contain 193 references – 63 for invoking hate, 121 for the "us versus them", good versus evil and civilised versus uncivilised portrait of events and 29 for the innocence of the victims murdered in terrorist attacks.

Another negative emotion present in **Blair´s** speeches is fear. He invoked fear 88 times, for example by describing the terrorist attacks in detail, by stressing that terrorist would attack again, or by linking the terror threat to a potential use

of the weapons of mass destruction by the terrorists and making the threat sound even more destructive. He invokes fear by stressing the exceptional character of this threat (19 times) by comparing it to past events such as the Falklands War or the Gulf War where the casualties were significantly lower than in the terrorist attack of 9/11, or by stressing the scope of the attack. The emotion of fear should also lead to support of the policies aimed at dealing with the threat.

However, while **Blair´s** speeches not only make people safe, secure and determined but also scared and hateful, he did not use emotional words very often and there are only 35 references to such words. He uses words such as tragedy, sickening event, horror, barbarism, or evil.

3.2 Gordon Brown

The second analysed speaker is **Gordon Brown** who was the Prime Minister between 27th June 2007 and 11th May 2010 (GOV.UK c) for three years. During this period there were some terrorist attacks but none of them led to a high number of casualties (Global Terrorism Database, United Kingdom). The UK continued to be part of the alliances that fought in Afghanistan and Iraq, no new War needed justification. That can explain why **Gordon Brown** delivered only five speeches focused on terrorism during his time in office.

When looking at the positive emotions invoked by **Gordon Brown´s** speeches the emotion of safety is slightly more present than the references to determination to fight the terrorists (59 to 57 references). He thus primarily attempts to make people feel safe at home. To invoke the feeling of safety and security he talked about the measures that the UK adopted to protect her citizens at home. He talked about protection of the borders and also referred to the problem of radicalization and presented measures that the government was taking to counter the violent radicalization. When talking about this issue he mentioned the need to prevent radicalization of Muslim citizens. So even though he does separate the terrorists from the Muslim population and acknowledge their role in the fight against terrorism (calming people´s negative feeling towards Muslims in 8 references) he still created a link between them saying that it was the Muslim population that is mostly at risk of radicalization.

In the rhetoric evoking determination, and thus support for the UK policies abroad, he speaks about the need to stabilize Afghanistan but also the important role of Pakistan. **Gordon Brown** in his speeches on terrorism did not focus on the War in Iraq. He also talked about the measures that needed to be adopted to deal with terrorists, such as strengthening of the Europol and Eurojust. He also

linked the feeling of safety and determination to the feeling of pride (and support) for the "heroes" fighting and protecting people in terrorism-related operations (totally 10 references). He speaks mainly about British troops but there are also three references to police and emergency services. And the feeling of nationalism (3 times), again in relation to the exceptionality of the British Army and the British contribution to the War in Afghanistan. **Brown** does not invoke the feeling of solidarity, the only references that are somehow close to the feelings of solidarity are two cases when he thanks and appreciates the deployment of foreign troops in Afghanistan.

The rhetoric invoking negative feelings is less present in **Brown´s** speeches than the rhetoric invoking positive feelings. He, as well as **Blair**, invokes the hate towards terrorism and present terrorists as murderers while portraying their victims as innocents. However, he does not contrast the bad characteristics associated with terrorists with the good values of the Western world. He does not present it as a battle between civilised and uncivilised world, either. One reference in **Brown´s** speeches was coded as hate, while seven of them were coded as "us versus them" and two as referring to the innocence of the victims.

The most often present negative emotion in his speeches is fear. He made 32 references that could invoke fear in people. He creates fear by stressing the desire and potential of terrorists to attack anywhere in the world, by linking terrorism with nuclear capabilities or by speaking about attempted attacks that took place in the UK. **Brown** does speak about the terrorist threat as about something exceptional, something that has never been here before. He speaks about it as a new kind of threat in five references. The presence of negative emotions may invoke increased public support for the War on Terrorism – when people feel hate or fear they will want to deal with the source of the emotions (i.e., the terrorists).

Gordon Brown does not use emotional words. There are only two cases that might be coded as emotional words – one of them is a time when he quotes **Obama** who labelled al Qaeda as cancer, the second one is when he spoke about murder of British citizens.

3.3 David Cameron

David Cameron, the third analysed Prime Minister, was in the office from 11th May 2010 until 13th July 2016 (GOV.UK d). During this period the UK had not experienced any high casualty terrorist attacks (Global Terrorism Database, United Kingdom) however, some high casualty terrorist attacks took place across

Europe (Global Terrorism Database). The UK withdrew from Afghanistan (BBC, 2015a) during his time in office and joined the coalition with the US to launch airstrikes at positions of the Islamic State (BBC, 2015b). He delivered 12 speeches focused mainly on terrorism throughout his six years in office.

The most present positive emotion (and also the most present of all emotions) in **David Cameron´s** speeches is determination, possibly leading to the support of the War on Terrorism (159 references). He spoke about what had to be done to defeat terrorists. He used general statements to let people know that terrorists could not win and the UK would not be afraid and would never give up in this War. In his speeches he made sure that everybody knew that the UK was a strong country and terrorists were the weak ones who were desperately trying to defeat the UK but they did not have a chance. He focused more on what should have and would be done rather on introducing the policies that had already been accepted. When speaking about the measures that should evoke the feeling of safety and security among people, he mainly stressed two things. First, the measures that the government adopted to reduce radicalization – not only the violent one but radicalization in general – both online and in madrassas and other places. Second, he focused on the security of Jewish population. He promised the Jewish people that they would not be targeted again and used even references to the Holocaust to make his point. **Cameron** made 21 references that should invoke the feelings of safety in his rhetoric.

He also focused on the Jewish community and Israel when expressing solidarity with people and other countries. He also expresses solidarity with European countries that suffered mass casualty terrorist attacks – Belgium and France (17 references). **Cameron**, like **Blair**, explicitly stressed the difference between Islam and Islamic extremism and also said that terrorism was not a link to any particular religion or ethnic groups, this way he tried to calm negative emotions towards Muslims in general, and prevent hate crimes on British soil. He did so 11 times throughout his speeches. He also mentioned the need for patience twice in his speeches and stressed that this War could not be won overnight, in case not to lose public support if the War in not won immediately.

Cameron also stressed the role of policemen, soldiers and emergency services that he portrayed as heroes in 9 references. This is connected to the feeling of safety as well as pride and nationalism, and strengthening of the public support. He portrayed the UK as one of the greatest nations and highlighted its values such as democracy, freedom or peacefulness; invoking nationalism 13 times. This is contrasted with the picture of terrorist who were seen as brutal

barbaric murderers who attempted to destroy the British (and even the Western) way of life, and have to be defeated. He portrayed as a good vs. evil, civilised vs barbaric and created feelings of hate towards terrorists who were dehumanised by him. He highlighted this division even more by stressing the innocence of the victims killed by terrorists and, as noted above, he even compared the attacks on Jewish people to the Holocaust when innocent Jewish people were killed only for being Jewish. These portrayals of terrorists are connected to the emotion of hate. The hate is invoked 29 times, while "us versus them" division 38 times and the innocence of the victims was stressed 24 times in his speeches.

Cameron´s speeches also invoked the feeling of fear by the statement that the country could never be totally save or by raising the terrorist threat level from substantial to severe and stressing that that was the first time in past three years that was done. He also stressed the threat to the UK posed by the existence of the caliphate in Iraq and Syria and the possibility of return of foreign fighters. The emotion of fear, that is present in 95 references, is also connected to the highlighting the threat as exceptional, that was done three times in Cameron´s speeches, with the reference to 9/11 terrorist attacks and the London bombing of 2005. The invocation of fair may also lead to the support of the UK policies aimed to defeat the threat.

In his rhetoric David Cameron used more emotional words than both of his predecessors. There are in total 58 references when he used emotional language such as sickening barbarism, brutality, evil, tragedy, sickened beyond words, poisonous hatred, the darkest moments, sickening brutal murder, or shocked and sickened.

3.4 Theresa May

The last analysed Prime Minister is Theresa May who was in the office between 13 July 2016 and 24 July 2019 (GOV.UK a). During her time in office, there were two attacks on people in London and one in Manchester that resulted in several casualties (Global Terrorism Database, United Kingdom) and the UK also still continued the operations against the Islamic State (BBC, 2018).

She, similarly to David Cameron, invoked mostly the feelings of determination to defeat the threat of terrorism, to gain the public support. Her rhetoric was more like mobilizational rhetoric when she promised people what would be done and assuring them that the UK would not give up to terrorism. Her rhetoric contains 65 references about determination and only eight that should make people feel safe and secured. The references that can make people feel

safe appeared when she spoke about deployment of military personnel on streets to support the police, about the plots that were successfully disrupted, and that the life in the UK continued as usual. Besides, she did not discuss specific domestic measures adopted to protect people from further attacks that would have given them more feeling of safety and security. On the other hand, she also attempted to calm people by saying that the threat level to the country would not be increased because there was no reason for that and that they should carry on in their lives as normal. Additionally, she attempts to calm the hate towards Muslim community, and reduce the possibility of the increase of right wing extremist influence, by stressing the difference between Muslims and terrorists, but she did that only once.

Her rhetoric is similar to all of her predecessors by pointing to the heroism of police, emergency services and military personnel, however she also stressed the heroism of the Iraqi troops and increasing support for them and the deployment of British troops abroad. She pointed to the heroism in 22 references. In 11 references, she also expressed solidarity with other countries in the fight against terrorism and thanked others for the solidarity expressed to the UK. **May** also stressed the innocence of the victims killed in the terrorist attacks and the fact that they were unarmed. This is contrasted with the terrorists who, according to her, were armed, brutal and evil, and need to be defeated. She highlighted the differences between the terrorists and the UK and invoked feelings of nationalism towards the UK and hate towards the terrorists, in order to increase support for the War on Terrorism. She also framed the War on Terrorism in the "us versus them" rhetoric when se highlighted the British/Western values against those of the terrorists. She portrayed the UK and especially London as one of the best places on earth with the right values and no fear of terrorism. These feelings of nationalism were invoked in six references, while the hate towards terrorists was present in eight cases, "us versus them" division was apparent in 17 cases and the highlighting of innocence of victims that were killed in terrorist attacks in 15 cases.

Besides hate, her rhetoric also invoked fear by saying that another terrorist attacks could happen any time, stressing the number of attacks that had recently taken place in Europe, or raising the threat level to the UK to a critical one – so even though she initially made people safe by saying that the threat level would stay at the lower level, she later replaced the feeling of safety with fear by raising the level to critical, and thus increasing support for her counterterrorism policies. She made 55 references in her speeches that could invoke fear in people.

However, unlike her predecessors, she did not raise the level of fear by labelling the terrorist threat as something exceptional, which might be caused by the length of the War on Terrorism at the time she was in the office – terrorism was no longer anything exceptional but a new reality.

Like **Cameron**, **May** also used emotional words, such as cowardly attack, evil, sickening or brutal terrorist attacks. She used emotional language in totally 23 references in her speeches.

Table 1: Nodes for all Prime Ministers

	Blair	Brown	Cameron	May
us versus them	121	7	38	17
determination	114	57	159	65
fear	88	32	95	55
hate	63	1	29	8
emotional words	35	2	58	23
Victims' innocence	29	2	24	15
solidarity	29	2	17	11
nationalism	23	3	13	6
calming	21	8	11	2
exceptionalism	19	5	3	x
safe	16	59	21	8
hero	15	10	9	22
patience	2	x	2	x

Source: created by author, based on coding in NVivo

Conclusion

The findings showed that all four Prime Ministers used and invoked similar emotions in their speeches. The answer to the research question: *What emotions are present in speeches of selected Prime Ministers of the UK and what emotions are they attempting to invoke in the audience?* is that they all invoke feelings of determination by talking about the measures that will be adopted in the future, about the missions abroad – Afghanistan, Iraq and later Syria; and by stressing the fact that the UK would never be scared of the terrorists and never surrender in this War. When the audience feels determined to fight and defeat terrorism, they will most likely support the deployment of the British troops abroad in the

counterterrorism military operations. All of the analysed speakers also invoked the feelings of safety and security, however each of them in a different way. **Blair** and **Brown** invoked the feelings of safety by introducing measures that the government adopted to make the UK more secure from the terrorist threat. **Cameron** focused on measures against radicalization and security of the Jewish community and **May** talked about successful disruption of plots and deployment of the British Army in the streets. By doing that the Prime Ministers not only make people feel safe but also stress the measures they adopt and/or their success in the fight against terrorism at the British soil.

Each of the Prime Ministers also calmed the negative feelings towards Muslim population in general and stressed the difference between Muslims and extremists, so they prevent possible attacks on British Muslim citizens and support of right-wing extremists. This is mostly true for **Blair**, on the other end of the scale is **May** who made only one such reference. All Prime Ministers also invoked feelings of solidarity with the countries and people who suffered from terrorism or appreciated solidarity expressed to the UK, and all of them also invoked feelings of nationalism and pride, which was connected not only to the references to the greatness of the UK but also the heroism of their police, troops and emergency services, in order to ensure that the people continue to support both the troops and emergency services. All Prime Ministers, except for May, also stressed the importance of patience in this War and that the victory would not come quick – to calm down the expectations of people that the War will be won immediately and to prevent the withdrawal of public support after short time.

All analysed Prime Ministers also invoked negative emotions in their speeches – hate and fear, which may lead to ensure continuing public support for counterterrorism operations aimed to deal with the enemy who is the source of the danger. The emotion of hate was often invoked in the connection with portraying terrorists as brutal murderers who killed innocent civilians. **Blair**, **Cameron** and **May** stressed the division of "us versus them" and good versus evil in their speeches, **Brown** avoided such a distinction. The fear was invoked, for example, by stressing the terrorists´ desire and their capability to attack in the UK again. **Blair**, **Cameron** and **May** used emotional words, which made the emotions in their speeches even stronger.

In conclusion, as this analysis confirms, emotions are present in the speeches of political leaders, not only as a neutral communication tool but also as a source of manipulation of public opinion. The Prime Ministers attempt to gain public support for their operations, legitimize the War and stress the measures

they took to protect the British citizens at home in increase their approval ratings. It is important to study the presence of emotions in political speeches to understand the political behaviour of both politicians and people in a given country. Leaders use various types of emotions, both positive and negative, which can influence their public support and it is therefore important to continue in such analysis of various leaders in the future.

References:
BARRETT, A. W. 2004. Gone Public, The Impact of Going Public on Presidential Legislative Success. In *American Politics Research,* Vol. 32 No. 3, 2004, pp. 338-370, https://doi.org/10.1177/1532673X03260580.
BBC. 2015 a. UK troops in Afghanistan: Timeline of key events. *BBC*, 22 December, 2015. Available at: https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-35159951.
BBC. 2015 b. Syria air strikes: What you need to know. *BBC*, 3 December, 2015. Available at: https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-34931421.
BBC. 2018. Islamic State and the crisis in Iraq and Syria in maps. *BBC*, 28 March, 2018. Available at: https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-27838034.
De CASTELLA, K. – MCGARTY, C. 2011. Two Leaders, Two Wars: A Psychological Analysis of Fear and Anger Content in Political Rhetoric About Terrorism. In *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy,* Vol.
11 No. 1, 2011, pp. 180-20,. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-2415.2011.01243.x
De CASTELLA, K. – MCGARTY, C. – MUSGROVE, L. 2009. Fear Appeals in Political Rhetoric about Terrorism: An Analysis of Speeches by Australian Prime MInster Howard. In *Political Psychology*, Vol. 30, No. 1, 2009, pp. 1-261 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2008.00678.x
ERISEN, C. E. – Villalobos, J. D. 2014. Exploring the invocation of emotion in presidential speeches. In *Contemporary politics*, Vol. 20, no.4, 2014, pp. 469-488, https://doi.org/10.1080/13569775.2014.968472
Global Terrorism Database, United Kingdom. Available at: https://www.start.umd.edu/gtd/search/Results.aspx?search=united+kingdom&sa.x=28&sa.y=6
Global Terrorism Database. Available at: https://www.start.umd.edu/gtd/search/Results.aspx?search=europe&sa.x=0&sa.y=0.
GOV.UK a. The Rt Hon Theresa May MP. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/people/theresa-may.

GOV.UK   b.   The   Rt   Hon   Tony   Blair.   Available   at: https://www.gov.uk/government/history/past-prime-ministers/tony-blair.

GOV.UK   c.   The   Rt   Hon   Gordon   Brown.   Available   at: https://www.gov.uk/government/history/past-prime-ministers/gordon-brown.

GOV.UK   d.   The   Rt   Hon   David   Cameron.   Available   at: https://www.gov.uk/government/history/past-prime-ministers/david-cameron.

HEATH-KELLY, Ch. 2016. Post-Structuralism and Constructivism. In Jackson,R. ed. 2016. *Routledge Handbook on Critical Terrorism Studies.* London and New York: Routledge, 2016, pp. 136-159.

JARVIS, L. 2010. *Speaking of Terrorism: Gordon Brown´s War of Words. Rusi*, 2010. Available at: https://rusi.org/publication/speaking-terrorism-gordon-brown's-war-words.

KETTELL, S. 2013. Dilemmas of Discourse: Legitimising Britain´s War on Terror. In *British Journal of Politics & International Relations.* Vol 15, no. 2, 2013, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-856X.2012.00531.x

LOSEKE, D. R. 2009. Examining Emotion as Discourse: Emotion Codes and Presidential Speeches Justifying War. In *The Sociological Quarterly.* Vol 50, no.3, 2009, pp. 497-524, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.2009.01150.x

MARTIN. J. 2013. A feeling for democracy? Rhetoric, power and the emotions. In *Journal of Political Power.* Vol. 6, no.3, 2013, pp. 461-476, https://doi.org/10.1080/2158379X.2013.846557

Analysed   speeches –   Available   at   official   website   - https://www.gov.uk/search/news-and-communications?

<u>Tony Blair</u>

September 11 attacks: Prime Minister's statement (11/9/2001)

Statement to Parliament in response to terrorist attacks in the US (14/9/2001)

Statement to Parliament (US terror attacks) (4/10/2001)

Prime Minister's statement to the House of Commons (8/10/2001)

PM speech at the Lord Mayor's Banquet (11/11/2002)

PM's Statement to Parliament on NATO Summit (25/11/2002)

PM statement on the G8 Summit (4/6/2003)

PM statement at Downing Street on Saddam Hussein (16/12/2003)

PM's speech on US Elections (3/11/2004)

PM's speech at the Lord Mayor's Banquet (15/11/2004)

Statement to Parliament on the European Council and relations with Libya (29/3/2004)
PM's Parliamentary Statement on European Council (8/11/2004)
PM's Statement on Publication of UN High-level Panel Report (1/12/2004)
Statement on the final day of the G8 Summit (8/7/2005)
Statement to Parliament on the London bombings (11/7/2005)
Statement from the PM following COBR meeting (21/7/2005)
Statement to United Nations Security Council on terrorism (14/9/2005)
PM condemns Bali terrorist attacks (3/10/2005)
Speech at the Shaiba Logistics Base in Iraq (23/12/2005)
Foreign Policy Speech I (21/3/2006)
PM's world affairs speech to Lord Mayor's Banquet (13/11/2006)
PM's address to Troops in Kabul (20/11/2006)

Gordon Brown
Statement on security (25/7/2007)
National Security Statement (14/11/2007)
National Security Strategy statement (19/3/2008)
Transcript of PM's address at Camp Bastion, Afghanistan (28/4/2009)
PM's speech about the strategy on Afghanistan and Pakistan (29/4/2009)

David Cameron
PM's speech at Munich Security Conference (5/2/ 2011)
Statement on the death of Usama bin Laden, and counter terrorism (5/5/ 2011)
Prime Minister in Malaysia (13/4/ 2012)
David Cameron speaks at Munich memorial event (6/8/ 2012)
Statement on Woolwich incident (23/5/ 2013)
Threat level from international terrorism raised: PM press statement (29/8/ 2014)
PM's statement to Parliament on opposition to ISIL terrorism (3/9/2014)
Community Security Trust (CST): Prime Minister's speech (19/3/ 2015)
Tenth anniversary of the 7/7 London attacks: PM statement (7/7/ 2015)
Easter 2016: David Cameron's message Published (27/3/2016)
PM press statement following Paris talks (23/11/ 2015)
PM statement on National Security Strategy and Strategic Defence and Security Review 2015 (23 /11/2015)
Lord Mayor's Banquet 2015: Prime Minister's speech (16/11/ 2015)

Theresa May
PM Commons statement on Westminster attack (23/3/2017)

PM statement at the G7 Summit in Sicily (26/5/2017)
PM statement following London terror attack (4/6/ 2017)
PM statement following terror attack in Finsbury Park (19/6/ 2017)
PM statement on Crown Prince and Deputy Prime Minister of Saudi Arabia (21/6/ 2017)
European Council June 2017: Prime Minister's press statement (23/6/ 2017)
G20 Summit July 2017: Prime Minister's press statement (8/7/2017)
Barcelona attack: PM statement (17/8/2017)
PM statement following London terror attack (15/9/ 2017)
PM statement following meeting with Prime Minister al-Abadi of Iraq (29/11/ 2017)