

Sonja Torppa

A BETTER BRITAIN OR AN AWESOME FOURSOME?

A study on the rhetorical strategies of the sequential prime minister campaigns of Theresa May and Boris Johnson

Faculty of Information Technology
and Communication Sciences

Bachelor's thesis

August 2020

Sisällysluettelo

1. Introduction	1
2. Literature review	4
2.1 Discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis	5
2.2 Political discourse analysis	6
2.3 Methods of persuasion in political language	7
3. Data and Methodology	7
3.1 Data and the use of non-verbatim transcription	7
3.2 Method of analysis, its limitations & personal bias	8
4. Data analysis	10
4.1 Overview of Brexit	10
4.2 Analysis of the PM campaign launch speeches	11
4.2.1 The campaigns' core messages	13
4.2.2 Rhetorical styles as persuasive strategies	14
4.2.3 Narratives to divide and unite	18
4.2.4 Economics as competence	22
4.3 Analysis of the PM position acceptance speeches	23
5. Results and discussion	27
6. Conclusion	29
Bibliography	31
Appendices A-D	

ABSTRACT

Sonja Torppa : A Better Britain or an Awesome Foursome? A study on the rhetorical strategies of the sequential prime minister campaigns of Theresa May and Boris Johnson

Bachelor's thesis

Tampere University

Degree Programme of English language, literature, and culture

August 2020

Harva yhteiskunnan osa-alue herättää yhtä paljon jatkuvaa keskustelua kuin politiikka sekä poliitikkojen työssään hyödyntämä retoriikka. Tässä tutkimuksessa tutkin sitä, millaisia retorisia keinoja Theresa May ja Boris Johnson käyttivät kampanjoissaan Britannian pääministeriksi, ja miten he käyttivät näitä keinoja vaikuttaakseen puheissaan äänestäjiin sekä luomaan kuvaa heistä poliitikkoina. Tutkimuksen päämääränä on osoittaa, miten jopa poliittisessa viitekehelyssä, jossa ympäröivät tekijät pysyvät lähes samoina, poliittinen ilmapiiri voi vaihdella äärimmäisen nopeasti ja täten muokata poliitikkojen retorisia tekniikoita toisistaan hyvin erilaisiksi. Tämä vaihtelu voidaan laajentaa kuvastamaan yhteiskunnan nopeaa vaihtelua, jota kielenkäytöllä voidaan tutkia.

Esittelykappaleessa käydään läpi retoriikan merkitys politiikassa, Britannian vaalijärjestelmä, tutkimuksen erityispiirteet sekä tutkimuskysymykset. Kysymykset pyrkivät näyttämään, millaisia retorisia keinoja valitut konservatiivipoliitikot käyttivät, miten heidän persoonansa näkyvät puheiden retoriikassa sekä millaisia eroja retoriikassa on havaittavissa. Analyysiosiossa käytetään lähdemateriaalina kahta puhetta kummaltakin poliitikolta, konservatiivipuolueen sisäisten johtamiskampanjoiden aloituspuheita sekä ensimmäisiä puheita pääministereinä. Analysointi tapahtuu kvalitatiivisen tutkimusmetodin mukaisena puheiden lähilukuna, jonka analyysiin sovelletaan poliittista, kriittistä sekä tavallista diskurssianalyysia, sekä poliittisten vaikutuskeinojen, kuten facework-vaikuttamisen analyysia. Poliitikkojen retoriikoissa löytyy suuria eroja, ja poliitikot tietoisesti rakentavat henkilökohtaista kuvaansa puheidensa kautta. Tällä tutkimusmetodilla on siis mahdollista vastata tutkimuskysymyksiin sekä selkeästi osoittaa tutkimuksen hypoteesi poliittisen ilmaston radikaalista muutostiheydestä todeksi, ja demonstroida, miten poliitikkojen taustojen luomassa kontekstissa retoriset valinnat näyttävät usein hyvin tietoisina, poliittisina strategioina. Tutkimus osoittaa myös, miten retoriset strategiat liikkuvat usein vastakkaisuuksien maailmassa, jossa ne osin näyttävät toimivina, mutta saattavat vaikuttaa poliitikkojen menestykseen sekä pidettävyyteen samalla myös negatiivisesti.

Keywords: Qualitative analysis, political rhetoric, discourse analysis, facework, narrative framing, Britain, close reading, prime minister, campaign speech

The originality of this thesis has been checked using the Turnitin OriginalityCheck service.

1. Introduction

The world of politics, particularly regarding the position of Prime Minister, relies on the effective and often memorable rhetorical strategies of the politicians. Politicians are required to hold the attention of their constituents by the successful communication of their goals and themselves as leaders, thus ensuring their support in upcoming elections. Essentially, politicians are selling a product, and the product is their personal leadership and party policies. In Britain, the political system does not rely solely on the people electing the head of government directly, but the position of Prime Minister still requires a rhetorical strategy to demonstrate to the people that their style to lead the government will be to the people's satisfaction. In this thesis, I will analyze the first campaign speeches of sequential prime ministers of the UK, Theresa May and Boris Johnson, as well as their acceptance speeches as they take over the PM position.

In the Commonwealth website it is described that in the United Kingdom, the political system operates as a jointed, constitutional monarchy. The first aspect of government is a head of state, currently Queen Elizabeth II and the second aspect is a parliamentary democracy, where the parliament works as the legislative organ. The parliamentary branch of the government, unlike the monarchy, is chosen by an election, which is held at least every five years. (United Kingdom: Constitution and Politics, 2020)

The election that decides the prime minister works on "first past the post"-voting. In an article written in the Washington Post, first past the post -voting is characterized as a system where British citizens have one vote to use to choose a local member of parliament. Of those votes, the party which garners the most seats in parliament goes on to form the government, where prime minister is the head of the party with the most seats (Taylor, June 6th, 2017). In the article is also noted how this system of voting, unlike more often used proportional representation "often inflates majorities – meaning that a party doesn't have to receive 50 percent of the vote to have a majority in Parliament" (Ibid.). The article goes on to point out the historical divide this approach has created, where Britain

has a two-party system of the center-right Conservatives and the center-left Labour Party (Ibid.). Thus, it follows that the nation does not vote on the prime minister directly, but the leader of the party that garners the majority will be the next head of government.

The subject matter of this study created a unique situation, where there was within the conservative Tory party, sequential prime minister positions that both were opposed by the same, centre-left Labour party leader, Jeremy Corbyn. In addition, both of these prime ministers dealt and are dealing with the process of the UK leaving the European Union. Using the first campaign speeches of the internal leadership election for the Conservative party and thus prime minister, and the position's acceptance speeches of both Theresa May and Boris Johnson, it is possible to follow and compare the rhetorical campaign arcs of both the prime ministers in a political situation that has less variables than one might assume. In this study the focus will be on their political rhetoric and the ways these political figures influence and represent themselves in their campaign speeches. The importance of this study is the overview it gives to the intense fluctuation of political rhetoric. These political campaigns are sequential and yet many differences might be extracted from these campaigns, even with candidates within the same party. This fluctuation is then possible to be reviewed as a reflection on the rapidly evolving political climate, and the to-and-fro relationship political rhetoric and the political climate have with one another.

My research questions are:

1. *What means of political rhetoric can be detected in the speeches of the prime ministers?*
2. *In what ways, if any, do the political rhetoric and the persuasive methods differ from one candidate to another?*
3. *In what ways, if any, can the personal position of the candidate be detected from the speeches? i.e., how do the candidates reflect their personality through their rhetoric?*

As a central assumption it could be postulated that the political rhetoric means can vary in a multitude of ways, even when most of the surrounding variables stay approximately the same, and that reflects the rapid movement of the political climate that surrounds these events.

As the head of government, the prime minister holds substantial power in the UK, thus viewing this position will be crucial in the examination of political rhetoric's influence in the political system. The analysis of these rhetorical strategies during the prime minister campaigns will provide a fruitful look into the ever-fluctuating world of politics. The communicative necessities that a government leader must have in order to garner the most support from their constituents is reflected in the rhetorical choices they make during their campaigns. It is then important that the leader of the party shows consistency, reliability, and competence in order to provoke a favorable election. A strategic, rhetorically competent party leader can spearhead a campaign that will respond to the concerns of the public, thus winning more seats. The precarious portion of the rhetorical strategy of a political campaign is the reliability of the statements. The speeches do not have to justify in them the claims and promises made, that process is generally left to the media and to the politicians as they take on their coveted positions. This is why discourse analysis, critical, traditional and political will be implemented in this study, as the claims, attitudes and strategies of the politicians are meant to primarily further their campaign by narrative framing, and this can be detected when observing the context of the speeches.

The method of analysis will be a close reading of the candidates' four speeches using both traditional and critical discourse analysis and political discourse analysis as well as analysis of political persuasion, and the study will be qualitative. The study is divided into 6 sections, including first the introduction, then literature review in section 2, data and methodology in section 3, analysis of the data in section 4, results and discussion in section 5 and the sixth and final section will include the conclusion of the study.

2. Literature review

This section provides an overview on the crucial theoretical framework and theories pertaining to this study, along with the justification of their use in the study of rhetorical strategies in political campaign speeches. Discourse analysis with a leaning to the basis of critical discourse analysis will be used in this study and discussed in this section. In addition, a useful distinction is to be made between discourse analysis and political discourse analysis, as traditional discourse and political discourse have some fundamental differences. Furthermore, the nature of political campaign speeches demands an overview of the persuasion tactics employed to convince the constituents, thus a more detailed look into the linguistic strategies of political persuasion is made and discussed in the last part of this section.

2.1 Discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis

Discourse analysis is used widely over many fields of study. In this type of study, a qualitative analysis based on discourse analysis is best suited for the close reading of a limited amount of source data. Human speech is near universally context-dependent, almost no speech exists in a social vacuum. Fairclough characterizes his discourse analysis, DA, approach to be "-- based upon the assumption that language is an irreducible part of social life, dialectically interconnected with other elements of social life, so that social analysis and research always has to take account of language" (Fairclough 2003, 2). Discourse analysis thus does not operate purely on the level of texts but takes into consideration the overall contexts of situations where texts are produced and works on the basis that language is largely based on social constructs and contracts. Therefore, in the context of political speeches it offers a valuable insight into the motivations of the candidates to use certain phrases and means of argumentation. Discourse analysis does not purely entail the overview of social situations and context, but when applied to power structures, situations of injustice and abuse of power, it acquires the dimension in which critical discourse analysis (CDA) operates. Critical discourse analysis, as many theories pertaining to language and social structures often do, thus overlaps and

interconnects with other theories, such as discourse analysis in this case. According to van Dijk, “in our opinion CDA should deal primarily with the discourse dimensions of power abuse and the injustice and inequality that result from it” (van Dijk 252). In this study there will be little personal opinion or evaluation added on the political stances or opinions of the candidates, but to completely omit the acknowledgement of societal power structures in the candidates’ rhetoric would be a disservice to the reality of the political world. This is not to say that there is no personal opinion or bias – merely that a conscious effort is made to balance between an analytical close reading of the campaign rhetoric and sufficient regard for context, personal motivations of the candidates and the sociopolitical realities of the surrounding community.

2.2 Political discourse analysis

In continuum with CDA, political discourse analysis, PDA, by Fairclough & Fairclough bases on the notion that PDA should be viewed “as primarily a form of argumentation, and as involving more specifically practical argumentation, argumentation for and against particular ways of acting, argumentation that can ground decision” (Fairclough & Fairclough 2012, 1). The main difference between regular discourses and political discourse is posited to be that political discourse is “fundamentally argumentative and primarily involves practical argumentation” (ibid. 1). In the sequential first chapter its’ view on political discourse is explained further, as van Dijk theorizes “PDA is therefore understood as the reproduction and contestation of political power through political discourse , and this definition can be taken to underlie our own approach --” (van Dijk, quoted in Fairclough & Fairclough 2012, 17). In this book, the theoretical framework differs slightly from the approach I intend to take in the analysis of the campaign speeches of the candidates, as in the Faircloughs’ approach the focus is on whole texts as opposed to parts of texts and action as opposed to representation. It is, however, a valuable tool in examining the framing of narratives in political contexts, and reviewing, for example, together with methods of political persuasion the means to a goal -structure of political speeches. In addition to the structural tools of examining, the focus on

determining a separate political arena in which candidates operate may bring a sense of clarity to the analyses.

2.3 Methods of persuasion in political language

Another important aspect of analyzing political rhetoric is the analysis of persuasion in political language. Pertaining to campaign speeches, the element of persuasion is vital. Politicians need to appeal to the public in order to secure the best possible election results, as well as advance desired policies amongst colleagues. The relationship between language and politics is intrinsic. The power to further political agendas and garner voters is made possible by the effective use of language. As Partington & Taylor (2018, xvi-xvii) describe it:

In a functional democracy, the principal use of language in politics is for persuasion in debate in both the political sphere, that is, among politicians, but also the public sphere, in the media, both mainstream and social media. -- For the purposes of current work in political linguistics, we will adopt the definition that democratic politics is ‘the art of persuasion’, persuasion of the masses is generally via the mass media, and persuasion is achieved by the skillful use of language.

In the very core of this study is the examination of the political rhetoric of Theresa May and Boris Johnson. In the aforementioned work of Partington & Taylor, rhetoric is traced back to its’ Grecian origin and its’ strong ties to politics are underlined, detailing that the term rhetoric was developed as a form of persuasive art in Greece and additionally point out Charteris-Black’s findings that in the British National Corpus the term *rhetoric* is most frequently modified by adjectives such as *political* and *public*. They conclude that this is evidence of rhetoric’s prevalence in political discourse (ibid. 2018, 4).

One central aspect to the campaign speeches is the personality of the candidate and its representation in the speeches. Thus, it is natural to tie the analysis to the framework of the concept of face in sociolinguistic analysis. In Partington & Taylor, the idea of the face and facework is tied to political language. This means that the two types of face in politics, affective face and competence

face¹ have to be represented to garner votes and remain approachable, but often seem to not coexist harmoniously (Partington & Taylor 2018, 45). In addition, the evaluation of political language that is introduced in the work closely mirrors the evaluative parts of CDA and PDA that will be used in the examination of the speeches, thus creating a complementary framework of theory that can be effectively implemented in the review of the data.

3. Data and methodology

In this section the means of data collection and the data type is reviewed, with presenting motivations for the exclusion of certain data-related factors. The section is divided into subsections, where the first subsection describes the manner of data collection and the type of data used, and the second subsection describes the chosen methodology and appliance of the theoretical framework, as well as the limitations of said methodology and the subject of personal bias.

3.1 Data and the use of non-verbatim transcription

The data used in this study comes from non-verbatim transcriptions of political speeches. Due to length-related reasons and problems in data accessibility the use of non-verbatim transcription was used, as non-verbatim transcriptions of political speeches can be found in newspaper articles on the internet and other websites for free. A transcription of the speeches by hand would have been too laborious of a task for the purposes of a study of this length, even though in discourse analysis the inclusion of hesitation sounds and non-words can often provide a more complete view of the overall context. The focus of this data analysis, however, is the political rhetoric used by May and Johnson, not so much the manner in which it is presented. This view is supported by the fact that these types of political speeches that are held in order to announce a campaign or to accept a position are often rehearsed, pre-written and held for an audience, thus the significance of hesitations or the possibility

¹ The likable, communal, approachable face and the face of rationality, authority, and leadership, respectively (Partridge & Taylor 2018, 45).

of, for example, interruptions is greatly diminished. The choice to use speeches from the beginning of the prime ministerial campaigns as well as the speeches made in accepting the position was made to exhibit a complete arc of both candidates' political rhetoric. In addition to this, the possibility of inadvertently using speeches that are not equivalent in purpose is diminished, as the two aforementioned campaign speech types are easiest to distinguish from the campaigns, as well as being among the easiest to find in sources which are freely accessible on the internet. The data used in this study is thus non-verbatim transcriptions of the speeches, acquired from newspaper articles and political sites on the internet, and the data will be included as appendices for possible further examination.

3.2 Method of analysis, its' limitations & personal bias

The method of analysis implemented is a close reading of the four campaign speeches, the study type will be qualitative. The decision to use close reading and qualitative study was due to a personal interest in the often memorable political rhetoric of the British Tory party and the intriguing political situation that had formed in Britain over the past years. By examining the sequential British prime minister campaign speeches of May and Johnson, it is possible to acquire a coherent view of the rhetoric with which the candidates present themselves and their policies, in a political climate with the least amount of variables possible in a usually quite volatile research environment. For the purposes of providing answers to the research questions of the means of political rhetoric in the speeches, the possible differences and types of differences of rhetoric between candidates and the possible reflections of personality that may be brought forth in the speeches, the applying of a close reading based on context sensitive methods such as CDA and PDA will yield the best results. The amount of data chosen for this study is not extensive enough to justify the use of a quantitative method with, for example, a corpus-based analysis. This does not, however, exclude the possibility of implementing the findings of this study to represent larger political trends and the rapid movement of societal demands for the government, thus ideally proving correct the center assumption of this study.

There are limitations, of course, to the implementation of a qualitative research unto larger, societal phenomena, yet the mere timeframe and the subsequent nature of the campaigns should be evidence enough for the rapidly evolving nature of politics and the changing sympathies of politicians. CDA and discourse analysis in general often calls for, whenever possible, the inclusion of any relevant context. It is, however, my intention for the sake of clarity, to include situational and background information of the politicians when necessary, to understand some of the rhetorical choices that might have been influenced by that background or those situations. CDA, PDA and parts of analysis of persuasion tactics require the use of phrases and longer stretches of text, thus the analysis does not base on short, grammatical units of data. The analysis of corresponding speeches of both candidates will provide a stable basis on which a comparative discourse analysis can be implemented. Other limitations of the methodology are the exclusion from the data pool the relevant newspaper responses to the speeches, as the focus in this study is the political rhetoric. As for the qualitative approach, the limitations are varied. In an article in the *Qualitative Report*, Steven E. Krauss defines qualitative research (2005, 763):

Qualitative research has the unique goal of facilitating the meaning-making process. The complexity of meaning in the lives of people has much to do with how meaning is attributed to different objects, people and life events. Erikson (1963) elaborated on the importance of meaning when he broke it down into two sub-categories: common meanings and unique meanings. What has a common meaning to a group of people may have a unique meaning to an individual member of the group. For example, a group of children having a reel and a string represent a living thing on a leash may have a unique meaning to an individual child who has lost a beloved pet. Thus, understanding unique meanings has to do with the construction of the meaning process and the many different factors that influence it. This is the unique work of qualitative research and data analysis in particular – to identify the contributors to an individual's (or groups') unique meaning

In the search for the possible meanings of political rhetoric and their relevance to the surrounding communities, there is a real possibility of bias that could interfere with the findings and handling of the rhetorical choices of the subjects. It is my intention, however, to implement the theoretical framework in such a way that the rhetorical choices will be the leading point, from which meaning can be extracted with the support of the framework and relevant contextual cues. I have

chosen the two conservative prime ministers to observe as neutrally as is possible the differences in approach that may arise when the speeches inside a same party are mapped and analyzed. With a choice to not use a Labour vs. Tory candidate base, I hope that a more neutral approach can be discerned from this study.

4. Data analysis

In this section, the analysis of the four speeches is conducted. The first speeches to be analyzed will be the campaign launch speeches, to which relevant background information is added concerning both candidates. The analysis will then go on to cover the acceptance speeches, which provides a linear representation of the data. For the purposes of this type of comparative data analysis the speeches are analyzed in pairs, presenting examples from both corresponding speeches simultaneously. The section will be divided into 3 subsections, and in the first subsection is a brief overview of the process of Brexit, as it is a key motivator in all the speeches, and in the following two subsections the campaign launch speeches and the acceptance speeches are analyzed subsequently, but for the purpose of clarity, separately.

4.1 Overview of Brexit

Brexit is the name of the process of Britain leaving the European Union. In 2016, Theresa May's predecessor David Cameron resigned, after the UK voted to leave the EU: "A public vote (known as a referendum) was held in June 2016, when 17.4 million people opted for Brexit. This gave the Leave side 52%, compared with 48% for Remain" (Brexit: All you need to know, Jan 17, 2020). This decision led Theresa May to be selected as the new prime minister of Britain. Brexit, however, was and is not a swift process, and the separation from the European Union took place during both the candidates' campaigns, thus affecting their rhetorical choices. After the 2016 referendum, the process of separation was started, and when concluded, led to a transition period, which is the period in which Britain was in the beginning of 2020.

4.2 Analysis of the PM campaign launch speeches

This section provides the analysis of the Conservative party's internal election campaign launch speeches of Theresa May and Boris Johnson. The section begins with an overview and analysis of the beginning of both speeches, and goes on to cover the campaigns' core messages, the politicians' rhetorical styles as persuasion strategies, narrative framing as both a divisive and unifying tool and the economical rhetoric as proof of competence.

The speeches start with a distinct difference in the way Theresa May and Boris Johnson² reference their predecessors. In May's speech, she opens with the acknowledgement and praise of the previous Prime Minister, David Cameron. She calls him by his full name and later his first name, praising his accomplishments in the position. She reminds how far the conservative party has come under the control of Cameron, highlights the social justice aspect of Cameron's policies, and congratulates him on stabilizing the economy (May, lls 1-7, see Appendix A, with line numbers marked). Johnson begins his launch speech with no acknowledgement of his predecessor, May, but a segment on the perseverance of Britain against expectations and success with issues such as unemployment, exports and, curiously, football (Johnson, lls. 1-5, see Appendix B). Using the basic principle of discourse analysis, the difference in the beginnings of the speeches can be analyzed. As it is characterized on the web page of Linguistic Society of America, discourse analysis analyzes language beyond the sentence (Tannen, 2020, ch. 1). This can be used to look at the context of the speeches, which in this case provide the context for the differing takes. May's predecessor stepped down from the prime minister position due to unsuccessful attempts to keep Britain in the EU³, thus May acknowledged their work in the campaign announcement, even though she still needed to get the support of voters to get the position. Johnson ran in a situation where May stepped down after

²May and Johnson, as of now, for the sake of brevity.

³<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/jun/24/david-cameron-resigns-after-uk-votes-to-leave-european-union>

unsuccessful attempts to deliver a Brexit deal⁴ which Johnson was set on delivering, so the positive acknowledgement is less necessary. The other unconventional choice of rhetoric, as is familiar style of Johnson's, is the previously mentioned inclusion of a football reference in the very beginning of a campaign launch. This inclusion of "English football teams have won both the Champions League and the UEFA cup by beating other English football teams" (Johnson, appx. B, lls 3-4) is a distinct step away from the rhetorical choices of May in her opening chapter. With the inclusion of the concept of face and facework in political language, these differing takes on a campaign can be purported to be different representations of affective face and competence face. May dedicates the entirety of the beginning of the launch speech to the work of the Conservative party and David Cameron, placing herself in the context of her predecessor while paying tribute to them. Johnson does not mention his predecessor. This may be May's facework to advance both her affective face in being benevolent towards her colleague and her competence face in showing that she is well versed in the financial and political situation of her country. Johnson's first chapter is similarly facework for his competence face in recognizing the financial situation of Britain, as it is facework for his affective face with the football reference. He opens with acknowledging, despite the expectations, that Britain's "economy has grown much faster than the rest of Europe" and "unemployment has fallen to the lowest level since 1972--" (Johnson, appx. B, lls. 2-3). This approach, seen in both speeches, has a function beyond facework.

In critical discourse analysis, the mere analysis of different discourses on their own is accompanied by the critical evaluation of the societal realities which shape the narratives created in politics. In addition to the intrinsic nature of politicians' personality in their campaigning, the surrounding societal factors play a key part in the campaign rhetoric. Both Johnson and May are good examples of narrative framing. In Fairclough & Fairclough, the effects of narrative framing are described to be the ability to make people accept a view and a narrative of choice of a crisis in order

⁴<https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-48379730>

to make people favor the actions and policies of the narrator in question. This makes narrative framing an inherently political act (Fairclough & Fairclough 2012, 4). In Johnson's first chapter, the purpose of describing Britain as surpassing all expectations is a good example of creating a narrative in which the perceived "underdog" defies all expectations and thrives. Due to the tumultuous uncertainty that has been the era of Brexit, the tactic here seems to be to restore some confidence in the minds of Britons by reminding them how their country made the right choice by leaving the EU. This strengthens Johnson's position in siding with the departure and makes it easier for him to propose steps that would "get Brexit done"⁵, which May could not deliver during her term.

4.2.1 The campaigns' core messages

Another interesting difference in the speeches of May and Johnson can be observed when they take a turn towards their core message. May, having dedicated the beginning of her speech to her predecessor's efforts, starts to describe the efforts of the Conservative Party as a whole, noting that the "economic rescue mission" was not the only issue the party has taken on, but in line with a bigger one – an issue concerning social justice. May notes the introduction of same-sex marriage and the exclusion of minimum wage workers from income tax as examples of social justice, and underlines the Conservative Party's "open, inclusive, One Nation agenda of social reform" which ensures victory in elections and a betterment of Britain (May, appx. A, lls. 9-13). This is the first instance where May clearly communicates her agenda in her campaigning. The narrative of social justice and injustice is central to her campaign, which entails a sort of rebranding of the Conservative Party as a party for both fiscal success and the betterment of everyone's quality of life, regardless of their gender, social status, wealth or sexual orientation. This is further elaborated in the sections of May's speech where she calls for unity in the country, which are analyzed later. Johnson's speech is as well centered around creating unity, yet the focus is almost purely on Brexit. The theme of unity was most probably

⁵ <https://theconversation.com/boris-johnsons-brexit-policy-explained-128490>

chosen as a bridge to unify the then largely divided Conservative party as well, due to Brexit. Johnson often underlines the strength and ability of Britain and calls for a successful Brexit in order to prevent Britain from losing their status and their constituent's trust (Johnson, appx. B, lls. 10-12). The centering of Brexit is a campaign strategy that Johnson has chosen, seemingly to highlight his ability to deliver a different, more successful electoral outcome than his predecessor, May. Johnson underlines the responsibility of the government in delivering promises made during elections, which appears to be a criticism towards the preceding government and PM. This can be seen more clearly in the following lines, where Johnson specifically addresses the process of Brexit. Johnson describes the process as “—three years and two missed deadlines” and insists that Britain leave the EU (Johnson, appx. B, ll. 26). This frames Johnson's campaign narrative as being restorative and one that is destined to deliver a successful outcome. May was campaigning during the Brexit era as well, but the focus of her main strategy is not so heavily on the separation. May divides her strategy in to three points: first, she emphasizes the need for Britain to have “-- strong, proven leadership -- to steer us through this period of economic and political uncertainty” while negotiating a good Brexit deal. Second, she calls for unity in the country while criticizing the dividedness of the Labour party and calls this unifying process a patriotic duty. Third, May highlights a positive vision for “a country that works not for a privileged few but for every one of us” (May, appx. A, lls. 25-34). This way of listing points in order is a rhetorical style May uses often in her speeches.

4.2.2 Rhetorical styles as persuasive strategies

May's speeches at times resemble essays, where she even includes subheadings, such as “Political certainty and economic confidence following the referendum” (May, appx. A, ll. 36) and “Negotiating our departure from the EU” (Ibid., ll. 83). This very edited style of speech is an interesting choice, and a drastically different one from Johnson's more relaxed style. It is a clear, rhetorical difference between Johnson and May. Johnson uses many colloquial terms and examples in his speech, whereas May keeps mostly to a more depersonalized style. Johnson uses language such as the idiomatic “Kick

the can again and we kick the bucket—” (Johnson, appx. B, ll. 37), and the metaphor of “[w]e are somehow achieving Grand Prix speeds, but without firing on all cylinders” (Ibid. lls. 51-52) and “--the desires and priorities of any Metropolitan-style guru or tech king or the head of some FTSE 100 company” (Ibid. lls. 20-21). This rhetoric of mixing idioms and metaphors is intrinsic in Johnson’s style, and underlines his ability to appeal to an electorate in more ways than one.. When examining the relevant context to the rhetorical choices of the candidates, Johnson’s style of colloquial speech can be analyzed efficiently as perhaps more of a strategic choice than a completely natural phenomenon. Johnson was trained in the classics in Eton college⁶ that he attended on scholarship, and where he acted as president for the Oxford Union, which is globally known to be “the largest and most famous debating society in the world” (Barr, 2020). With this contextual knowledge, it is possible to postulate that Johnson has made a conscious decision to move away from a more classically political rhetoric, towards a style that is more generally accessible to a larger constituent body. With the application of facework analysis, it can be further posited that this is a strategy to reinforce Johnson’s affective face and curate a political image of an everyman. This style coupled with for example the speeches’ inclusion (Johnson, appx. B, lls. 68-82) of Johnson’s previous successes in politics can be purported to be a strategy to appeal both to blue- and white-collar electorates. Johnson begins this section by a vow of uniting the country and outlines his successes during his position as the mayor of London, raising multiple boroughs from poverty, investing in affordable transit for the working class and “out-buil[ding] Labour with more than 100,000 affordable homes” (Ibid. ll. 73). He continues by emphasizing the decrease in murder rates and traffic fatalities, linking them to the pursuit of social justice (Ibid. lls. 76-78), much like May in her core message. Unlike May who included the protections of all in her speech more at subtext level, Johnson continues immediately by reassuring that this pursuit for social justice need not come at the expense of “the businesses and wealth creators who make those investments possible” and further continuing by

⁶ <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Boris-Johnson>

stating how “there was a long period when I was just about the only politician who is willing to stick up for financial services, even though they produce about £70[bn]--” (Ibid. lls. 80-81).

The rhetoric of May is a step closer to a more traditional Westminster politician. She constructs her arguments much like an essayist, uses lists to increase clarity and does not use colloquialisms much at all. With including the context of her upbringing, which she mentions in her speech (May, appx. A, lls. 176-180), the stylistic choices can be given more background:

I know some politicians seek high office because they're driven by ideological fervour. And I know others seek it for reasons of ambition or glory. But my reasons are much simpler. I grew up the daughter of a local vicar and the granddaughter of a regimental sergeant major. Public service has been a part of who I am for as long as I can remember.

The inclusion of this segment is facework as is Johnson's – merely in a different manner. May criticizes the motivations of some politicians, thus distancing herself from the other candidates and parts of the sitting government, while emphasizing her own motivation to be a public servant. This strategy exists to create an image of a politician whose motives are to benefit and serve the people, unlike the current politicians. This can be seen as narrative framing as well, where May evokes the image of the standard politician to be in pursuit of power and glory, where her motive is simply service. It is interesting to note that unlike Johnson, May uses little colloquialisms even in the sections concerning her personal life. There is an exception to this rule, however, when May continues on her way of doing politics (May, appx. A, lls. 182-184):

I know I'm not a showy politician. I don't tour the television studios. I don't gossip about people over lunch. I don't go drinking in Parliament's bars. I don't often wear my heart on my sleeve. I just get on with the job in front of me.

This section is a shift from the more detached rhetoric May has utilized throughout her speech and serves to strengthen her affective face. May does not use colloquialisms often, nor does she seem to have a relaxed, spontaneous rhetoric. This creates speeches that are structurally sound, yet often might lack evidence of proficiency in a more natural, intimate rhetoric that bolsters general likeability. Political speeches work in both reassuring the electorate that the candidate is proficient in the tasks

in front of them and likeable enough to garner voter support. In Partington & Taylor (2018, 213) the juxtaposition of the affective face, the competence face and what is expected of female politicians is eloquently explained to be “--always a difficult balancing act but particularly so for women--” and how this is usually referred to as the “double-bind of gender -- [where] you are required to fulfil two incompatible demands simultaneously”. This double-bind is further elaborated:

Women running for office are subject to two demands: Be a good leader! Be a good Woman! While qualities expected of a good leader (be forceful, confident) are similar to those expected of a good man, they are the opposite of those expected of a good woman (be gentle, self-deprecating)

(Washington Post 2016, quoted in Partington & Taylor 2018, 213)

This contrast can be included as relevant context in the analysis of May’s rhetoric. May has utilized most of her speech to emphasize her qualifications for the prime minister position, citing how “-- you can judge me by my record” as Home Secretary, and elaborating on her successes, such as fighting the Police Federation, cutting police spending without the rise of crime rates, stopping extraditions and negotiating treaties to deport suspects of terrorism⁷ (May, appx. A, lls. 186-191). The phrase “judge me by my record” is a good example of trying to appeal to a voter base. May builds a narrative throughout her speech where the qualifications and the motivations of the politician are more important than their gender.

Johnson operates by shifting between the affective face and the competence face as well, and the sections concerning competence face are quite similar to May’s. Johnson emphasizes his qualifications on many occasions, most notably in a section that outlines more of his successes as the mayor of London (Johnson, appx. B, lls. 112-118):

I took this city through riots and strikes and all the teething problems of the Olympics, which was actually no picnic as I remember, and with a team of stars we brought this city together with new infrastructure, with renewed and relentless emphasis on education and technology, we shrank that opportunity gap, and to sum up my mission in a sentence: what I want to do now, with your help, is to do for the whole country

⁷ <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-16584923>

what we did in London, releasing the creative energies of our country and its peoples and healing its divisions and I will make one final observation.

In this section it can be seen how Johnson underlines his abilities in organizing large events and being able to offer housing and opportunities for all. In spite of these successes, the manner in which this section is structured makes it appear less organized and more spontaneous, at points even difficult to follow. The facework that is done in this section on Johnson's competence face is thus dulled somewhat. The strategy here is an interesting, most likely unintentional mirroring of May's style, as she utilizes similar, point making phrases as Johnson. His "to sum up my mission" and "I will make one final observation" are very similar to May's style of producing subheadings and lists to create structure. In this section, however, the effect of the aforementioned summary is weakened as the following sentence is long, complicated, and even changes to a different point at the end.⁸

4.2.3 Narratives to divide and unite

In political speeches, especially in campaign bids it is integral for the candidate to position themselves within a narrative that raises them to be the best possible choice for the positions they run for. This is often realized by creating an us versus them -narrative, where the candidate is the protagonist and they have created an antagonist against which they build a case. This is a way of creating an atmosphere where the speaker's solutions are the only viable ones. Some great examples of this are campaign slogans, and in Partington & Taylor (2018, 52) the 1979 conservative campaign slogan of "Labour isn't working" is "considered by some to be one of the most successful campaign posters of all time --". In May's speech, the antagonist is not so much a particular person or a party, though Labour is mentioned in unfavorable light once in the speech, but the social structures that favor some and disadvantage others, and the culture of politics as a whole. According to May (May, appx. A, ll. 153) these social structures are "burning injustices" that she vows to correct, should she be elected as

⁸ I have viewed the delivering of the speech in video form in case the transcription had an error, but the sentence does continue without a pause into "-- and I will make one final observation".

prime minister. May lists these inequalities in a passionate section (Ibid. lls. 147-153), where she touches upon issues such as “[i]f you’re born poor, you will die on average nine years earlier than others”, “[i]f you’re black, you’re treated more harshly by the criminal justice system than if you’re white” and “[i]f you suffer from mental health problems, there’s too often not enough help to hand”. This strategy outlines the core issue May has promised to address during her campaign, social injustice, and paints it as the most critical problem at hand. Her rhetoric is strong and deliberate, which suggests a conscious choice to move away from the more known fiscal focuses of the conservative party and carry on in David Cameron’s footsteps in building a more inclusive conservative party:

But David’s legacy is about more than the economic rescue mission we undertook. Some of our biggest achievements – including the introduction of same-sex marriage and taking the lowest-paid out of income tax altogether – they’ve been all about the pursuit of social justice. We have shown that when the Conservatives have an open, inclusive, One Nation agenda of social reform, we win elections – and we change the country for the better” (May, appx. A, lls. 9-13).

Johnson uses narrative framing in a similarly passionate excerpt in his speech but outlines a different opponent than social injustice. Johnson, after an aforementioned section on his successes as the mayor of London during the Olympics (Johnson, appx. B, lls. 112-118), creates a strong narrative of the nature of the Labour party (Ibid. lls. 120-125).

I know the London Labour Left. I have studied them and their ways. I know who they are, I know their obsessions with strange far-left Latin American caudillos with proto-Marxist views and a curious hostility to free speech. And yet in Jeremy Corbyn we have a man who is far to the Left of Ken Livingstone, in his nihilistic determination to hike taxes to penal rates, to attack wealth creation and private property, and its failure, again and again, to extirpate anti-Semitism from his circle. And I’m afraid that he, and what he stands for, are a real threat to our fundamental values and our way of life.

In this excerpt Johnson uses rhetoric that is both critically targeting the perceived shortcomings of the Labour party and being intentionally excessive for humorous effect, as is exemplified by “far-left Latin American caudillos” and “nihilistic determination to hike taxes to penal rates”, among others.

Both Johnson and May ran for prime minister while Labour's candidate was Jeremy Corbyn, but Johnson, unlike May, criticizes Corbyn directly by name in his speech on more than one occasion. This strategy of naming opponents and framing them as examples of lack of success in the political field is a tactic Johnson utilizes that May does not. May's rhetoric is broader and avoids casting blame on specific individuals. This can be seen as a gracious style where no particular operator is at fault, but it can also translate as being less bold and unassuming, which can have a negative effect on the likeability as well as the competence face of the politician, which underlines the importance of strategic rhetorical choices. A popular politician has to be able to be proactive without seeming lightly provoked or destabilized.

Both of the candidates stress the need for unity in times of uncertainty, but they approach it from different angles. May stresses the impact Brexit had both on the government and the nation, calling for unity after the campaign she calls "bruising and often divisive" (May, appx. A, ll. 123). May emphasizes how, even her being a supporter of remaining in the EU, she has support from both sides of the campaign inside the conservative party (Ibid. lls. 134-135). May frames this as an example on the unifying potential of her leadership, not only inside the party and government, but through the nation (Ibid. lls. 135-137)

-- under my leadership the Conservative Party will be able to come back together and govern not just in the interests of seventeen million Leave voters or sixteen million Remain voters but in the interests of our whole country.

This narrative framing of Brexit being a divisive campaign that affected every level of society is slightly dissimilar to Johnson's rhetoric on the issue. Johnson does, like May, frame Brexit as a divisive campaign, yet the division is not between the people who voted to leave and the people who voted to stay, but mainly between the different parts of the United Kingdom. Johnson underlines the global significance of the different parts of UK together (Johnson, appx. B, lls 98-99), stating how "[o]ur friends abroad don't think of England or Scotland, or Wales, or Northern Ireland, they think of

all the values that are expressed by that Union Flag”. Johnson’s rhetoric differs drastically from May’s in these sections. May’s rhetoric is based on the notion that Britain has serious structural inequality that needs to be addressed, while Johnson emphasizes strongly its economic, social, and diplomatic successes. In addition to being narrative framing, Johnson’s excerpt on the need for unity strengthens his affective face, creating a section where he appeals to his audience by utilizing colloquial language and rhyming (Ibid. lls. 93-96):

That is the way we will reknit the bonds of this amazing country and in everything we do, we will seek to strengthen the union of our four nations. That invincible quartet, the awesome foursome that makes up the UK, the world soft power superpower, and I've seen across the world in our armed forces in our diplomacy, our sheer cultural impact how we are so much more than the sum of our parts.

Johnson’s narrative is thus decidedly more positive than May’s. However, Johnson’s narrative on the unifying capability of his leadership is framed as being not just within the party and the government and the different sides of Brexit voters, like May’s. Johnson (Ibid. lls. 141-143) frames his campaign and potential leadership as being “the opening salvo in a battle to restore faith in our democracy” and an effort “to renew the natural ties of affection that unite the UK, and to protect this country from red-tooth, red-clawed socialism of today's Labour party”. This rhetoric implies that there is a battle being fought to preserve democracy, and Johnson’s conservatives are its defenders. Framing a narrative in this way creates an atmosphere where Britain needs a defender and Johnson is the first choice. May does use the term “fight” on two occasions where she addresses the structural injustices in Britain (May, appx. A, lls. 154 & 156) but she does not use rhetoric that would imply, as Johnson does, that there is an actual threat against Britain and democracy. Instead May points out an internal struggle of the Labour party and a threat of nationalism (Ibid. lls. 29-30), stating how Labour are “tearing themselves to pieces” and how there are “divisive nationalists in Scotland and Wales” and outlines a duty of her Conservative party leadership to create unity in the country by governing in a way that is best for everyone. This rhetoric is in part similar to Johnson’s but does not imply the same

level of outward threat and emergency that warrants defending and Johnson has emphasized in his speech.

4.2.4 Economics as competence

Despite the fact that both May and Johnson make efforts to continue the reformation of the Conservative party as a party for everyone, the focus on economy and finances still shows strong in both speeches. In May's speech, she frames a financial narrative of steady growth and a strong foundation in an effort to increase confidence in Britain's ability to overcome Brexit's challenges (May, appx. A, lls. 47-50):

The fundamentals of the British economy are strong and will continue to be strong as we negotiate our departure from the EU. Economic growth has been solid, employment is at a record high, and the budget deficit has been reduced from eleven per cent of national income at the time of the banking crisis to a predicted three per cent this year.

The economy is thus one of the issues May underlines as a continuous positive, albeit she is cautious with the technicalities Brexit imposes, emphasizing how for example uninterrupted trading with the nations still in the EU is critical for the continuous financial success of Britain (Ibid. lls. 107-108). Johnson is likewise optimistic on the issue of economics. While May tied her social justice segment to the core of her political agenda as the conservative leader, Johnson underlines the securing of a good quality of life for everyone through his financial statements. He lists how everyone from service workers to police and the military can be fought for due to the efforts made to secure the private sector, banks, and the tech industry, and how simultaneous financial support to the private and public sectors is both possible and a prerequisite for further economic growth (Johnson, appx. B, lls. 84-87). Johnson highlights this with his signature, colloquial alliteration (Ibid. lls. 87-91):

It's that synergy, that symbiosis, that sizzling synergy that is so fertile in generating further economic growth and that is the formula that is the way we will breach the opportunity gap and bring the country together.

Johnson ends the financial section with a promise of winning (Ibid. lls. 138-139), while May vows against increasing taxes (May, appx. A, lls. 80-81). The differing rhetoric concerning the financial situation underlines the different views these politicians seem to hold on the social structures of the country - May views social justice as a structural issue, mostly correctable by policy, while Johnson perceives it to be mostly an economic one.

4.3 Analysis of the PM position acceptance speeches

The acceptance speeches of the prime ministers differ both in rhetoric and in formulation. May's acceptance speech is significantly shorter in comparison to Johnson's, and as an acceptance speech in general. May's speech is one page in length, while Johnson's speech nears five. This can possibly be explained by the fact that May has continuously encouraged the public to judge her based on her accomplishments and held a rhetoric that is mostly professional and impersonal, thus a short speech might have been a natural choice for the accepting of the position. The other interesting factor of the speech is the fact that it is at points a near exact copy of her campaign launch speech. Due to these factors the analysis will be shorter, in order to avoid repetition.

May begins traditionally by accepting the Queen's request to form a government, and goes on to reiterate, in the same terms as in her acceptance speech, her appreciation for David Cameron as her predecessor (May, appx. C, lls. 1-7). The first deviation from the acceptance speech comes when she underlines the full name of the Conservative party (Ibid. lls. 9-11):

- - the full title of my party is the Conservative and Unionist Party. And that word Unionist is very important to me. It means we believe in the Union. That precious, precious bond between England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

This is a step towards Johnson's rhetoric in his acceptance speech, where he strongly emphasized the meaning of the United Kingdom. However, May quickly moves back towards her core rhetoric of the unity and equal rights for not only these nations but for all their citizens, and continues with a section on social injustice that is taken directly from the acceptance speech (Ibid. lls. 12-21).

Johnson's acceptance speech follows the same general principles he outlined in his launch speech, yet the objectives have become clearer. He begins with the traditional address to the Queen on accepting the request to form a government. Johnson continues with a short tribute to "the fortitude and patience of my predecessor and her deep sense of public service" (Johnson, appx. D, ll. 4). This is the first clear departure in the acceptance speech rhetoric from May's on predecessors, mirroring the difference of the beginnings of the launch speeches. Johnson again does not name his predecessor and the positive acknowledgement is very short, while May writes a longer tribute, addressing her predecessor by name. Johnson then goes on to criticize May on her handling of Brexit (Ibid. lls. 8-10):

[I]t has become clear that there are pessimists at home and abroad who think that after three years of indecision, that this country has become a prisoner to the old arguments of 2016 and that in this home of democracy we are incapable of honouring a basic democratic mandate.

This criticism is another difference in the rhetoric of the prime ministers. May shared the views of David Cameron on the direction of the Conservative party, whereas Johnson's criticism stems from the need to steer Britain in a different direction concerning Brexit that had come as a point of contention in the British government and especially during May's term. Thus, Johnson's rhetorical strategy of strengthening his competence face by promising a drastically improved outcome compared to May's is to be expected.

An interesting rhetorical deviation in May's speech compared to the launch speech comes at the midpoint, where she changes her rhetoric to address the electorate directly in first person. May speaks on how the Conservative party will operate, stating that "[w]hen we pass new laws, we'll listen not to the mighty, but you. When it comes to taxes we'll prioritize not the wealthy, but you" (May, appx. C, lls. 32-33). This is a strategy to strengthen May's affective face, where she directly appeals to her constituents, and it is perhaps the most striking example of her impersonal style of rhetoric

transforming into a much more intimate style of address, while reminding people that there is still work to be done in “building a better Britain” (Ibid. ll. 40).

Johnson dedicates most of the rest of his speech for both the actions that need to be taken in order to deliver Brexit and to the many successes of Britain in multiple fields. Johnson’s rhetoric is largely positive, where he frames the narrative of Brexit to be one of success and freedom from the constraints of the European Union (Johnson, appx. D, lls. 144-150⁹, edited)

So let us begin work now to create free ports that will drive growth and thousands of high-skilled jobs in left-behind areas.

Let’s start now to liberate the UK’s extraordinary bioscience sector from anti-genetic modification rules, and let’s develop the blight-resistant crops that will feed the world --

Let’s change the tax rules to provide extra incentives to invest in capital and research --.

While May dedicated her speech to her core message of social justice, Johnson lists many areas of society and infrastructure that will be affected by Brexit and makes multiple, direct promises of better policies. This strategy of giving clear promises to the constituents seems like a logical one, as the preceding three years have not moved the process of separation forward much at all. Therefore, the clearly articulated policy changes and the predicted effects on the society and the economy are effective choices to strengthen Johnson’s competence face and appeal to the electorate after a long period of uncertainty. One of the most important promises Johnson makes in this speech is the promise of not bringing back checks on the Irish border, which has been a source of immense tension¹⁰ in the country (Ibid. lls. 98-99). These types of promises, however, can be difficult for politicians to keep, as even the delivering of Brexit as a whole was a promise that was not delivered merely a term earlier. It can be posited that Johnson drew broader outlines and voiced strong criticism of the opposing Party and previous government on his campaign launch to secure more support. Yet, with

⁹ edited to remove empty lines between sentences, thus the amount of lines marked here is above the number of lines in the written quote

¹⁰ <https://www.irishtimes.com/news/ireland/irish-news/the-history-of-the-irish-border-from-plantation-to-brexit-1.3769423>

the securing of the Prime minister position he started to announce specific policy changes and make several new promises with confidence, while May did not make specific promises or deviate greatly from her campaign launch rhetoric. This difference may be due to the fact that May followed a politician that similar to her, wanted to stay in the EU, thus her original, same stance on the issue might have left her in a difficult position where she did not want to make elaborate promises. Johnson, however had a different stance from the beginning, thus having less pressure to tread carefully.

The ending of the speeches differs as well between the prime ministers. Johnson dedicates the final section of his speech to the narrative of an extraordinary pool of future possibilities for Britain and reminding how “No one in the last few centuries has succeeded in betting against the pluck and nerve and ambition of this country” (Ibid. lls. 159-160). Johnson then notes on how the work to prepare for Brexit will start, and he will, together with the Conservative party, “-- work flat out to give this country the leadership it deserves, and that work begins now” (Ibid. lls. 162-163). In this concluding segment Johnson utilizes his known colloquialisms that have been present throughout the speech, while appealing to his constituents as being leaders at their service. While the rhetoric of leaders being in the service of the people is present in both May’s and Johnson’s speeches, May does not end her speech on the same notion as Johnson. May does underline the positive possibilities of Britain after Brexit like Johnson, but uses the sentiment in the context of betterment:

As we leave the European Union, we will forge a bold, new positive role for ourselves in the world. And we will make Britain a country that works not for a privileged few, but for every one of us.

That will be the mission of the government I lead, and together, we will build a better Britain (May, appx. C, lls. 38-40).

Both of the prime ministers thus end their acceptance speeches by condensing their core messages, May by reminding how unity will help build a better country and Johnson by reiterating how Britain has and continues to surpass limitations and expectations.

5. Results and discussion

In this section there will be an overview on the research questions posed in the beginning of the study, and the results they produced. The findings in relation to the preliminary, center assumption of the study are outlined as well.

The research questions of this study were chosen to highlight the different means in which politicians can appeal to their constituents. The first research question, “What means of political rhetoric can be detected in the speeches of the prime ministers?” produced a multitude of different means of political rhetoric. In the campaign launch speeches May utilized list-creating as a rhetoric with which she created a means to end -result, while Johnson used a large amount of irony and colloquial speech to appeal to his voter base. May, in contrast, kept an impersonal style throughout the speech. Both of the politicians utilized discussion of economics to do competence facework. Both politicians used methods to do affective facework, May by reminiscing on her humble beginnings and Johnson by using football references and exaggeration as a comedic effect. Another political rhetoric utilized was narrative framing, where on multiple occasions both May and Johnson created narratives that strengthened their leadership capabilities and criticizing the Labour party was an example of this with both of them. Their rhetoric means did not differ significantly in the acceptance speeches, although May did begin to address her constituents with a first-person narrative.

The analysis as regards the second research question, “In what ways, if any, do the political rhetoric and the persuasive methods differ from one candidate to another?” produced very interesting results. May’s rhetoric was very respectful to her predecessor, impersonal, non-colloquial and did not use specific people as subjects for criticism but directed her critique towards societal structures and the atmosphere of politics in general. This decidedly professional, traditional political rhetoric is an interesting juxtaposition when considering the fact that she, unlike Johnson has a blue-collar

background. Johnson's rhetoric, however, is filled with colloquialisms, intentional alliteration, metaphors, irony, and sections that often feel more or less improvised rather than meticulously structured. Considering Johnson's elite education in the classics and a privileged upbringing, the choice to use these methods seems to be a conscious one. May and Johnson differ also in the way they frame their role as leaders. Johnson speaks of the political atmosphere as being a fight to preserve democracy, while May underlines her leadership as being more humble, public service. May does emphasize her ability to be a strong leader as well but does not create as aggressive of a narrative.

The third research question was partially answered in the previous sections, "In what ways, if any, can the personal position of the candidate be detected from the speeches? i.e., how do the candidates reflect their personality through their rhetoric?". May expressed her personal position through her use of clear structure, which communicated a well-planned approach to campaigning. This essay type structure, however, at points made her seem distant and unrelatable. May seemed to try to demonstrate through this rhetoric that she is capable and informed on the necessary requirements of the position. Her personal position was, still, most evidently reachable through her core message on social justice. Her impassioned descriptions of social injustices demonstrated a deep sense of responsibility and vigor concerning equal opportunity for all. The strong emphasis on this aspect does, however, beg the question if the Conservative party has been struggling with uniting the societal changes that have occurred and the values that have been considered conservative previously, and how the party intends to distance themselves from Labour in the future. Johnson, on the other hand showed most of his personal position in the sections concerning the unity of Britain, where he passionately declared the values and powers the United Kingdom holds as a unified force, and the importance of keeping every part of Britain intact through Brexit. The other points were his determination to leave the EU, where he on multiple points expressed extreme disappointment to the manner in which the separation was conducted by the previous government. The rhetoric Johnson uses on this issue can be seen as a reflection on the frustration of the country with Brexit.

The preliminary, center assumption of this study was that the political climate is volatile, thus the rhetoric of the politicians would come to mirror those changes in a way which would create multiple different rhetorical strategies, even when surrounding factors were as stable as possible and great amounts of time would not have passed. The assumption was indeed supported by the findings of this study. Multiple points of dissimilarity between the politicians were discerned, such as their manner of addressing their predecessors, their opponents, and even in addressing the current political process itself.

6. Conclusion

Many previous studies have contrasted different political speeches, such as Caitlyn Brook Blaney's thesis "The language of political persuasion: three case studies exploring "rhetoric coercion" (2014) and Lena Kulo's thesis "Linguistic features in political speeches" (2009), but there have been little to no case studies that would demonstrate the continuous, fast fluctuation of political situations that political rhetoric could reflect, thus the conditions of this type of study were both rare and necessary. In this paper the analysis of rhetoric was a tool in demonstrating how suddenly situations change in politics, and how swiftly politicians need to adapt their rhetoric to accommodate these changes. This can clearly be seen in this study, where the conditions were unusually stable for a political situation. Both of the chosen politicians in this study ran against the same Labour candidate, Jeremy Corbyn. Both of their predecessors resigned due to Brexit. Both May's and Johnson's campaigns ran during Brexit and were designed to deliver Brexit successfully, and their campaigns were consecutive. Both May and Johnson are or have been Conservative party leaders. This created a unique opportunity to examine how politicians implement means of persuasion in their campaign arcs and how their personalities, gender and upbringing might affect their rhetorical strategies in a situation where the outside influences are practically identical, and the results produced drastically different rhetorical strategies and means of persuasion.

In the UK, the successful position of a prime minister is argued to be supported by actions pertaining to the Statecraft Thesis by Jim Bulpitt. In Toby James' article on political leadership as statecraft concerning British party leaders, he quotes "Bulpitt's original support mechanisms were party management, a winning electoral strategy, political argument hegemony, and most importantly, governing competence" (Bulpitt 1986, quoted in James 557). These strategies can all be purported to exist based largely on the strategic rhetorical competence of the political figures. The governing competence in democracy does not lay solely on the personal choices of the head of government, therefore the communication skills and an ability to use rhetoric to further the desired policies is a crucial part of the political power of the elected official. This type of research into political rhetoric might thus be an opening to a discussion where language might begin to be an integral tool in examining, predicting, and analyzing societal changes and power structures. Future research could benefit from the findings of this study and provide a direction in which to advance. The constraints of a study this size could be discarded with a study of a larger sample size of data, where qualitative study methods could be complimented by the implementation of a quantitative study method. In this way, the scope of the study could be larger, and the findings more easily read into the surrounding society and its changes. With the implementation of a quantitative method and a larger data pool, corpus research might provide additional language usage information. Further improvements would be the inclusion of a longer timeframe, where it would be possible to study the public responses to the political climate, therefore demonstrating how societal changes reflect in political rhetoric, and how in turn that political rhetoric impacts the surrounding society. Language is above all a mirror for society, where trends, moral codes and behaviors are duplicated and oftentimes the images reflected back have a similar power to shift discussion in directions that are still unpredictable but can be within our grasp. Thus, it is vital for us to be able to understand the multitude of ways language has the power to impact and modify our minds and societies, and in my view the language of politics is a tremendous place to begin.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Johnson, Boris. "Boris Johnson's Campaign Launch Speech (in full)." *Great British Politics*. June 23rd, 2019. Available from <https://www.greatbritishpolitics.co.uk/uk/1028-boris-johnson-s-campaign-launch-speech-in-full>. Accessed on August 27th, 2020.

Johnson, Boris. "Boris Johnson's first speech as Prime Minister: 24 July 2019." *GOV.UK*. Available from <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/boris-johnsons-first-speech-as-prime-minister-24-july-2019>. Accessed August 27th, 2020.

May, Theresa. "Theresa May's launch statement: full text." *Conservative home*. June 30th, 2016. Available from <https://www.conservativehome.com/parliament/2016/06/theresa-mays-launch-statement-full-text.html>. Accessed on August 27th, 2020.

May, Theresa. "Theresa May's first speech as Prime Minister: full text: The Spectator." *The Spectator*. July 13th, 2016. Available from <https://www.spectator.co.uk/article/theresa-may-s-first-speech-as-prime-minister-full-text>. Accessed on August 27th, 2020.

Secondary sources

Casciani, Dominic. "Profile: Abu Qatada." *BBC News*. June 26th, 2014. Available on <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-16584923>. Accessed on August 27th, 2020.

Fairclough, Norman. 2003. *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London Routledge.

Fairclough, Norman & Isabela. 2012. *Political discourse analysis: a method for advanced students*. London: Routledge.

James, Toby S. 2018. "Political leadership as statecraft? Aligning theory with praxis in conversation with British party leaders." *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 20, 3: 555-572. Available from <https://journals-sagepub-com.libproxy.tuni.fi/doi/pdf/10.1177/1369148118778961>. Accessed on August 27th, 2020.

Krauss, Steven E. 2005. "Research Paradigms and Meaning Making: A Primer." *The Qualitative Report* 10, 4: 758-770. Available from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol10/iss4/7/>. Accessed on August 27th, 2020.

Partington, Alan and Charlotte Taylor. 2018. *The language of persuasion in politics: an introduction*. London: Routledge.

Patel, Oliver. "Boris Johnson's Brexit policy explained." *The Conversation*. December 11th, 2019. Available from <https://theconversation.com/boris-johnsons-brexit-policy-explained-128490>.

Stewart, Heather & Rowena Mason and Rajeev Syal. "David Cameron resigns after UK votes to leave European Union." *The Guardian*. June 24th, 2016. Available from <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/jun/24/david-cameron-resigns-after-uk-votes-to-leave-european-union>. Accessed on August 27th, 2020.

Accessed on August 27th, 2020.

Taylor, Adam. "Analysis | The U.K. election, explained: How to make sense of Britain's latest vote." *The Washington Post*. June 6th, 2017. available from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2017/06/06/the-u-k-election-explained-how-to-make-sense-of-britains-latest-vote/>. Accessed on August 27th, 2020.

The Editors of Encyclopædia Britannica. "Boris Johnson: Prime minister of United Kingdom." *Encyclopædia Britannica*. June 15th, 2020. Available from <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Boris-Johnson>. Accessed on August 27th, 2020.

“Theresa May resigns over Brexit: What happened?” *BBC News*. May 24th, 2019. Available from <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-48379730>. Accessed on August 27th, 2020.

“United Kingdom: Constitution and politics.” *The Commonwealth*. Available from <https://thecommonwealth.org/our-member-countries/united-kingdom/constitution-politics>. Accessed on August 27th, 2020.

van Dijk, Teun A. 1993. “Principles of critical discourse analysis.” *DISCOURSE & SOCIETY* 4, 2: 249-283. Available from

<http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Principles%20of%20critical%20discourse%20analysis.pdf>.

Accessed on August 27th, 2020.

Appendices A-D

Appendix A

1 Good morning, and thank you for coming. I want to start by paying tribute to the Prime Minister.

2 It is easy to forget how far the Conservative Party – and our country – have come since David Cameron was first elected leader in
3 2005. Thanks to David, we were elected into government for the first time in eighteen years. We won a majority in the House of
4 Commons for the first time in 23 years.

5

6 And – in difficult times – we stabilised the economy, reduced the deficit and helped more people into work than ever before.

7

8 But David’s legacy is about more than the economic rescue mission we undertook. Some of our biggest achievements – including the
9 introduction of same-sex marriage and taking the lowest-paid out of income tax altogether – they’ve been all about the pursuit of
10 social justice. We have shown that when the Conservatives have an open, inclusive, One Nation agenda of social reform, we win
11 elections – and we change the country for the better.

12

13 So I want to thank David, on behalf of our Party, for his public service – and for his significant achievements as Prime Minister. It
14 has been a privilege to serve in his Cabinet.

15

16 Candidacy to become Leader of the Conservative Party and Prime Minister

17

18 I have invited you here today to announce my candidacy to become the Leader of the Conservative Party – and Prime Minister of the
19 United Kingdom.

20

21 And I do so for three clear reasons.

22

23 First, following last week’s referendum, our country needs strong, proven leadership – to steer us through this period of economic
24 and political uncertainty, and to negotiate the best possible terms as we leave the European Union.

25

26 Second, we need leadership that can unite our Party and our country. With the Labour Party tearing itself to pieces, and divisive
27 nationalists in Scotland and Wales, it is nothing less than the patriotic duty of our Party to unite and govern in the best interests of the
28 whole country.

29

30 And third, we need a bold, new, positive vision for the future of our country – a vision of a country that works not for a privileged
31 few but for every one of us.

32

33 Political certainty and economic confidence following the referendum

34

35 I will turn to those three issues in just a moment. But as we know this is not a normal leadership election held in normal
36 circumstances. So I want to talk first about the immediate need for political certainty and economic confidence following the
37 referendum.

38

39 Whether you supported Leave or Remain in the referendum campaign – and whether you predicted the sky would fall in or whether
40 you didn’t – the result means we face a period of uncertainty that needs to be addressed head on. The country needs strong leadership
41 and a clear sense of direction, to give confidence to investors, to keep the economy moving, and to keep people in work.

42 .

43

44 Our financial system is well-capitalised and resilient. The capital requirements of the biggest banks and the liquid assets they hold
45 mean they have the flexibility to keep on lending to businesses and families. And the Governor's swift action last Friday means that
46 the Bank of England is ready to provide significant additional funds and liquidity in foreign currency, should our financial
47 institutions need it. He has also made clear that the Bank continues to assess the economic conditions and will take further action if
48 necessary.

49

50 So the Bank of England has taken the right actions to maintain confidence, and I know that the Chancellor has said he will support
51 the Bank if other measures are needed. But beyond that, I want to use this opportunity to make several things clear.

52

53 First, Brexit means Brexit. The campaign was fought, the vote was held, turnout was high, and the public gave their verdict. There
54 must be no attempts to remain inside the EU, no attempts to rejoin it through the back door, and no second referendum. The country
55 voted to leave the European Union, and it is the duty of the Government and of Parliament to make sure we do just that.

56

57 Second, there should be no general election until 2020. There should be a normal Autumn Statement, held in the normal way at the
58 normal time, and no emergency Budget. And there should be no decision to invoke Article Fifty until the British negotiating strategy
59 is agreed and clear – which means Article Fifty should not be invoked before the end of this year.

60

61 Third, we should make clear that for the foreseeable future there is absolutely no change in Britain's trading relationships with the
62 EU or other markets. And until a new legal agreement is reached with the EU, which will not happen for some time, the legal status
63 of British nationals living or working in Europe will not change – and neither will the status of EU nationals in Britain.

64

65 And fourth, while it is absolutely vital that the Government continues with its intention to reduce public spending and cut the budget
66 deficit, we should no longer seek to reach a budget surplus by the end of the Parliament. If before 2020 there is a choice between
67 further spending cuts, more borrowing and tax rises, the priority must be to avoid tax increases since they would disrupt
68 consumption, employment and investment.

69

70 Negotiating our departure from the EU

71

72 These are all measures that will be taken by a Conservative Government I lead, and they offer stability and certainty to consumers,
73 employers and investors for the foreseeable future. And I want to reassure foreign governments, international companies and foreign
74 nationals living in Britain that we are the same outward-looking and globally-minded and big-thinking country we have always been
75 – and we remain open for business and welcoming to foreign talent.

76

77 But looking ahead, negotiating the best possible terms as we leave the European Union will be crucial to our future prosperity. And
78 that is going to require strong, proven leadership. I intend, in the coming weeks, to set out in some more detail my proposed
79 negotiating principles, but for now I want to make two important points about the way we conduct this negotiation.

80

81 First, nobody should fool themselves that this process will be brief or straightforward. Regardless of the time it takes to negotiate the
82 initial deal, it is going to take a period lasting several years to disentangle our laws, rules and processes from the Brussels machinery.
83 That means it is going to require significant expertise and a consistent approach. I will therefore create a new government department
84 responsible for conducting Britain's negotiation with the EU and for supporting the rest of Whitehall in its European work. That
85 department will be led by a senior Secretary of State – and I will make sure that the position is taken by a Member of Parliament who
86 campaigned for Britain to leave the EU.

87

88 The second point is while the ability to trade with EU member states is vital to our prosperity, there is clearly no mandate for a deal
89 that involves accepting the free movement of people as it has worked hitherto. Now is not the time for me to set out my full
90 negotiating principles – that will come later. But I want to be clear that as we conduct our negotiations, it must be a priority to allow
91 British companies to trade with the single market in goods and services – but also to regain more control of the numbers of people
92 who come here from Europe. Any attempt to wriggle out of that – especially from leadership candidates who campaigned to leave the
93 EU by focusing on immigration – will be unacceptable to the public.

94

95 The need for unity

96

97 The process of withdrawal will be complex, and it will require hard work, serious work, and detailed work. And it means we need a
98 Prime Minister who is a tough negotiator, and ready to do the job from day one.

99

100 But even then, it will not be possible to do what is right for Britain, to get the best deal we can for our country, unless we are united
101 as a Party and as a Government. That is why I believe so strongly that there needs to be a proper contest with a leader elected by the
102 whole Party with a proper mandate – and no coronation brought about by back-room deals.

103

104 We've just emerged from a bruising and often divisive campaign. Throughout, I made clear that on balance I favoured staying inside
105 the EU – because of the economic risk of leaving, the importance of cooperation on security matters, and the threat to the Union
106 between England and Scotland – but I also said that the sky would not fall in if we left. I was open about the costs and the benefits
107 and the risks and the opportunities of EU membership. So now the decision has been made, let's make the most of the opportunities
108 that our departure presents – and get out into the world and help British firms to do business all around the globe.

109

110 Because the task in front of us is no longer about deciding whether we should leave or remain. The country has spoken, and the
111 United Kingdom will leave the EU. The job now is about uniting the Party, uniting the country – securing the Union – and
112 negotiating the best possible deal for Britain. And as you can see from some of my early supporters present here today, like Chris
113 Grayling from the Leave campaign and Justine Greening from the Remain campaign, under my leadership the Conservative Party
114 will be able to come back together and govern not just in the interests of seventeen million Leave voters or sixteen million Remain
115 voters but in the interests of our whole country.

116

117 A vision of a country that works for everyone

118

119 And this is a crucial point. Of course we need to unite the Party and the country, and of course we need to negotiate the best deal we
120 can with Europe. But if we're going to govern in the interests of the whole country, we cannot allow the Government to be defined
121 exclusively and indefinitely by the process of our withdrawal from the EU. Because Britain still needs a Government that is capable
122 of delivering a programme of serious social reform and realising a vision of a country that truly works for everyone.

123

124 The evidence of this need has been known to us for a long time. If you're born poor, you will die on average nine years earlier than
125 others. If you're black, you're treated more harshly by the criminal justice system than if you're white. If you're a white, working-
126 class boy, you're less likely than anybody else to go to university. If you're at a state school, you're less likely to reach the top
127 professions than if you're educated privately. If you're a woman, you still earn less than a man. If you suffer from mental health
128 problems, there's too often not enough help to hand. If you're young, you'll find it harder than ever before to own your own home.
129 These are all burning injustices, and – as I did with the misuse of stop and search and deaths in police custody and modern slavery – I
130 am determined to fight against them.

131

132 But the mission to make this a country that works for everyone goes further than fighting these injustices. If you're from an ordinary,
133 working-class family, life is just much harder than many people in politics realise. You have a job, but you don't always have job
134 security. You have your own home, but you worry about mortgage rates going up. You can just about manage, but you worry about
135 the cost of living and the quality of the local school, because there's no other choice for you.

136

137 Frankly, not everybody in Westminster understands what it's like to live like this. And some need to be told that what the
138 Government does isn't a game, it's a serious business that has real consequences for people's lives. I will set out more detailed
139 proposals in the coming weeks, but for today I want to be clear: under my leadership, the motives of the Conservative Party will
140 never be in any doubt. And our actions will be bold. We, the Conservatives, will put ourselves at the service of ordinary, working
141 people and we will strive to make Britain a country that works for everyone – regardless of who they are and regardless of where
142 they're from.

143

144 Who I am

145

146 I know there is a great hunger for this kind of One Nation vision in the Conservative Party. Whether it is the 2020 Group, the Blue
147 Collar Conservatism agenda or the social justice caucus, I have never known our Party to be so alive with such creative policy
148 thinking and such an obvious desire to improve people's lives.

149

150 And it this is the kind of Conservatism I've always believed in and always stood for. I know some politicians seek high office
151 because they're driven by ideological fervour. And I know others seek it for reasons of ambition or glory. But my reasons are much
152 simpler. I grew up the daughter of a local vicar and the granddaughter of a regimental sergeant major. Public service has been a part
153 of who I am for as long as I can remember.

154

155 I know I'm not a showy politician. I don't tour the television studios. I don't gossip about people over lunch. I don't go drinking in
156 Parliament's bars. I don't often wear my heart on my sleeve. I just get on with the job in front of me.

157

158 And you can judge me by my record. As Home Secretary, I was told I couldn't take on the Police Federation, but I did. I was told I
159 couldn't cut police spending without crime going up, but crime is lower than ever. I was told I shouldn't start asking questions about
160 police corruption, but everywhere I've seen it – from Stephen Lawrence to Hillsborough – I've exposed it. I was told I couldn't stop
161 Gary McKinnon's extradition, but I stood up to the American Government and I stopped it. I was told I couldn't deport Abu Qatada,
162 but I flew to Jordan and negotiated the treaty that got him out of Britain for good.

163

164 But if ever there was a time for a Prime Minister who is ready and able to do the job from day one, this is it. We have immediate
165 work to do to restore political stability and economic certainty, to bring together the Party and the country, and to negotiate a sensible
166 and orderly departure from the European Union. But more than that, we have a mission to make Britain a country that works not for
167 the privileged and not for the few but for every one of our citizens.

168

169 Together, we – the Conservative Party – can build a better Britain.

Appendix B

1 It's a measure of the resilience of this country that since the vote to leave the EU and in defiance of all predictions, the economy has
2 grown much faster than the rest of Europe. Unemployment has fallen to the lowest level since 1972, exports have soared, English
3 football teams have won both the Champions League and the UEFA cup by beating other English football teams, and inward
4 investment has soared to a record £1.3 trillion.

5

6 It's almost as if the commercial dynamism of the British people is insulating them from the crisis in our politics, and yet we cannot
7 ignore the morass of Westminster, where parties have entered a yellow box junction, unable to move forward or back, while around
8 the country, there is a mood of disillusion even despair at our ability to get things done. The longer it goes on, the worse the risk that
9 there will be serious contamination and a real loss of confidence because the people of this country deserve better from their leaders.
10 They need courage and they need clarity and they want a resolution.

11

12 And that is our mission today, and that is why I'm standing before you because now is the time to remember our duty to the people
13 and the reasons for the Brexit vote. It wasn't just about democracy. Though, that was fundamental. It wasn't just about immigration
14 though people were entirely reasonable in wanting national control. I remember that campaign vividly, and I think I understood some
15 of the feelings of those who voted to leave. They wanted to be heard. They wanted to feel that they too could be part of the
16 astonishing success of this country. They wanted to feel that their hopes and dreams were as important to the government as the
17 desires and priorities of any Metropolitan-style guru or tech king or the head of some FTSE 100 company.

18

19 And so now is the time to unite this country and unite this society. And we cannot begin that task until we have delivered on the
20 primary request of the people – the big thing that they asked us to do.

21

22 After three years and two missed deadlines, we must leave the EU on October 31st. We must do better than the current Withdrawal
23 Agreement, that has been rejected three times by Parliament, and let me be clear that I am not aiming for a no-deal outcome. I don't
24 think that we will end up with any such thing. But it is only responsible to prepare vigorously and seriously for no deal. Indeed, it is
25 astonishing that anyone could suggest dispensing with that vital tool of negotiation. I think this is a great country, and that we are
26 more than capable of rising to the challenge and it's only by preparing and raising awareness of what no deal might entail that we
27 would ensure that we do not resort to that option. It's only if we have the guts and the courage to get ready for it that we will carry
28 any conviction in Brussels and get the deal we need because they don't want no deal any more than I do. And we will simply not get
29 a result if we give the impression that we want to go on kicking the can down the road with yet more delay.

30

31 Delay means defeat. Delay means Corbyn. Kick the can again and we kick the bucket with every week and month that goes by, in
32 which we fail to deliver on our promise. I'm afraid we will further alienate, not just our natural supporters driving them into the arms
33 of insurgent parties, anyone who believes that politicians should deliver on their promises. The paradox is that we have not allayed
34 the divisions in our society by failing to deliver the outcome, which millions voted for, we wouldn't ease the tensions with delay, we
35 made them worse, and we risk making them worse again. And so when we come up with that better deal. I think there will be a sense
36 of overwhelming relief. As Brexit finally leaves the front pages, and becomes a debate about how to get the best possible free-trade
37 deal in Brussels, and then they'll be the chance to concentrate on the Britain that we can create for everyone.

38

39 It's an extraordinary fact that the United Kingdom is forecast in our lifetimes, to go neck and neck with Germany as the largest most
40 prosperous economy in Europe. With the lead in so many of the cutting edge industries: tech, academia, battery technology, turbine
41 design that is enabling us to be world leaders in clean power and environmental protection. And yet, if I may be permitted to use a
42 metaphor based on the internal combustion engine. We are somehow achieving Grand Prix speeds, but without firing on all cylinders.
43 We all know there is a huge gulf in the prosperity between London in the southeast, the most productive region in the whole of
44 Europe, and the rest of the UK. And so if we are to respond to that profound message of the Brexit vote. If we are to unite our
45 country and unite our society, then we must fight now, for those who feel left behind.

46

47 We need now to level up, not to neglect our capital of course not, but to put in the infrastructure that will lift every region, Northern
48 Powerhouse rail, proper connectivity in the West Midlands. It is absurd that Spain should have 80 per cent coverage of fibre optic
49 broadband against only seven per cent in this country. Madness, that Leeds should be the largest city in Europe with no metro rail
50 system. We must end the injustice of our education funding gap both in primary and secondary schools, giving young people

51 everywhere the same tools and the same freedom and the same confidence to succeed and do more to fund our amazing colleges that
52 have been too often forgotten, because it should be our fundamental moral purpose as a government to bridge, not just the wealth
53 gap, not just the productivity gap, but the opportunity gap between one part of the UK and another.

54

55 And I know we can do it. I know we can unite our country and our society. Because I have seen and used exactly those tools to help
56 to unite our capital, the greatest city on Earth. When I became mayor 11 years ago, we had four of the six poorest boroughs in the
57 UK. When I left office after the two terms, we had none of the bottom 20, and although everybody's life expectancy had risen it was
58 among the poorest quartile, that the games had been fastest and what was the method by which we brought the city together: we
59 made fantastic investments in affordable mass transit, so that people on modest incomes could live near their place of work, we out-
60 built Labour with more than 100,000 affordable homes, we massively expanded the London Living Wage policy that was then
61 adopted by the national government.

62

63 We cut the murder rate by 50 per cent, cut road traffic fatalities by 50 per cent. And when you consider that those calamities fall
64 disproportionately on poorer families, you can see that everything we did was driven by a desire for social justice and promoted that
65 outcome, and yet of course at the same time, we defended and championed the businesses and wealth creators who make those
66 investments possible and there was a long period when I was just about the only politician who is willing to stick up for financial
67 services, even though they produce about £70 billion in tax for our economy and I did it because that is the symmetry at the heart of
68 modern conservatism.

69

70 We can fight for the teachers and the nurses, and the firemen, and the armed service personnel and the police, precisely because we
71 are willing to encourage the tech wizards and the shopkeepers and the taxi drivers and, yes, the bankers as well. And we enable the
72 extraordinary success of our private sector with a strong committed, passionate, well funded public sector. It's that synergy, that
73 symbiosis, that sizzling synergy that is so fertile in generating further economic growth and that is the formula that is the way we will
74 breach the opportunity gap and bring the country together, responding to a mighty plea of the majority of our people for fundamental
75 change on the 23rd June 2016 so that no town, no community, no person feels left behind.

76

77 That is the way we will reknit the bonds of this amazing country and in everything we do, we will seek to strengthen the union of our
78 four nations. That invincible quartet, the awesome foursome that makes up the UK, the world soft power superpower, and I've seen
79 across the world in our armed forces in our diplomacy, our sheer cultural impact how we are so much more than the sum of our parts.

80

81 Our friends abroad don't think of England or Scotland, or Wales, or Northern Ireland, they think of all the values that are expressed
82 by that Union Flag. Economic and political freedom, democracy, free speech, human rights, a passionate determination to campaign
83 for the protection of the natural world. Female education. That's what they know the United Kingdom stands for, and they admire it
84 deeply. And over the last few years, I've seen in our friends the desire for this country to recover its confidence and self-belief. And
85 the curious thing is that very often it's been our friends and partners who have shown more confidence in this country than we have
86 ourselves.

87

88 It's time to end this debilitating uncertainty, to end the doubts and division with clarity and decision. And that is why I believe I'm the
89 right person to take this country forward and I'm proud and humbled to have the support of so many of my parliamentary friends and
90 colleagues here today, and indeed my representatives of my former team in City Hall.

91

92 And though I do not for one minute underestimate the complexity and challenges that lie ahead. I have long experience of managing
93 real short term difficulties in the confident expectation of long-term success. I took this city through riots and strikes and all the
94 teething problems of the Olympics, which was actually no picnic as I remember, and with a team of stars we brought this city
95 together with new infrastructure, with renewed and relentless emphasis on education and technology, we shrank that opportunity gap,
96 and to sum up my mission in a sentence: what I want to do now, with your help, is to do for the whole country what we did in
97 London, releasing the creative energies of our country and its peoples and healing its divisions and I will make one final observation.

98

99 I know the London Labour Left. I have studied them and their ways. I know who they are, I know their obsessions with strange far-
100 left Latin American caudillos with proto-Marxist views and a curious hostility to free speech. And yet in Jeremy Corbyn we have a
101 man who is far to the Left of Ken Livingstone, in his nihilistic determination to hike taxes to penal rates, to attack wealth creation and

102 private property, and its failure, again and again, to extirpate anti-Semitism from his circle. And I'm afraid that he, and what he stands
103 for, are a real threat to our fundamental values and our way of life.

104

105

106 I come to this fight now as a proud conservative to this campaign and by the way just about every seat in the country. And I believe
107 in the innate decency of our country in his genius and in its hard-won freedoms. I believe in setting people free by equipping them
108 with the education to achieve their dreams. I believe in the vital symmetry between free-market economics and superb public
109 services, and I will do absolutely anything I can within the bounds of the constitution and the law to prevent the government of the
110 UK from passing into the hands of those who, by their total disdain for wealth creation, their content – the normal aspirations of
111 millions to improve their lives – would compromise our ability to fund the NHS, and so much else besides. My friends, we cannot let
112 them anywhere near Downing Street.

113

114 Last time, I would remind you, that I faced an emanation of that cabal, I defeated him when the Conservatives were 17 points behind
115 in London. We can do it again and we must. We can get Brexit done and we can win. We can unite our country and our society and
116 that is why I'm standing to be leader of the Conservative party and prime minister because this contest is not chiefly about any one
117 person, or even about the Conservative party, it is the opening salvo in a battle to restore faith in our democracy to renew the natural
118 ties of affection that unite the UK, and to protect this country from red-tooth, red-clawed socialism of today's Labour party.

119

120 And we're going to do this by articulating a new and inspiring vision for sensible moderate, modern conservatism. My friends, I ask
121 you, now, to join me in that great project and yes, sometimes that great challenge that lies before us, but with your help and with the
122 help of the British people we will succeed and the whole country will win.

Appendix C

1 I have just been to Buckingham Palace where Her Majesty the Queen has asked me to form a new government, and I accepted.

2 In David Cameron, I follow in the footsteps of a great, modern prime minister. Under David's leadership, the government stabilized
3 the economy, reduced the budget deficit, and helped more people into work than ever before.

4 But David's true legacy is not about the economy, but about social justice. From the introduction of same-sex marriage, to taking
5 people on low wages out of income tax altogether.

6 David Cameron has led a one nation government and it is in that spirit that I also plan to lead. Because not everybody knows this, but
7 the full title of my party is the Conservative and Unionist Party. And that word Unionist is very important to me. It means we believe
8 in the Union. That precious, precious bond between England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

9 But it means something else that is just as important. It means that we believe in a Union not just of the nations of the United
10 Kingdom, but between all of our citizens. Every one of us, whoever we are and wherever we are from.

11 That means fighting against the burning injustice that if you are born poor, you will die on average nine years earlier than others. If
12 you're black, you're treated more harshly by the criminal justice system than if you are white. If you're a white, working-class boy,
13 you're less likely than anyone else in Britain to go to university. If you're at a state school, you're less likely to reach the top
14 professions than if you were educated privately.

15 If you are a woman, you will earn less than a man. If you suffer from mental health problems, there's not enough help to hand. If
16 you're young, you'll find it harder than ever before to own your own home.

17 But the mission to make Britain a country that works for everyone means more than just fighting these injustices.

18 If you're from an ordinary working-class family, life is much harder than many people in Westminster realize. You have the job, but
19 you don't always have the job security. You have your own home, but you worry about paying the mortgage. You can just about
20 manage, but you worry about the cost of living and getting your kids into a good school.

21 If you're one of those families. If you're just managing. I want to address you directly. I know you're working around the clock, I
22 know you're doing your best, and I know that sometimes, life can be a struggle. The government I lead will be driven not by the
23 interests of a privileged few, but by yours.

24 We will do everything we can to give you more control over your lives. When we take the big calls, we'll think not of the powerful
25 but you. When we pass new laws, we'll listen not to the mighty, but you. When it comes to taxes we'll prioritize not the wealthy, but
26 you. When it comes to opportunity, we won't entrench the advantages of the fortunate few. We will do everything we can to help
27 anybody, whatever your background, to go as far as your talents will take you.

28 We are living through an important moment in our country's history. Following the referendum we face a time of great national
29 change. And I know because we're Great Britain, we will rise to the challenge.

30 As we leave the European Union, we will forge a bold, new positive role for ourselves in the world. And we will make Britain a
31 country that works not for a privileged few, but for every one of us.

32 That will be the mission of the government I lead, and together, we will build a better Britain.

Appendix D

1 Good afternoon
2 I have just been to see Her Majesty the Queen who has invited me to form a government and I have accepted
3 I pay tribute to the fortitude and patience of my predecessor and her deep sense of public service
4
5 but in spite of all her efforts it has become clear that there are pessimists at home and abroad
6
7 who think that after three years of indecision
8 that this country has become a prisoner to the old arguments of 2016
9 and that in this home of democracy we are incapable of honouring a basic democratic mandate
10 And so I am standing before you today to tell you
11 the British people
12 that those critics are wrong
13 The doubters, the doomsters, the gloomsters – they are going to get it wrong again
14
15 The people who bet against Britain are going to lose their shirts
16 because we are going to restore trust in our democracy
17 and we are going to fulfil the repeated promises of parliament to the people and come out of the EU on October 31
18 no ifs or buts
19 and we will do a new deal, a better deal that will maximise the opportunities of Brexit while allowing us to develop a new and
20 exciting partnership with the rest of Europe
21 based on free trade and mutual support
22
23 I have every confidence that in 99 days' time we will have cracked it
24 but you know what – we aren't going to wait 99 days
25 because the British people have had enough of waiting
26
27 The time has come to act,
28 to take decisions
29 to give strong leadership and to change this country for the better
30 and though the Queen has just honoured me with this extraordinary office of state
31 my job is to serve you, the people
32 because if there is one point we politicians need to remember it is that the people are our bosses
33

34 My job is to make your streets safer – and we are going to begin with another 20,000 police on the streets
35 and we start recruiting forthwith
36
37 My job is to make sure you don't have to wait 3 weeks to see your GP
38 and we start work this week with 20 new hospital upgrades, and ensuring that money for the NHS really does get to the front line
39
40 My job is to protect you or your parents or grandparents from the fear of having to sell your home to pay for the costs of care
41 and so I am announcing now – on the steps of Downing Street – that we will fix the crisis in social care once and for all with a clear
42 plan we have prepared
43 to give every older person the dignity and security they deserve
44
45 My job is to make sure your kids get a superb education
46 wherever they are in the country
47 and that's why we have already announced that we are going to level up per pupil funding in primary and secondary schools
48 and that is the work that begins immediately behind that black door
49 and though I am today building a great team of men and women I will take personal responsibility
50 for the change I want to see
51 Never mind the backstop – the buck stops here
52
53 And I will tell you something else about my job.
54
55 It is to be Prime Minister of the whole United Kingdom
56 and that means uniting our country
57 answering at last the plea of the forgotten people
58 and the left behind towns
59 by physically and literally renewing the ties that bind us together
60 so that with safer streets and better education and fantastic new road and rail infrastructure and full fibre broadband
61 we level up across Britain
62 with higher wages, and a higher living wage, and higher productivity
63 we close the opportunity gap
64 giving millions of young people the chance to own their own homes
65 and giving business the confidence to invest across the UK
66 because it is time we unleashed the productive power not just of London and the South East
67 but of every corner of England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland
68 the awesome foursome that are incarnated in that red white and blue flag
69 who together are so much more than the sum of their parts
70 and whose brand and political personality is admired and even loved around the world
71 for our inventiveness, for our humour, for our universities, our scientists, our armed forces, our diplomacy

72 for the equalities on which we insist – whether race or gender or LGBT or the right of every girl in the world to 12 years of quality
73 education

74 and for the values we stand for around the world

75 Everyone knows the values that flag represents

76 It stands for freedom and free speech and habeas corpus and the rule of law

77 and above all it stands for democracy

78 and that is why we will come out of the EU on October 31

79 because in the end Brexit was a fundamental decision by the British people that they wanted their laws made by people that they can
80 elect and they can remove from office

81 and we must now respect that decision

82 and create a new partnership with our European friends – as warm and as close and as affectionate as possible

83 and the first step is to repeat unequivocally our guarantee to the 3.2 m EU nationals now living and working among us

84 and I say directly to you – thank you for your contribution to our society

85 thank you for your patience and I can assure you that under this government you will get the absolute certainty of the rights to live
86 and remain

87

88 And next I say to our friends in Ireland, and in Brussels and around the EU

89

90 I am convinced that we can do a deal

91 without checks at the Irish border, because we refuse under any circumstances to have such checks

92 and yet without that anti-democratic backstop

93 and it is of course vital at the same time that we prepare for the remote possibility

94 that Brussels refuses any further to negotiate

95 and we are forced to come out with no deal

96 not because we want that outcome – of course not

97 but because it is only common sense to prepare

98 and let me stress that there is a vital sense in which those preparations cannot be wasted

99 and that is because under any circumstances we will need to get ready

100 at some point in the near future

101 to come out of the EU customs union and out of regulatory control

102 fully determined at last to take advantage of brexit

103 because that is the course on which this country is now set

104 with high hearts and growing confidence we will now accelerate the work of getting ready

105

106 and the ports will be ready and the banks will be ready

107 and the factories will be ready

108 and business will be ready

109 and the hospitals will be ready

110 and our amazing food and farming sector will be ready and waiting to continue selling

111 ever more not just here but around the world
112 and don't forget that in the event of a no deal outcome we will have the extra lubrication of the £39 bn
113 and whatever deal we do we will prepare this autumn for an economic package
114 to boost British business and to lengthen this country's lead as the number one destination in this continent for overseas investment
115
116 and to all those who continue to prophesy disaster
117 I say yes – there will be difficulties
118 though I believe that with energy and application they will be far less serious than some have claimed
119 but if there is one thing that has really sapped the confidence of business over the last three years
120 it is not the decisions we have taken
121 it is our refusal to take decisions
122
123 and to all those who say we cannot be ready
124 I say do not underestimate this country
125 Do not underestimate our powers of organisation and our determination
126 because we know the enormous strengths of this economy
127 in life sciences, in tech, in academia, in music, the arts, culture, financial services,
128 It is here in Britain that we are using gene therapy, for the first time, to treat the most common form of blindness
129 here in Britain that we are leading the world in the battery technology that will help cut CO2 and tackle climate change
130 and produce green jobs for the next generation
131 and as we prepare for a post-Brexit future it is time we looked not at the risks but at the opportunities that are upon us
132 so let us begin work now to create free ports that will drive growth and thousands of high-skilled jobs in left behind areas
133 let's start now to liberate the UK's extraordinary bioscience sector from anti genetic modification rules
134 and let's develop the blight-resistant crops that will feed the world
135 let's get going now on our own position navigation and timing satellite and earth observation systems – UK assets orbiting in space
136 with all the long term strategic and commercial benefits for this country
137 Let's change the tax rules to provide extra incentives to invest in capital and research
138 and let's promote the welfare of animals that has always been so close to the hearts of the British people
139 and yes, let's start now on those free trade deals
140 because it is free trade that has done more than anything else to lift billions out of poverty
141 all this and more we can do now and only now, at this extraordinary moment in our history
142 and after three years of unfounded self-doubt it is time to
143 change the record
144 to recover our natural and historic role as an enterprising, outward-looking and truly global Britain, generous in temper and engaged
145 with the world
146 No one in the last few centuries has succeeded in betting against the pluck and nerve and ambition of this country
147 They will not succeed today
148 We in this government will work flat out to give this country the leadership it deserves
149 and that work begins now

150 Thank you very much.