

University of Pardubice  
Faculty of Arts and Philosophy  
Department of English and American Studies

## **Politically Correct Language in Public Speeches**

Michaela Matoušková

Diploma Paper

2010

Univerzita Pardubice  
Filozofická fakulta  
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

**Politicky korektní jazyk v mluvených projevech**

Michaela Matoušková

Diplomová práce

2010

Univerzita Pardubice  
Fakulta filozofická  
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky  
Akademický rok: 2010/2011

## ZADÁNÍ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE

(PROJEKTU, UMĚLECKÉHO DÍLA, UMĚLECKÉHO VÝKONU)

Jméno a příjmení: **Michaela MATOUŠKOVÁ**  
Studijní program: **M7503 Učitelství pro základní školy**  
Studijní obor: **Učitelství anglického jazyka**

Název tématu: **Politicky korektní jazyk v mluvených projevech**

### Zásady pro vypracování:

Studentka se ve své diplomové práci zaměří na charakteristiku a užití jazykových prostředků politicky korektního jazyka v anglických mluvených projevech. Nejprve na základě studia relevantní odborné literatury z oblasti lingvistiky a sociolingvistiky definuje a vymezení pojem „politicky korektní jazyk“. Dále bude klasifikovat a charakterizovat jazykové prostředky politické korektnosti se zaměřením na lexikální a sémantickou stránku jazyka. Následně provede analýzu vybraných mluvených projevů s cílem objasnit užití popsaných jazykových prostředků. Na základě analýzy studentka zmapuje frekvenci zkoumaných jazykových prostředků, vysvětlí jejich funkce, vliv na posluchače a efektivitu s ohledem na sdělnou funkci jazyka. Na závěr zdůvodní převažující tendence a nastíní další možný vývoj.

Rozsah grafických prací:

Rozsah pracovní zprávy:

Forma zpracování diplomové práce: **tištěná/elektronická**

Seznam odborné literatury:

Crystal, David; Davy, Derek: *Investigating English Style*. Harlow: Addison Wesley Longman, 1969. ISBN 0-582-55011-4

Corbett, Greville: *Gender*. Cambridge University Press, 1991. ISBN 0-521-33845-X

Hudson, Richard A.: *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge University Press, 1996. ISBN 0-521-56514-6

Poynton, Cate: *Language and Gender: Making the Difference*. Oxford University Press, 1985. ISBN 0-19-437160-3

Romaine, Suzanne: *Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford University Press, 1994. ISBN 0-19-875134-6

Graddol, David; Cheshire, Jenny; Swann, Joan: *Describing Language*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1994. ISBN 0-335-19315-3

Crystal, David: *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge University Press, 1997. ISBN 0-521-62994-2

Crystal, David: *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press, 1995. ISBN 0-521-59655-6

Vedoucí diplomové práce:

**Mgr. Petra Huschová, Ph.D.**  
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky


Datum zadání diplomové práce: **30. dubna 2008**

Termín odevzdání diplomové práce: **31. března 2010**



prof. PhDr. Petr Vorel, CSc.  
děkan

L.S.



Mgr. Šárka Bubíková, Ph.D.  
vedoucí katedry

V Pardubicích dne 30. listopadu 2008

Prohlašuji:

Tuto práci jsem vypracovala samostatně. Veškeré literární prameny a informace, které jsem v práci využila, jsou uvedeny v seznamu použité literatury.

Byla jsem seznámena s tím, že se na moji práci vztahují práva a povinnosti vyplývající ze zákona č. 121/2000 Sb., autorský zákon, zejména se skutečností, že Univerzita Pardubice má právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití této práce jako školního díla podle § 60 odst. 1 autorského zákona, a s tím, že pokud dojde k užití této práce mnou nebo bude poskytnuta licence o užití jinému subjektu, je Univerzita Pardubice oprávněna ode mne požadovat přiměřený příspěvek na úhradu nákladů, které na vytvoření díla vynaložila, a to podle okolností až do jejich skutečné výše.

Souhlasím s prezenčním zpřístupněním své práce v Univerzitní knihovně.

V Pardubicích dne 25. 3. 2010

Michaela Matoušková

Ráda bych poděkovala všem, kteří se podíleli na vzniku této práce. Děkuji především vedoucí mé diplomové práce Mgr. Petře Huschové, Ph.D. za cenné rady, ochotu a vstřícnost, s jakou mi poskytovala konzultace a komentář k této práci. Děkuji také PhDr. Šárce Ježkové, Ph.D., která vedla můj diplomový seminář a s prací mi taktéž pomáhala.

## **Annotation**

This diploma paper deals with politically correct language in public speeches. The theoretical part defines political correctness and states two language means of political correctness: euphemism/dysphemism and genderlect. Furthermore, it concentrates on selected areas of linguistic taboo and possible ways of expressing gender-neutrality in the English language. In the practical part, the theory is applied to public speeches in order to prove whether the language means of political correctness correspond to the expressions detected in the data as well as to state the frequency of occurrence of these means.

## **Keywords**

Politically correct language; language means of political correctness; euphemism; dysphemism; genderlect; public speeches

## **Abstrakt**

Tato diplomová práce se zabývá politicky korektním jazykem v mluvených projevech. V teoretické části práce je definována politická korektnost a jsou uvedeny dva jazykové prostředky politické korektnosti: eufemismy/dysfemismy a genderlect. Následně se práce zaměřuje na vybrané oblasti lingvistického tabu a možné způsoby vyjadřování genderové neutrality v anglickém jazyce. V praktické části je teorie aplikována na mluvené projevy za účelem zjistit, zda se dané jazykové prostředky politické korektnosti v anglických mluvených projevech vyskytují a stanovit četnost výskytu obou jazykových prostředků.

## **Klíčová slova**

Politicky korektní jazyk; jazykové prostředky politické korektnosti; eufemismus; dysfemismus; genderlect; mluvené projevy

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction .....	1
2. Politically correct language.....	3
2.1 Explanation of the term .....	3
2.2 History and origin of politically correct language.....	4
2.3 Criticism of political correctness.....	5
3. Euphemism and dysphemism.....	7
3.1 Explanation of the terms .....	7
3.1.1 Face-work.....	9
3.2 Linguistic taboo.....	11
3.2.1 Sex and body parts .....	12
3.2.2 Death and killing .....	15
3.2.3 Mental and physical illness .....	17
3.2.4 Races and nationalities .....	19
3.2.5 Homosexuality .....	21
4. Genderlect .....	23
4.1 Social status and its reflection in female and male speech styles .....	23
4.2 Lexical and semantic differences in female and male speech.....	24
4.3 Gender-neutral language .....	26
4.3.1 Generic man .....	26
4.3.2 Gender-neutral they.....	27
5. Characteristics of public speeches .....	29
6. Analysis .....	31
6.1 Background of the analysis .....	31
6.1.1 Death and killing .....	32
6.1.2 Generic man .....	37
6.1.3 Races and nationalities .....	40
6.1.4 Mental and physical illness .....	44
6.1.5 Homosexuality .....	47
6.1.6 Sex and body parts .....	49
6.1.7 Gender-neutral they .....	49
6.2 Summary of results.....	50
7. Conclusion.....	55
8. Resumé .....	57
9. Bibliography.....	61
10. Appendices.....	65
10.1 Appendix 1: The data corpus.....	65
10.2 Appendix 2: Electronic sources of the public speeches .....	79



## **1. Introduction**

This diploma paper deals with the issue of politically correct language in public speeches. Political correctness is of a great interest not only for linguists and sociolinguists. The primary aim of this paper is to mark the occurrence of two language means of political correctness, namely euphemism/dysphemism and genderlect, in public speeches and prove whether the expressions for the selected language means discussed in the theoretical part correspond to the expressions detected in the data. The language means of political correctness were chosen on the basis of various sources from linguistics and sociolinguistics. The language means are classified and characterized on lexical and semantic level.

This diploma paper consists of two main parts, a theoretical part and an analytical part. The theoretical part is further divided into several chapters. The theoretical part is opened with explanations and characteristics of politically correct language. The origins and history of political correctness are discussed afterwards. The third subchapter focuses on criticism of political correctness.

Concerning the contents of chapter 3 and 4, they are devoted to the two language means of political correctness already mentioned above. These are discussed in much more detail as they are the basis of the analysis. Both chapters are opened with theoretical introductions to the language means from linguistic and sociolinguistic viewpoint. Chapter 3 further examines selected areas of linguistic taboo, namely the language for sex and body parts, death and killing, mental and physical illness, races and nationalities, and homosexuality, while chapter 4 deals with possible ways of expressing gender-neutrality in the English language: the use of generic man and gender-neutral they is discussed. All these linguistic areas as well as the individual expressions examined in the theoretical part were chosen on the basis of what the sources suggested to be frequently used in the English language today. The theoretical part of this paper is concluded by a general description and characteristic features of public speeches. The main types of public speeches are briefly introduced and their functions and aims are mentioned.

The practical part of this paper contains the results of the analysis and demonstrates the prevailing tendencies of using politically correct language in two types of public speeches: informative speeches and special occasion speeches. The analysis is

based on a random selection of samples from both types of the public speeches collected from various online sources. In the analysis, the individual expressions are approached and analysed on examples taken from the data. The expressions are commented on with regard to the contexts in which they occurred as well as with respect to the audience. As already suggested above, the main aim of the analysis is to mark frequency of occurrence of euphemisms, dysphemisms, and genderlects for the above-mentioned linguistic areas. In the last subchapter, the frequency of occurrence of the language means is compared in both types of the public speeches.

## 2. Politically correct language

Political correctness represents a serious issue in the English language nowadays. It affects language means, two of which constitute a major part of this work. These means are euphemism/dysphemism and genderlect. The following chapter is devoted to the general introduction of political correctness.

### 2.1 Explanation of the term

Politically correct language has been a widely discussed topic in English speaking countries in recent years. It is, therefore, essential to begin this paper with the explanation of the term.

According to Allan and Burridge, politically correct terms are suitable expressions which speakers choose in order to refer to dispreferred terms. Thus, as they note, “the phrase *politically correct* is now completely entangled with euphemism [...]” (2006:96). For more information on euphemism see chapter 3 which deals with the issue in more detail.

The meaning of politically correct language is also defined in *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language* as a linguistic orthodoxy which eradicates prejudice about people who are perceived as disadvantaged or oppressed. Therefore, political correctness refers to, for example, race, gender, religion, sexual affinity, ecology, and physical and mental personal development (Crystal 2003:177). In other words, to be politically correct means to use nondiscriminatory language in order not to offend any of these groups and areas.

Another use of politically correct language is provided by Cameron. She writes that political correctness means to give certain groups the opportunity to define how they would like to be called by others and to emphasize their self-identity (1998:152). This is also noted by Allan and Burridge who illustrate it on the politically correct term *African-Americans*. According to them, the aim of using this term is not to draw attention to genetics or colour of African-American people but to stress their historical roots. Moreover, the usage of politically correct expressions “calls for a more precise and accurate use of language.” This can be applied to the term *married*. This term refers only to a relationship that is confirmed by law. On the other hand, the word *partner* does not only include heterosexual relationships but also homosexual relationships

(2006:96-97). Based on these assumptions, it could be said that calling others the way they prefer to be called as well as using accurate expressions is considered to be politically correct behaviour.

After introducing political correctness in this chapter, the following one deals with its history and origin.

## **2.2 History and origin of politically correct language**

Before discussing history of political correctness, the origin of the term *politically correct* itself needs to be explained first. According to Allan and Burrige, it first appeared in a US Supreme Court Decision in 1793. However, despite few earlier appearances of the word, it became widely used later in the 1960's by the American New Left (2006:91). Nevertheless, the term has no longer to do with a political position nowadays but refers to verbal behaviour instead (2006:94).

The concept of politically correct language has not originated recently. To comment on the development of the notion, Duignan and Gann's words can be used: "[...] political correctness rose to prominence in the late 1980's but grew out of postmodernism and cultural revolution of the 1960's." (1995:13). Atkinson adds that "it started with a few voices but grew in popularity until it became unwritten and written law within the community." The reason why political correctness came to existence was to prevent people from talking offensively and thus to protect them from being talked offensively about as well (<http://www.ourcivilisation.com/pc.htm>).

According to Crystal, organizations became afraid of being criticized by the public and hence they started avoiding politically incorrect language so that they were not accused of being offensive. As a result, offensive words were banned from use even in contexts which did not evoke anything racist, for example (2003:177). This can be illustrated on the word *black* (the word is further dealt with in chapter 3.2.4). Even expressions such as *black market*, *black sheep*, and *black ball* started to be avoided as well (Romaine 2000:125). Similarly, the generic use of *man* (see chapter 4.3.1) became attacked too (Crystal 2003:177).

Concerning the replacement of offensive expressions, Cameron comments on the linguistic changes caused by political correctness. She points out that the use of language reflects sensibilities and changes in society such as the result of the social

struggle against discrimination. Replacing words which are considered to be politically incorrect with those regarded as politically correct is something that has to be fought for (1998:152).

The origins and history of political correctness have been discussed in this chapter. The next one deals with opinions on the issue.

### **2.3 Criticism of political correctness**

Political correctness has its opponents as well as proponents. This chapter seeks to provide arguments of both groups. Before dealing with these, an important theory in the concept of political correctness must be discussed and explained in brief.

The theory in question is the *Sapir-Whorf hypothesis*. This theory, associated with two American linguists Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf, supports the proponents' opinion on the importance of changing our language in terms of using politically correct expressions. Cameron explains the hypothesis as follows: "language reflects and determines what we perceive as real (or salient, or significant)." (1998:9). In other words, language determines thought and "there is no pristine perception of reality unmediated by thought's categories and classifications." (Stein 1998:23). Based on these definitions, it can be argued that the way we speak changes the way we think. Therefore, for example, if we use nondiscriminatory language, we will not think of other people in a discriminatory way. However, the opponents of political correctness argue that it is impossible to change our perception of other people by using politically correct expressions.

When discussing negative attitudes towards political correctness, its opponents claim that it is "a trend towards terminological absurdity." A writer from the New York Times, cited by Crystal, has called political correctness a "lethal weapon for silencing anyone whose ideas you don't like." In general, opposers of politically correct language argue that the whole notion is meaningless as it does not remove the real inequalities among people (2003:177).

On the other hand, defenders of political correctness claim that it is the use of the language itself which makes these inequalities preserve (2003:177). What is more, political correctness aims at creating language that includes different communities rather than exclude them. Political correctness has made important gains in achieving

acceptance of nondiscriminatory language and effecting positive change as it aims to remove labelling and name-calling. Cameron observes that “in so doing, it reflects the positive changes taking place in our society; it enables, and genuinely empowers.” Additionally, the proponents of the notion do not dictate to use inclusive language (1998:152). In other words, we can decide ourselves whether or not to use politically correct expressions. It is not forbidden by law, however, everyone who would use politically incorrect language would be seen by the public as being offensive.

The issue of political correctness concludes chapter two. The following chapter is devoted to the first language means of politically correct language examined in this paper: euphemism and dysphemism.

### 3. Euphemism and dysphemism

This chapter opens with the definitions and explanations of euphemism and dysphemism. The following subchapters seek to examine the notion of face and provide some explanatory detail on taboo. As taboo motivates the production of euphemism, it must be inevitably discussed in this paper. The euphemistic and dysphemistic language for taboo topics is also further dealt with.

#### 3.1 Explanation of the terms

In *The Oxford English Dictionary*, euphemism is defined as a “ [...] figure of speech which consists in the substitution of a word or expression of comparatively favourable or less unpleasant associations, instead of the harsher or more offensive one that would more precisely designate what is intended.” (1971:323). Wardhaugh adds that the unpleasantness of certain subjects, such as death, dying, or criminality, is neutralized by euphemistic expressions. Euphemisms also make some occupations and tasks sound more pleasantly (2006:240). The term *sanitation engineer*, for example, is a more pleasant substitution for *garbage collector* (Andrews 2008:128).

Euphemisms are also used in order to be kind, to avoid offending other people, hurting their feelings, and humiliating them. They are more acceptable terms in certain social situations. On this account, Burridge writes that it is more convenient to say that a person is *chronologically gifted* or *experientially enhanced* rather than *old* as the latter is not a respectful term and can cause offence to the person (2005:222-223).

Stein examines euphemism in terms of its rhetorical properties. He raises a question of what generates the language and why we use certain kinds of language in certain situations. He notes that euphemism is a symbol and like all symbols, it represents something else. It draws our attention on some things while, at the same time, it distracts it from others (1998:29). When examining euphemism as a symbol, Burridge also defines it in this regard. She describes euphemism “as a kind of linguistic dressing” and adds that “it can be decorative, ornamental, flavour-enhancing, concealing – the kind of linguistic behaviour that turns *bottlenecks* and *traffic jams* into *localized capacity deficiencies*.” (2005:36). Stein further explains what makes euphemistic expressions different from other symbols and why we prefer them to other symbols, for instance hyperbole. The reason for the choice for euphemistic expressions is in how

they substitute for something else. If hyperbole exaggerates, euphemism, on the other hand, understates so that it completely disguises what we really think and wish to say. As a result, the original intention of what we say is hardly recognizable (1998:29-30). The term *the final solution of the Jewish question* can be provided as an example. This euphemism was used by the Nazis in order to hide their real intentions and to get away with the genocide (1998:39).

What is more, Burrige points out that some people accuse euphemisms of disguising and confusing facts, and that all euphemisms are dishonest in a sense. Nevertheless, not all euphemisms should be seen as confusing reality. Many of them make our lives easier because they are used in order to avoid things which threaten or distress us (2005:230).

As already discussed above, euphemisms are used as substitutions for dispreferred expressions. However, many expressions which are euphemistic at one point often degenerate into dysphemisms as they gain negative connotations (the term *connotation* is explained in chapter 3.2). As *dysphemism* is another key term used throughout this paper and is inevitably related to euphemism, it needs to be explained in this section. The explanation of the term is provided by Burrige who defines it as follows: it is “the offensive counterpart to the sweet-smelling euphemism” (2005:38). Allan adds that dysphemisms “are offensive either about the denotatum<sup>1</sup> or to the audience, or both.” For example, instead of saying *I’m off to have a piss* at a formal dinner party, a speaker should more conveniently say *excuse me for a moment* (Allan and Burrige 2001:12).

When examining the use of dysphemism, it could be asked what motivates its production. Allan and Burrige indicate that dysphemism is motivated by fear, distaste, hatred, or contempt. Speakers use dysphemisms in order to insult and downgrade others. Furthermore, another significant use of dysphemisms is that they are a way to let the steam off by using swear words in order to calm anger and frustration (2001:11).

As mentioned above, some euphemisms often become dysphemisms. Even though euphemisms, by definition, are not yet contaminated, they often degenerate into taboo terms through contamination by taboo topics (Allan and Burrige 2005:5). As a

---

<sup>1</sup> The term *denotatum* is explained in the Shorter Oxford English Dictionary as follows: “expression by marks, signs, or symbols; the individuals to which a word applies.” (1970:16).



consequence, it is necessary to find a new euphemistic substitution so that the polite use of language is restored (McKnight 1969:270). Allan and Burridge note that the contamination of euphemisms is caused by “society’s perception of a word’s tainted denotatum contaminating the word itself,” and they add that “the degree of contamination perceived in the denotatum ranges on a scale which has fear, abhorrence, loathing and contempt at one end, and nothing worse than low social esteem at the other.” (2005:5). The word *immodest* is one of a number of words which were originally euphemistic but attached negative connotations (see chapter 3.2 where the term is explained). This word is derived from the Latin *modus*, meaning *measure*. Its original meaning, however, was *extreme* or *immoderate* (McKnight 1969:270).

After explaining the key terms *euphemism* and *dysphemism* in this chapter, the following one deals with the notion of face.

### **3.1.1 Face-work**

The following section is devoted to the concept of face as the use of euphemism in relation to one’s face is of a great importance.

Firstly, it is necessary to provide a definition of face. In their work on politeness, Brown and Levinson define it as “the public self-image that every member of a society wants to claim for himself or herself.” In other words, face refers to one’s positive social value (1987:61). Additionally, face is something other people give us and that is why we need to be careful to give it to them as well (Hudson 1996:114).

Hudson notes that the face theory was developed by Ervin Goffman, an American sociologist, who introduced the term *face-work* which stands for maintaining or saving face (1996:113-114). Before moving on, there are several terms in the notion of face which need to be clarified. These terms are *positive face* and *negative face*, and *to save face* and *lose face*.

To begin with, the term *positive face* refers to “the appreciation and approval that others show for the kind of person we are, for our behaviour, for our values and so on.” (Hudson 1996:114). On the other hand, *negative face* is defined by Brown and Levinson as follows: it “is the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction, [...] freedom of action and freedom from imposition.” (1987:61). In

addition, it is the desire not to be interfered by others and “the need to act without giving offense.” (Wardhaugh 2006:277).

Concerning the *loss of face*, the principle is explained as follows:

Much of what we usually call ‘politeness’ or ‘etiquette’ in social gatherings consists of disregarding aspects of behaviour that might otherwise lead to a ‘loss of face’. Episodes in an individual’s past, or personal characteristics that might produce embarrassment if mentioned, are not commented on or referred to ... Tact is a sort of protective device which each party involved employs in the expectation that, in return, their own weaknesses will not be deliberately exposed to general view (Giddens 1993:93, cited by Hudson 1996:114).

Taking this into account, the term *lose face* refers to being humiliated or losing respect. In contrast, to *save face* means to preserve respect and dignity (Hudson 1996:113).

After discussing face in general in this section, the issue should be finally applied to the use of euphemism.

As Wardhaugh writes, we are supposed to protect our face as well as face of others (2006:276). On this account, talking with one another can be only successful if all participants are aware of the conventions that rule their language (Allan and Burridge 1991:4). We apply these conventions effectively, which means that we need to manage our verbal behaviour very carefully (Hudson 1996:115). We choose different strategies for maintaining our as well as other people’s face. The choice of these strategies depends entirely on a particular situation. In order to produce the desired face effects, we choose what expressions we shall use (Allan and Burridge 1991:6). That is why we employ euphemisms because they are used to protect other people from being offended (Hudson 1996:114).

In relation to face, Allan and Burridge define euphemism as an alternative expression to a dispreferred one which people use in order to avoid either their own or other people’s loss of face. (1991:11). “Every time we open our mouths, we have to consider whether what we say is likely to maintain, enhance, or damage our own face, as well as considering the effect of our utterance on others. We have to work to create the effect we intend to create.” (1991:4-5).

The issue of face will be further dealt with in the practical part of this paper when commenting on expressions chosen by the speakers. The following chapter provides necessary information on taboo which is also important when examining euphemism and dysphemism.

### 3.2 Linguistic taboo

Taboo terms are dispreferred expressions and they are alternatively called dysphemisms. Euphemisms are motivated either by taboo topics or they are simply alternatives to the dispreferred expressions (Allan and Burridge 2006:32).

To introduce the notion of taboo, we can use Allan's definition: "that which is taboo is forbidden. Taboo(ed) words are those considered offensive, shocking, or indecent when used in certain contexts." (2001:148). Additionally, certain things are not supposed to be said and they can be referred to only euphemistically in certain situations, or by certain people (Wardhaugh 2006:239). Furthermore, there are a number of factors which determine whether our language is or is not appropriate. These factors include the relationships between speakers and their audience, and the situation (Allan and Burridge 2006:30). "What determines whether a particular expression is euphemistic, dysphemistic, or neutral is a set of social attitudes or conventions." (Allan and Burridge 1991:231).

Moreover, both euphemism and dysphemism are effects of *connotation* (Allan 2001:147). Jones defines connotation as the definition and meaning that people associate with words. Connotation can be, for example, positive and negative. To illustrate this, the word *heart* has positive connotations because it is commonly associated with love. On the other hand, the word *plague* refers to a disease and thus has negative connotations (2004:81). With regard to the above definitions, it is difficult to define whether words are or are not appropriate without having the context of their use. Therefore, in the theoretical part of this paper, all words are described and classified according to what the literature suggests to be generally perceived as appropriate or inappropriate. In the analytical part of this paper, however, the language means of political correctness must be commented on and classified with respect to the particular contexts of the selected public speeches.

As noted previously, linguistic taboos should not be mentioned. But it does not mean they cannot be violated. According to Wardhaugh, people do so in order to draw attention to themselves, to offend, to show contempt, to provoke, and to be aggressive (2006:239). Breaking linguistic taboos can result in penalties in the form of corporal punishments, or social ostracism from one's family or a social group as these have their

written or unwritten conventions governing acceptable behaviour (Allan and Burridge 2006:8).

In this chapter, the notion of taboo in relation to euphemism and dysphemism was examined. As euphemism can be taboo-based, it is important to know what euphemisms might be used when referring to taboo topics as well as what euphemisms might be used instead of dispreferred terms. There is a wide range of taboo topics and linguistic areas but all of these cannot be covered in this paper. Hence, the following chapters are devoted to the language for those taboo topics which are considered to be subject to strong social taboos. Similarly, as the sources suggest, the expressions for the linguistic areas commented upon are the most frequently used ones in the English language nowadays. Therefore, it might be assumed that the expressions for the chosen taboo topics may frequently occur in the public speeches used for the analytical part of this paper. In case the aim of the public speech is to save one's face, euphemistic or neutral expressions might occur more frequently. If there is a higher occurrence of dysphemistic terms, the speakers might cause the loss of the audience's as well as their own face (face is discussed in chapter 3.1.1).

### **3.2.1 Sex and body parts**

The content of this chapter is devoted to the language for sex and the associated body parts. As these are strongly tabooed topics in most cultures, this chapter discusses the appropriate expressions for them. Besides that, it also comments on their negative counterparts. Before dealing with terms for these taboo topics, it is important to emphasize that they are not only used to refer to these. Their major function is to insult other people, their personalities, or characteristics.

Sex has always been a strong taboo topic. Therefore, as Jay claims, a lot of euphemistic expressions have been created in order to allow people to talk about it in an acceptable way. He continues that "the sheer abundance of euphemisms for sex is a good indication of how important it is for speakers to talk around the topic." (2000:128).

To begin with, one of the most frequently used terms in the English language today is the word *fuck* which refers to *having sex*. This one is regarded as strongly dysphemistic and can be used both as a verb and a noun, such as in *fuck you* and *have a*

*fuck* (Allan and Burridge 1991:90). Etymologically, the origin of the word is hard to trace, partly because the word was taboo to the editors of the original Oxford English Dictionary. However, the dictionary suggests it either derives from the Norwegian word *fukka* or from the German word *ficken* (<http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?search=fuck&searchmode=none>). Allan and Burridge name some of the euphemistic substitutions which are frequently used for this dysphemistic term. These are, for example, *sexual intercourse*, *copulation*, *coition*, *make it*, *get to it*, or *fall to it* (1991:90). Additionally, the verb *do* is also a commonly used euphemism for having sex (Baker 2002:94). Other euphemisms for *fuck*, suggested by Attwood, are *make love* or *sleep with* someone (2008:300).

As noted previously, the term *fuck* is considered to be strongly dysphemistic. Nonetheless, it is necessary to point out that apart from the fact that *fuck* is used to refer to sex, there is also a nonliteral meaning of the word which is *to spoil* or *ruin* something. With this meaning, the word is largely used in the English language today (Allan and Burridge 1990:91). In addition to this, there is also a neutral sense of the word which Jemie illustrates on the sentence *Run, motherfucker, run!* As he claims, if this is said by a player to their playmate, for example, it is perceived as negative as it expresses anger and frustration. However, if said by a coach to a player, the meaning is rather neutral (2003:17).

Besides the sexual connotations of the word *fuck*, the term is also used to describe different kinds of situations. It can be found in greetings: *How the fuck are you?*; in refusals: *Oh you can fuck right off*; in questioning authority: *Who do the fuck you think you are?*; or in expressing confusions: *What the fuck...?*, just to name a few (<http://justin.justnet.com.au/rudestuff/uses-of-the-word-fuck.html>).

To mention the vocabulary for female genital organs, the word *cunt* is used in the English language. According to Allan and Burridge, this body-part term already existed in Early Middle English and was found in people's names, such as *Godwin Clawecuncte* or *John Filecunt*. In addition, *cunt* was also a water channel. Considering this, this body-part term was not originally dysphemistic at all. However, it gained negative associations over time and is considered to be one of the most tabooed English words nowadays (2006:52). Other dysphemistic terms for female genitals are *pissflaps*, *fuckhole*, or *cockpit* (Allan and Burridge 1991:100). *Vagina*, as Burridge indicates, is a

neutral substitution for the dysphemistic terms above (2005:122). As far as euphemisms are concerned, some of those used to refer to female genitals are *equipment*, *waterworks*, or *fanny* (Allan and Burrridge 1991:100,102).

A number of expressions referring to male genital organs exist in the English language as well. The neutral term *penis* has a wide range of negative expressions such as *tail*, *cock*, *prick*, *dick*, *dangle*, *wally*, or *wiener* (Allan and Burrridge 1991:97). All these are regarded as strongly dysphemistic and therefore unacceptable to be said in public. Some euphemistic expressions for these dysphemisms are *doodle*, *diddle*, *dong*, or *dink* (Allan and Burrridge 2005:3). When dealing with expressions for male genital organs, Burrridge also comments on the neutral noun *testicles* and notes that some of the dysphemistic expressions used for this word are *balls*, *eggs*, or *nuts* (2005:43). The euphemistic terms used for *testicles* are *tally-wags*, or *twiddle-diddles* (Allan and Burrridge 2001:2).

As already suggested, all the terms discussed so far are primarily used to offend one's personality or characteristics. On this account, the word *cunt* is mainly used to refer to nastiness or maliciousness. Therefore, *cunt* means *nasty*, *malicious*, or *despicable*. Similarly, the words *prick* and *dick* refer to one's stupidity (Partridge 1961, cited by Tsohatzidis 1990:166-167).

In chapter 3.2, the importance of context in relation to euphemisms and dysphemisms was discussed. Thus, it can be mentioned that despite the fact that dysphemistic expressions referring to sex are generally perceived as offensive, they can be acceptable for some people under certain circumstances. Jay reveals that sexual partners, for example, can use dysphemisms during a sexual act. In this case, the dysphemisms function as euphemisms as they express intimacy (2000:129).

He also observes that even though there is a large number of words referring to sex and body parts, some aspects of sexuality do not have their euphemistic expressions. Because some words and topics lack their euphemistic expressions, such taboos, then, remain taboos. In this connection, he further indicates that there are no euphemisms for oral sex and speakers have to use some of the dysphemistic terms, such as *blow job*, when they want to refer to it. However, they should not do so in public as they would be accused of being offensive (2000:128). On the contrary, Allan and Burrridge mention a

neutral expression *fellatio* which can be alternatively used when talking about this topic (2006:150).

After introducing the language for sex and the associated body parts in this chapter, the following one deals with the language for another strong taboo topic which appears to be *death* and *killing*.

### **3.2.2 Death and killing**

To introduce the content of this chapter, the following quotation by Algeo and Pyles can be used: “euphemism has been frequently used when we must come face to face with the less happy facts of our existence.” Since there are violent, unpleasant, and sad experiences in our lives, such as death, the bitterness of these experiences is softened by the use of such euphemisms as *the final sleep* (2005:214).

As suggested above, death is subject to taboo. Therefore, there appears a question of what causes the reluctance against talking about death. The answer is given by Algeo and Pyles who suppose that it is “because of superstitions connected with the word itself.” Thus, using euphemistic expressions is preferred to naming death directly (2005:214). Allan and Burridge add that verbal taboos on death are based on fears. People avoid speaking about death because they are afraid of losing their loved ones (2006:222). They further mention other fears in avoiding mentioning death. The fears in question are the notion of death as the ultimate end of life, or the fear of not knowing what follows death as people have no experience with it. In addition, some people refuse to name death directly as they are afraid of the souls of the deceased (1991:153).

After introducing the motivation for death euphemisms in general, it is necessary to continue with introducing euphemistic and dysphemistic expressions for death and killing.

To begin with, death is commonly referred to as a journey, a beginning of a new life, and a loss. As for the latter, such euphemisms include *losing* and *missing* (Allan and Burridge 2006:224; 1991:161). As for the metaphor of death as a journey, some euphemistic expressions arising from this notion are *go on a journey*, *pass away*, *go to sleep*, or *depart* (Algeo and Pyles 2005:214). When discussing euphemism depicting death as a journey, Allan and Burridge observe an interesting source for this notion.

They point out that terms such as *go to meet one's maker*, *go to a better place*, and *go to heaven* come from Christianity (2006:226).

When discussing euphemisms, one of the most common ways of referring to death is by using the word *sleep*. Allan and BurrIDGE observe why this euphemism is preferred to the neutral term *die* and they come to the conclusion that when we sleep, the absence of soul is only temporary (2006:225). Additionally, according to Stein, it is preferable to say that one's *life terminated* rather than someone *died*. If death and aggression are masked, they are easier to bear as they are suppressed by euphemism (1969:27).

As already mentioned, euphemisms for death are preferred because death is regarded as a strong taboo. In chapter 3.1, the matter of euphemisms as degenerating into taboo words was discussed. The expressions such as *mortician* and *undertaker* are words which were originally euphemistic but gained negative connotations (see chapter 3.2 for the definition of the term) over time and had to be replaced. The current euphemism which is suggested to be used instead is the term *funeral director* (BurrIDGE 2005:35). Additionally, McKnight notes that "*undertaker*, under the name *funeral director*, attempts to escape the unpleasant associations attaching to his occupation." (1969:272).

A significant use of euphemism is undoubtedly its flippant use and therefore it should be discussed in brief in this section. The flippancy towards fear-based taboos is commented upon by BurrIDGE. She indicates that such use helps people to deal with the fear of death. Also, as there are people who have to deal with death on a daily basis, the flippant use of euphemisms makes it easier for them to bear (2005:36-37). It makes death "more tolerable to human consciousness than it would otherwise be." (Algeo and Pyles 2005:215). In such a way, euphemistic expressions are used especially by doctors and workers of funeral parlours. Among flippant euphemisms are expressions such as *kick the bucket*, *call it quits*, *check out*, *cock up one's toes*, or *peg out*. Nonetheless, some people may perceive these as dysphemistic rather than euphemistic. Especially the euphemism *kick the bucket* "is typically a [...] downgrading of death." Thus, it can function as dysphemism on other occasions (Allan and BurrIDGE 2001:10). In other words, it is the context which determines whether these terms are euphemistic or dysphemistic.



Another area where flippant euphemisms appear is the criminal law. Thus, when referring to capital punishment, the term *swing* is used for *hang*, and *fry* is used for *electrocute*. In a similar way, *coffin* can be sometimes described as a *wooden overcoat* (Allan and BurrIDGE 1991:166).

So far, the language for death and dying has been discussed. The last section of this chapter deals with the language for killing. As Allan and BurrIDGE suppose, in wars, euphemisms are often used to mask the true purpose of killing, and to reduce feelings of responsibility. Besides that, these euphemisms also distance actions from those who carry them out (2006:235). Some of the euphemisms used in legal killings are *execute*, *pacify*, which means to kill, or *neutralize*, which means to kill selected targets (Allan and BurrIDGE 1991:166).

The following chapter examines the language for mental and physical illness, which is another area of a strong linguistic taboo.

### **3.2.3 Mental and physical illness**

Terms referring to mental and physical illness also primarily serve as terms of insult. Therefore, before dealing with the language for these, it should be explained why these terms are used to offend other people.

As Allan and BurrIDGE note, since mentally ill patients are viewed as “morally deficient, incurable, and potentially dangerous [...]”, and their behaviour perceived as socially unacceptable, a number of dysphemistic expressions arise from this area to allow us to offend others (1991:187). Furthermore, “the fear of becoming insane is one of the most common fears felt by normal people, taking equal place with those of cancer and death.” (Gillis 1972:177, cited by Allan and BurrIDGE 1991:189).

To begin with, euphemisms for mental and physical illness originate when people are afraid of “losing control over their thoughts and actions.” Madness is seen as losing control, which explains the euphemism *losing one's mind*. On this account, saying *I'm going crazy* suggests an action that is out of control. “Loss of control is the motivation behind many of the different meanings of [...] *crazy* in normal non-clinical usage.” (Allan and BurrIDGE 2006:214). The euphemism *be crazy about* can be also used as an example here. As McKnight points out, it expresses the intensity of a feeling for a person or a thing (1969:274).

When dealing with the euphemism *crazy*, McKnight writes that it is one of the most common terms referring to mental illness. This euphemism originally meant *cracked*, or *flawed* (1969:270). Allan and Burridge suppose that it was originally applied to all kinds of illness. However, its meaning has narrowed to mental illness only throughout time (2005:6).

Another typically used euphemism for mental illness is the word *lunatic*. If we look in *The Chambers's Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*, we find out that the original meaning of *lunacy* was “a kind of madness formerly supposed to be affected by the moon”. Thus, *lunatic* was someone “affected with a lunacy”, or a “madman”. (2001:611). This term gave rise to some of its synonyms such as *loon* or *loony*, both regarded as euphemistic as well (Allan and Burridge 1991:188).

A large number of dysphemistic expressions are associated with physical and psychological illness. Some of these are named by Allan and Burridge who claim that terms such as *idiot*, *fuckwit*, *nutter*, *spastic*, *jerk*, *cripple*, *airhead*, *fool*, *cretin*, and *spastic* are regarded as strong dysphemisms and therefore they primarily serve as terms of insult (1991:148).

Another dysphemism, and a frequently used one, is the expression *silly*. This term is one of a large number of euphemisms which became dysphemistic over time. Its original meaning was *blessed*, or *blissful*. The current meaning of the word is only mildly dysphemistic. The term *mentally disabled* is the same case as it was once a euphemism as well. After some time, however, it had to be replaced by *mentally challenged* which is now the desired expression (Allan and Burridge 1991:148). Crystal notes that the same thing happened to the term *disabled people* who are supposed to be referred to as *people with disabilities* or *differently abled* instead (2003:177). According to *The American Heritage Book of English Usage*, the term *physically challenged* is proposed as well. The purpose of these euphemistic substitutions is “to emphasize the positive aspect of the challenge that a particular condition presents over the negative aspect of hindrance or incapacity.” (1996:194).

When examining the language for mental and physical illness, it could be asked what motivates the choice between different expressions. Allan and Burridge argue that it is not only the matter of lexical choice. “Different connotations motivate the choice between these different vocabulary items.” Based on this assumption, they explain why

the word *cancer*, for example, is avoided. They observe that the reason for this is its associations with malignancy and death. As *growth* and *tumor* can be benign, these are more preferable terms. Therefore, the choice of euphemisms and dysphemisms depends entirely on the context (1991:4).

This chapter introduced euphemistic and dysphemistic expressions for mental and physical illness. The following one is devoted to racist and nationalist terms.

### 3.2.4 Races and nationalities

The language for races and nationalities is one of the most vulnerable linguistic areas. As the sources do not provide euphemistic expressions for these, this chapter is devoted to their neutral terms. Their dysphemistic expressions are also discussed.

Before dealing with the language for races and nationalities, there appears a question of why offensive terms come from these areas. Allan and Burridge explain that it seems that “all human groups have available in their language a derogatory term for at least one group with which they have contact.” (2006:83).

To begin with, one of the richest lexicon in the English language is for African-Americans. The presence of African-American people in the United States was, according to Crystal, a considerably influential factor in creating English vocabulary. He notes that “until the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, most of this lexicon reflected the status and conditions of slavery, a great deal of it consisting of insult and invective.” Such words included, for example, *slave driver*, or *negro thief* (2003:97). In addition, Feagin mentions that phrases including *black*, such as *to do a black deed*, *to tell a black lie*, *to be on a black list*, or *to give a black mark*, have a negative tone as well. On the contrary, the positive tone in phrases *to tell a white lie*, or *to be a white knight* is apparent (2001:120). However, many efforts to change the language have been made since then. In the 1980’s, under the notion of political correctness, the language for African-American people was limited to a great extent (Crystal 2003:97).

Concerning the linguistic changes in the development of racist expressions, these can be illustrated on the word *black*. Originally, the term was politically correct and acceptable when referring to African-Americans. After some time, however, it must have been replaced as it gained negative connotations. The next terms were *negro* and *coloured*, followed by *Afro-American*, *Africo-American*, and *Afro* (2003:97). Burridge

points out that “so it goes on - society’s prejudices continue to bubble away, undermining the euphemistic value, and the negative connotations soon reattach themselves.” (1998:73). The term *African-American* is the politically correct expression used nowadays (Crystal 2003:97).

As previously mentioned in chapter 2.2, the term *black* has negative connotations (see chapter 3.2 where *connotation* is explained) and is perceived as insensitive even when it is not used to refer to African-American people. As a result, as Crystal remarks, it is banned from use in all contexts, even those that do not evoke anything racist. Therefore, terms such as *blackboard* or *black pieces* in chess are now avoided as well (2003:177).

Although dysphemisms referring to African-American people are thought to be offensive labels, they can be in fact acceptable and perceived as positive among members of the labeled group (Cameron 1998:152). The word *nigger* can be provided as an example here. This word is generally perceived as derogatory. Nonetheless, Folb defines the term as follows:

**nigger** Form of address and identification among blacks (can connote affection, playful derision, genuine anger, or mere identification of another black person; often used emphatically in conversation) (1980:248, cited by Allan 2001:154).

In other words, despite the fact that the word *nigger* should be marked as typically offensive, it is perceived as positive when used among members of the African diaspora (Allan 2001:155). In addition to this, by using such terms in a positive way, African-Americans “attempt to create a positive image for blackness.” (Romaine 2000:125).

It has been already mentioned that the term *black* is generally considered to be offensive. However, an interesting fact is observed by Cameron. She notes that the word *white* can be perceived as offensive as well. According to her, some people claim that *white* degrades African-Americans and promotes racism when used to talk about all human beings. Therefore, it is sometimes suggested to use *person* instead of *white* (2003:141).

As discussed above, some dysphemistic terms can be euphemistic when used in certain contexts, or by certain people. On this account, Australian Aborigines “do not show no strong aversion to using [otherwise dysphemistic] terms like *blackfella*, *Abo*, and *boong* among themselves.” (Eagleson 1982:157, cited by Burrige 1998:71).

Similarly, neither the dysphemism *skippy* is dysphemistic when used for an Australian person, nor is *lebo* for a Lebanese. “Most, if not all, of these ‘racist’ terms can be used without irony between people of the group identified by it.” (Allan 2001:154).

In chapter 3.1.1, face was discussed. Allan defines dysphemisms in relation to face and writes that racist dysphemisms are used to offend one’s face by referring to their race, ethnicity, or nationality (2001:154). When mentioning dysphemistic terms, some of them can be provided here. These are, for example, *polak* for a Pole, *wop* and *eyetie* for an Italian, *ayrab*, *towel head*, *dune coon*, and *camel jockey* for an Arab, *chief* and *Geronimo* for a Native American, and Asian people are dysphemistically referred to as *slopes*, *gooks*, or *kanardles* “from *can hardly see*” (Allan and Burridge 2006:83).

To sum up this chapter, it was devoted to dysphemistic and neutral terms for races and nationalities. In the following chapter, the language for homosexuality is discussed.

### **3.2.5 Homosexuality**

Although the language for sex has already been discussed in chapter 3.2.1, this chapter deals with the language for homosexuality separately. Even though all sex is subject to taboos, homosexuality has always been the strongest one despite the fact that attitudes towards homosexuality have changed and they are more positive nowadays. It is still an effective insult to accuse someone of being homosexual or insult someone using a homosexual term (Allan and Burridge 2006:81).

The morality of homosexual acts and relationships was frequently questioned in the past. However, it is considered to be wrong by a lot of people, especially by the church, even nowadays. Looking at the history of homosexuality, it can be observed that it was seen as “a pathological condition” until the 1960’s. A decade later, homosexuals “identified themselves as oppressed minorities” and they have declared their homosexuality publicly since then (2006:156).

As far as the vocabulary for homosexuality is concerned, the earliest dysphemisms appeared already in the first half of the twentieth century. These were, for example, *long-haired men*, *short-haired women*, *lispng boys*, or *deep-voiced girls*. These terms are not used in the English language today, however (2006:155).

One of the most common words for gays and lesbians used nowadays is *queer*. This term also refers to bisexuals, transsexuals, and transvesties. Even though it was originally dysphemistic, it is rather neutral nowadays (2006:156). The opposite term for *queer* is the neutral adjective *straight* which is used to mean *heterosexual* as its meaning “ordinary, basic, without special admixture” implies “ordinary in sexual inclinations” (Sampson 2002:194). Additionally, Sullivan remarks that among the homosexual community, the term *queer* is used in a positive manner and expresses solidarity (2003:45).

The euphemism *gay* is another frequently used term for homosexuals. According to Stewart, it is “the preferred term for reference to a same-gender orientation [...] because homosexual implicitly emphasizes the sexual and diminishes the other aspects of gender orientation.” He adds that *gay* is used both for males and females (2001:127). The original meaning of the term was, however, quite different. Allan and Burrige observe that it meant *bright, full of fun* but since the 1960’s, it has been still less frequently used as its meaning narrowed to *homosexual* (2001:8). As far as the euphemism *gay* is concerned, it is interesting to point out that when someone wants to use this term with its original meaning, they rather resort to using a proper synonym as using *gay* could cause embarrassment. Moreover, “a speaker simply will not risk to use a taboo term when none was intended.” (Allan and Burrige 2005:7).

Summing up so far, chapter 3 has introduced the concept of euphemism and dysphemism and discussed the appropriate and inappropriate language for several taboo topics. Generally, it is preferred to use euphemisms when referring to taboo topics. By doing so, the negative connotations and associations of words are reduced to the denotations of the words only. The following chapter deals with the other language means involved in the issue of politically correct language: genderlect.

## 4. Genderlect

This chapter provides characteristic features of gender differentiation in the English language from linguistic and sociolinguistic viewpoint. Furthermore, it aims to comment on this sociolinguistic pattern in more detail.

### 4.1 Social status and its reflection in female and male speech styles

To begin with, the definition of *genderlect* should be provided first. Perry defines it as “a useful label to refer to the set of features that mark stereotypical masculine and feminine speech.” (1992:127). Furthermore, “it refers to both expected and observed verbal behaviour because we know more about which gender-based message cues people are expected to use than about how often a given individual actually uses any of these cues in a given setting.” (Bate 1988:58).

Concerning the differences in men’s and women’s language behaviour, Wardhaugh raises a question of what causes these differences and he makes the following observation: men and women have learned to act and talk in certain ways. Therefore, language behaviour is learned. “Men learn to be men and women learn to be women, linguistically speaking.” (2006:327). On the contrary, regarding the fact that women’s and men’s language contains features characteristic of their speech, Romaine claims that women use the language they do only because of their less powerful position in society in relation to men, and because the English language is made and controlled by men, as many feminists argue (2000:101).

Another interesting fact is also observed by Romaine. She notes that because women are perceived as inferior, their language is perceived the same way. Moreover, women’s speech is often contrasted to men’s speech and in comparison with standards of men’s speech, it is found to be deficient (2000:100-101). Perry also observes women’s speech in relation to their power and social status. She mentions that all the features involved in women’s speech make women look weak and unassertive. Thus, women’s speech is seen as a speech of “someone whose status is low.” (1992:129). However, the status women hold in society cannot be changed by changing their communicative style and therefore feminine genderlect should be taken as an alternative rather than ineffective communicative style (1992:134).

When examining women's speech in terms of powerlessness, Wardhaugh writes that it is often described as "trivial, gossip-laden, corrupt, illogical, idle, euphemistic, or deficient; [...] nor is it necessarily more precise, cultivated, or stylish – or even less profane." Women and men also possess different ranges of verbal skills. Nevertheless, even though it is only women who are said to gossip, there are many opinions on the fact that men gossip as much as women do. They only do so in a different way (2006:316-317).

When distinguishing between men's and women's speech, Romaine indicates that according to some researchers, these two are so typical that they could be perceived as two different language varieties. Many linguists and sociolinguists observe a number of differences between feminine and masculine speech. These differences can be found in syntactic, lexical and phonological features, intonation patterns, use of tag questions, and a number of other features (2000:79). What is more, genderlect does not necessarily have to refer to speech only. It can also refer to nonverbal communication that is also typical of males and females (Perry 1992:127). However, as linguistic behaviour is of a major importance in this paper, the issue of genderlect will be further examined on lexical and semantic level.

#### **4.2 Lexical and semantic differences in female and male speech**

As lexical and semantic features of male and female speech are of a major importance of this work, these are discussed in this chapter in more detail. There are a number of ways in which gender identities and relations interact with language. These are explored by linguists as well as sociolinguists.

Concerning typical features of female speech, women often use euphemisms as substitutions for vulgar and taboo words in their speeches (Lakoff 2004:137-138). They also speak more politely and avoid coarse language. On the other hand, the use of slang and swear words is typical of men's speech (Romaine 2000:118). Besides that, men are derogatory towards women and minority groups. They frequently use dysphemistic expressions against them (Allan and Burridge 1991:231).

As Romaine suggests, "a number of sociolinguistic studies have found that women tend to use higher-status variants more frequently than men." (2000:100).



However, according to one research carried out in 1992, women also use swear and dirty words. The research showed the following:

The word *ass* was used by females to denote either a social deviation or a body part; it was used mainly as a body part by males. *Cock*, *cunt*, and *dick* appeared as body parts in males' data but were not recorded for females. Similarly, neither *tits* nor *pussy* were used by females. For males, *tits* was a body part and *pussy* referred to a social deviation. *Piss* referred to anger for females but was more likely to mean a process for males. *Balls*, *fuck*, *shit*, and *suck* were used more or less the same by both males and females. (Jay 1992:139).

Looking at the results of the research, it can be observed that even though some words were used both by men and women, they used them in different ways in most cases. Nonetheless, Allan and Burrige claim that women use swear and dirty words only in the company of the same gender (2006:89).

As far as the use of offensive terms by men and women is concerned, Jay also finds out that men and women speak offensively in different ways. He observes that men curse and use more offensive language more frequently than women, and they also have a richer vocabulary of curse and offensive words (2000:166). Furthermore, women usually use milder swear words and expletives. On the other hand, men's use of swear words is stronger. Therefore, for example, a woman would say *Oh, dear!*, while saying *Dammit!* or *Oh, shit!* would be more typical of men (Crawford 1995:24).

Another interesting fact on men's swearing is brought by Lakoff. She points out that in middle America, males are required to swear, tell dirty jokes, and be able to talk about such topics as the workings of their car engines. This is believed to prove their masculinity (2004:148). In this way, the use of dysphemistic language "becomes a desirable macho marker of sexual identity, just like fighting, or getting drunk, and other antisocial behaviors." (Allan and Burrige 1991:230). On the other hand, Stockwell observes that as "men aim for a more streetwise, 'macho standard' [...] women are more conscious of being judged on appearance and so hypercorrect 'upwards'." (2002:16).

Concluding this chapter, we can say that the question of female and male speech is a significant issue in the English language. The differences in feminine and masculine genderlect appear in a number of features which make female and male speech styles recognizable and typical of both genders. The following chapter deals with the problem

of linguistic references to females, which is another significant issue involved in genderlect.

### **4.3 Gender-neutral language**

There is a large number of linguistic means which are dysphemistic towards women. Since this represents a serious problem in the English language, this chapter seeks to introduce and examine two linguistic means of making references to women. These means are generic man and gender-neutral they.

#### **4.3.1 Generic man**

The use of generic man is one of the most common ways of expressing gender bias against women in the English language. Many linguists and sociolinguists suggest alternative gender-neutral terms which are proposed to be used instead.

Since a lot of terms downgrade women, there have been many efforts made by feminist movements to change language in order to make it less dysphemistic towards women. Feminists also believe that changing language will change attitudes towards women (Allan 2001:153).

The crucial problem is in the use of generic man. Hudson suggests that it should be replaced by a gender-neutral word *person* which is a more preferable term than *man* as it eliminates the linguistic bias against women (1996:103). Contrary to the belief that the use of generic man discriminates women, some grammarians claim that words including generic *man*, such as *mankind*, *man power*, *man-made*, or *-man* compounds, in fact do not exclude females, but they include them (Romaine 2000:114). Similarly, Cameron argues that gender distinctions in languages have nothing to do with female inferiority to men and therefore feminists should not argue that generic man indicates sexist language. It is just a grammatical fact, not that women are something less than men (1998:85).

Nevertheless, Doyle in Cameron denies the opinion that the use of generic man does not express bias against women. She claims that the fact that people tend to link gender-marked expressions “with maleness”, and that “they bring males images to mind” has been proven by many experiments and researches. She further argues that

replacing sexist terms for non-sexist ones is easy, more accurate, and will make language more received by people (Cameron 1998:150).

Furthermore, Allan mentions that there have been a lot of guidelines for non-sexist language and it is advised to use neutral alternatives instead of gender-marked and sexist terms. Therefore, it is advised to use *chairperson* or *chair* instead of *chairman*, *policeman* should be replaced with *police officer*, and similarly *human beings*, *humanity*, or *people* are more preferable terms than *mankind* (2001:153).

#### **4.3.2 Gender-neutral they**

The use of masculine pronouns *he*, *his*, or *him* as gender-neutral pronouns also represents a serious issue in the English language as it is considered to be prejudicial or even sexist. Parsons writes that the use of these pronouns as generic goes back to the times in the past when many positions and occupations were exclusively male. The masculine pronouns were not really gender-neutral but only reflected “the reality at that time.” He continues that “now that times have changed, language needs to reflect that change.” (2004:98).

Corbett notes that since there are many difficulties with generic *he* in the English language, the use of *they* is suggested as this pronoun does not distinguish gender. Although *they* is primarily used for plural forms, it is often chosen to replace singular pronouns as well. By doing so, gender remains unmarked and language becomes gender-neutral (1991:221-222). The use of gender-neutral *they* is also suggested by Parsons who indicates that sentences such as *A student should always do his homework* should be converted to *A student should always do their homework* (2004:99). An alternative to the gender-neutral *they* is discussed by Allan. He suggests that the doublets *he/she*, *him/her*, or *he or she*, *him or her* are also possible (2001:153-154).

As far as the use of gender-neutral *they* is concerned, Romain explains why it is often preferable by women. She claims that many researches have shown that women feel excluded when they read texts where the pronoun *he* is used as generic. However, grammarians argue that the masculine pronoun *he* is in fact generic and can be used when referring to both females and males (2000:114). Nonetheless, the use of gender-neutral pronouns “will not guarantee that women will be treated equally with men.” (Hudson 1996:104).

To sum up the contents of the theoretical part of this paper, the language means of politically correct language, namely euphemism, dysphemism, and genderlect, have been discussed. The following chapter mentions general characteristics of public speeches and contains practical analysis of informative and special occasion speeches.

## 5. Characteristics of public speeches

Before moving on to the analysis itself, it is necessary to introduce the essential features of public speeches from which the data corpus is taken and analysed. In this chapter, public speeches are commented on from stylistic viewpoint.

An important function of public speaking is that it creates a group of people with the same interest. Many people do not even realize their attitude towards an issue until they hear someone giving their arguments on the issue in public (Griffin 2008:9).

There are three kinds of public speeches distinguished by Griffin. He formulates these based on their purpose. The informative speech helps the audience to understand a concept or action and evaluates facts. The persuasive speech aims at influencing the audience's beliefs and attitudes towards a person, place, or a thing. The last one, the special occasion speech, depends on the context and its aim is to make the audience feel good about something or someone, to entertain or inspire (2008:9). By giving a special occasion speech, speakers introduce a person or an event to their audience, they commemorate a person for his or her achievements, or they accept awards (Griffin 2009:25). Furthermore, special occasion speeches are given at weddings, funerals, graduations, or award ceremonies (2009:413). Other types of public speeches are, according to Hellman and Staudacher, deliberative speeches and argumentative speeches. The former refers to identification of problems and finding solutions by either small or large groups (1969:59-60). The primary aim of the latter is to change one's attitude through arguments and evidence (1969:115).

As Winter writes, the important element in public speaking is entertainment. "The audience must be awakened, and taken on with the speaker." Through public speeches, the speaker informs, amuses, charms, or thrills. "Readiness in expressing emotions, happiness in the imitative faculty, for touching the eccentric in character or incident, are talents that come in to play." (2009:44-45). As Griffin adds, the speaker directs their ideas and feelings at the audience to gain the desired impact on them (2008:9).

As far as the use of language is concerned, according to Griffin, speakers should avoid offensive language as the audience might become uncomfortable and, as a result, they would stop listening to the speaker. Therefore, euphemisms should be employed in this case (2009:56). This can be also applied to gender-inclusive language. If a speaker

uses gender-biased language, it also prevents the audience from listening and “hearing the main arguments and ideas of a speech.” Moreover, if a speaker uses the pronoun *he* as generic, they give the impression of not recognizing women as equal individuals to men (2009:57).

Concerning the use of euphemisms by public speakers, Jaffe points out that especially politicians use euphemisms in order to talk about controversial topics. She concludes that “by carefully choosing their wording, speakers hope to create perceptions that produce their desired spin or interpretation.” (2009:210).

## 6. Analysis

In this chapter, the outcomes of the analysis are provided. This practical part focuses both on the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the analysis. The main purpose of the qualitative analysis is to prove whether the language for the taboo topics examined in the theoretical part of this paper corresponds to the politically correct and incorrect expressions detected in the selected public speeches. However, it must be emphasized that only a limited pattern of occurrences is analysed, which might be reflected in the results of the analysis. The main aim of the quantitative analysis is to mark frequency of occurrence of expressions in the public speeches. As already dealt with in chapter 3.2, the context plays an important role in the evaluation of expressions for taboo topics. Therefore, the terms are commented on with respect to the contexts in which they were found as well as to the connotations they attach to themselves in the particular contexts of the individual public speeches. They are also commented on with respect to the audience. The expressions detected in the data have been identified as neutral in the contexts in the majority of cases. Thus, it should be defined what is understood by a neutral context in this analysis. The terms are identified as neutral in their contexts when the speakers refer to subjects and groups of people in general, when the expressions used together with the analysed ones are mostly neutral and factual, and when the passages of the statements that precede and follow the analysed expressions do not show any intention of offending a person, such as in this example:

I tell you, this Labour government will not allow the world to stand by as more than 20,000 children **die** today from diseases we know how to cure. We will not pass by as 100 million men, women and children face a winter of starvation. [26]

### 6.1 Background of the analysis

The practical part of this paper contains two types of public speeches: informative speeches and special occasion speeches which were selected from various online sources. The informative speeches contain mainly political speeches made either by politicians or other individuals commenting on political issues, and speeches made by representatives or members of various political and humanitarian organizations. As for the special occasion speeches, these contain graduation and commencement speeches, commemorative speeches, anniversary speeches, and eulogy speeches. The

choice of these types of public speeches is based on the assumption that these speeches should not contain politically incorrect expressions because public speakers, especially politicians, should aim to save the audience's as well as their own face (see chapter 3.1.1 for the explanation of the term). Both the informative and special occasion speeches chosen for the analysis have the same aims and functions which were already discussed in chapter 5.

The data corpus consists of 220 occurrences of expressions falling into the areas of the taboo topics already discussed in the theoretical part of this paper. Concerning the proportion of informative and special occasion speeches, there are twenty-five informative and twenty-one special occasion speeches analysed. As far as the number of occurrences is taken into account, the same number of expressions was analysed in both types of the speeches: there are 110 expressions found in the informative speeches and 110 expressions in the special occasion speeches. The data corpus is attached in Appendix 1. As the analysed speeches are lengthy, only paragraphs or sentences containing the individual expressions are attached. The sentences and paragraphs with the expressions are numbered chronologically and the individual expressions are written in bold. In the analysis, the paragraph or sentence numbers are added in brackets. In Appendix 2, the online sources of the speeches are provided.

### **6.1.1 Death and killing**

The first area of linguistic taboo to be discussed is the issue of politically correct and incorrect terms for death and killing as these came out to be the most frequently used expressions in the analysed speeches. With its 70 samples found in 16 informative and 11 special occasion speeches, the language for death and killing constitutes 32% of all language means of political correctness used. As two types of public speeches were analysed in the practical part of this paper, the comparison of these will be further provided in the summary of results in chapter 6.2.

In all analysed speeches, it has been found out that the neutral term *death* (1-25) was the most frequently used term for this taboo topic. The noun occurred in 36% of all expressions for death and killing. As far as context is concerned, it can be seen from the outcomes of the analysis that in the majority of cases, it occurred in neutral contexts.



However, it should be emphasized that in three contexts, it might have been replaced by a euphemistic expression. This can be illustrated in the examples below:

1. And now **death** has done its part to reveal this man and the President for what he was. [19]
2. And then there are the 10 years since our mother's **death**. [17]
3. I received one of those letters a few days ago. It was from our beloved friend and colleague Ted Kennedy. He had written it back in May, shortly after he was told that his illness was terminal. He asked that it be delivered upon his **death**. [2]
4. Millions of people are working on behalf of strangers, even if the evening news is usually about the **death** of strangers. [23]

In (1) and (2), the term *death* occurred in eulogy speeches. In the first example, the speaker used it when addressing a family of a deceased person. In (2), the speaker talked about their mother's death. Similarly, *death* was also used to refer to a deceased person in (3). As already discussed in chapter 3.2.2, euphemistic terms are preferred to dysphemistic and neutral ones so that death of a close person is made more bearable. Thus, it could be concluded that euphemistic terms would be more convenient in all three cases. On the other hand, the context in (4) is neutral as the speaker referred to strangers in general.

The second most frequently used term for death was the neutral verb *die* (26-39) which was detected in 14 occurrences and thus represents 20% of occurrence of all terms for death and killing detected in the data. This term, except for one case where a euphemism would be more convenient, occurred in neutral contexts. A few samples contrasting the contexts where the term *die* occurred are as follows:

5. Our commanders on the ground will continue to make progress and provide time for the development of a grand strategy. That will be wasted effort, as we have seen repeatedly since 2003. In the meantime our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines will continue to **die**. [27]
6. After all, as he said then, it takes *no resources* and *no effort* on our part to let a baby with pneumonia or malaria die without getting treatment, to let a little girl remain undernourished, to let her mother **die** in childbirth, or to fail to prevent an HIV-infected mother from passing her infection on to her baby. [29]

In the first example, the term *die* was used by the speaker to comment on dying of American soldiers in general and therefore the context is neutral. In contrast to this, *die* in (6) refers to *a little girl whose mother died*. The speaker talked about any little girl,

however, since mentioning a child's parent's death might be perceived as vulnerable, it might have been said euphemistically in this case.

As Algeo and Pyles claim, people are afraid to name death directly because they believe there are superstitions "connected with the word itself." Therefore, it is more preferable for speakers to resort to using euphemisms when referring to death (2005:214). Nonetheless, as far as the frequency of occurrence of euphemistic terms is concerned, these occurred in least cases. Despite the fact that the sources claim that one of the most common ways of referring to death is by using the euphemistic expression *sleep*, which is a more appropriate term for the neutral *die* (see chapter 3.2.2), this term was not found at all. The euphemistic expressions detected were the following ones: the nouns *loss* (44) and *passing* (41), the verbs *lose* (42-43) and *pass away* (40), and the adjective *lost* (45). It should be pointed out that all these euphemisms were also euphemistic in the contexts:

7. But those of us who loved him, and ache with his **passing**, know Ted Kennedy by the other titles he held: Father. Brother. Husband. Uncle Teddy, or as he was often known to his younger nieces and nephews, "The Grand Fromage," or "The Big Cheese." I, like so many others in the city where he worked for nearly half a century, knew him as a colleague, a mentor, and above all, a friend. [41]
8. As you know so well, the passage of time never really heals the tragic memory of such a great **loss**, but we carry on, because we have to, because our loved one would want us to, and because there is still light to guide us in the world from the love they gave us. [44]
9. ACAP is flexible enough to provide this type of assistance, to fund the repair of a damaged home, or to ensure that children are able to continue their education when one or both parents are **lost**. [45]

In (7), the euphemism *passing* occurred in a eulogy speech where the speaker commemorated a friend of theirs. Similarly, the term *loss* in (8) refers to a deceased person as well. In (9), the speaker talked about death in a family, which might be perceived as a more sensitive issue than talking about death in general. All these facts lead us to the conclusion that the speakers used the euphemistic expressions appropriately with regard to the occasions in all three cases. Looking at the context in (8), it can be observed that a metaphor of death as a loss was used. Moreover, the phrases *there is still light to guide us* and *the love they gave us* have emotive connotations. In contrast to this, the terms in (7) and (9) are rather factual. As far as face is concerned, both the audience's and the speaker's dignity and respect were preserved

as death was referred to euphemistically in these contexts. The speakers were aware of the conventions that rule the language and were careful to give face to the audience.

As already said above, the expression *loss* is a euphemistic substitution for the neutral term *death*. To contrast the differences between the euphemistic and the neutral contexts in which these two terms occurred, the following sentences can be used:

10. Ted Kennedy has gone home now, guided by his faith and by the light of those he has loved and **lost**. [43]
11. That collaboration has resulted in reducing the number of **deaths** of children under five from over 15 million in the 1980s to an estimated 9.2 million in 2008. [9]

In the first example (10), *lost* occurred in a eulogy speech and thus was used appropriately; the term is euphemistic in the context. Furthermore, metaphorical language was used here again. In contrast to this, death is referred to factually in the second sentence (11). The speaker reported on a number of people who died during a certain period and therefore the context can be regarded as neutral. Nevertheless, if the speaker referred to a familiar person, such as in delivering a funeral speech, a euphemistic term would be more suitable. To comment on face, the speaker in (10) considered the effect of what they said on other people and by using a euphemistic term in connection with a deceased person, they were not being disrespectful to others.

Concerning the language for killing, several terms were found as well. The analysis revealed that the most frequently used term for killing was the neutral noun *genocide* (46-60). This term occurred in 15 cases and represents 21% of all language for death and killing detected in the samples. Other terms found were the euphemism *executed* (69) which occurred in 1 case, the neutral term *death penalty* (70) also occurred in 1 case, and sentences with the euphemism *ethnic cleansing* (62-64) were identified in 3 cases. *Ethnic slaughter* (61), a synonymous term for *ethnic cleansing*, was also found in 1 case. According to the outcomes of the analysis, all these terms occurred in neutral contexts only. Even though *ethnic cleansing* could be regarded as a euphemism for *genocide*, and some sources claim these two are synonymous terms, they should not be confused. *The Webster's New World College Dictionary* defines *ethnic cleansing* as follows: "the systematic attempt to eliminate an ethnic group from a country or region as by forced expulsion or mass execution". On the other hand, *genocide* is defined by the same source as "the systematic killing of, or a program of

action intended to destroy, a whole national or ethnic group” (<http://www.yourdictionary.com/dicthelp.html>). With regard to these definitions, the difference between the terms is in that *genocide* means intentional murder, while *ethnic cleansing* refers to forced migration, either through expulsion or genocide. The fact that the speakers did not use these two as synonyms can be illustrated in the following example where both terms occurred:

12. It also includes our shared responsibility to protect populations from **genocide**, war crimes, **ethnic cleansing**, and crimes against humanity - a responsibility solemnly accepted by all nations at last year's UN summit. [54, 63]

To prove that the terms for killing were neutral in the contexts, the following samples can be used:

13. That is why there should never be amnesty for **genocide**, crimes against humanity and massive violations of human rights. [52]
14. We have used our military to eliminate governments seen as a threat to our national security, to undo aggression, to end **ethnic slaughter**, and to prevent chaos. [61]

In both cases, the terms were used in the same contexts, which can be applied to all the samples in which they occurred.

As for dysphemistic terms for death and killing, these have been detected as well. The dysphemisms for *genocide* and its organizers and executors occurred in 3 cases. These terms were *mass murderer* (66-67) and *mass murder* (68). Nonetheless, these dysphemisms were used in neutral contexts only:

15. And, by focusing on the human story, this museum will, we hope, become a moral platform attesting to the indefensibility of terrorism, to the absolute unacceptability of indiscriminate **mass murder** as a response to grievance. [68]

Taking the context and the words used into consideration, the speaker did not use the dysphemism *mass murder* in an offensive way. The effect of using this term in this context is the same as if the neutral term *genocide* had been used instead.

The neutral term *coffin* (65), already mentioned in chapter 3.2.2, was also detected in the samples. Even though the context in which it occurred is neutral, the term should be commented on as well. It was found in the following case:

16. A journalist once described me as the Eeyore of national security - able to find the darkest cloud in any silver lining. I used to joke that when an

intelligence officer smelled the flowers, he'd look around for the **coffin**.  
[65]

It is apparent from the context that the term was used in a jocular way and the speaker did not talk about death of a person.

In chapter 3.2.2, the flippant use of euphemisms for death and killing was discussed. As Allan and Burridge observe, such use “is typically a [...] downgrading of death.” (2001:10). As the results of the analysis have shown, however, no euphemistic terms were used by the speakers in this way. This finding might be caused by the selection of the speeches. As the flippancy towards death is typically used by people who often come to contact with it, such as doctors, the analysed speeches were made especially by politicians.

To summarise the section devoted to the language for death and killing, neutral and dysphemistic expressions have occurred more frequently in the analysed public speeches. These have been detected in 84% of occurrence, while the euphemistic expressions constitute only 16% of all expressions for death and killing found. Nevertheless, the dysphemistic and the neutral terms have occurred in neutral contexts in the majority of cases. As for the euphemistic terms, the speakers used these mainly in eulogy speeches or when talking about vulnerable topics, such as death in a family. The high occurrence of terms for death and killing might be caused by the fact that these are widely discussed issues nowadays.

### **6.1.2 Generic man**

Linguistic issues related to the use of generic man were already discussed in chapter 4.3.1. Since words including generic *man* express linguistic bias against women, they should be replaced by gender-neutral words, for example *person* (Hudson 1996:103). However, according to some grammarians, linguistic gender bias does not express female's inferiority to males, which is denied by feminists, and should be taken just as a grammatical fact (Cameron 1998:85).

Turning to the outcomes of the analysis, expressions with generic man and its gender-neutral substitutions constitute the second most frequently used language means of political correctness. With their 55 occurrences, they constitute 25% of all linguistic

areas analysed. The proportion of expressions with generic man in informative and special occasion speeches will be illustrated in chapter 6.2.

As the results of the analysis have shown, the public speeches contained 35 gender-biased (71-106) and 20 gender-inclusive expressions (107-125). As for the number of expressions used by men and women, men used 28 gender-biased expressions and 11 gender-neutral expressions in 21 speeches. On the other hand, women used 10 gender-biased and 6 gender-neutral expressions in 6 speeches altogether. When considering occurrences of gender-biased terms, it is important to point out that they did not occur in negative contexts at all; they occurred in neutral contexts only. The use of the gender-biased and gender-neutral expressions by males and females can be compared in the following examples:

17. I'd like to talk about the -- the laws of **man**, here in this city, where those laws are written. [84]
18. Because of what America did in the 20th century, there are hundreds of millions of people around the world who now live in freedom – who, but for the price paid by the United States, would have lived in despair. I know of no other such example of national selflessness in the history of **mankind**. [88]
19. Every day, I saw more evidence about the evils **humankind** will inflict on their fellow humans, to gain or maintain power. I began to have nightmares, literal nightmares, about some of the things I saw, heard, and read. [96]
20. As a **freshman** at Sarah Lawrence, I read Tonio Kröger with my don, Harold S. L. Wiener, and that one remarkable short story helped frame for me the core (and continuing) challenge of modern Europe in terms of the urgent need to bridge nationalistic divisions as a prerequisite for economic and social vitality, creativity and productivity. [97]

In the first sentence (17), it is obvious that the speaker, male in this case, did not intend to discriminate women by using the gender-biased term *man* which can be interpreted as *humanity* here. Similarly, in (18), the speaker was also male and, as in the previous example, he also referred to both men and women. On the other hand, the female speaker in (19) used a gender-neutral term but she used it the same way as the terms in (17) and (18) were used. It is interesting to point out that even though the speaker in (20) was also female, she used the gender-biased expression *freshman* when talking about herself. This finding supports the view that for some people, generic man does not exclude women but is in fact gender-inclusive (see chapter 4.3.1).

When dealing with terms referring to all human beings, the gender-neutral *humanity* can be contrasted to the gender-biased *mankind*:

21. But **humanity's** greatest advances are not in its discoveries - but in how those discoveries are applied to reduce inequity. [117]
22. They reflect the striving for human authenticity and commercial ways which benefit all **mankind**. [99]

Looking at the contexts, they are both neutral, and the gender-biased term in (22) refers to both males and females as the term in (21).

As noted previously, the gender-neutral word *person* is suggested to be used instead of generic *man* so that gender bias against women is eliminated from the English language. Expressions including *person* were also found in the data and were detected in 7 occurrences. To illustrate whether there was any difference between the use of generic *man* and gender-inclusive *person*, these two are compared in the following examples:

23. And in its historical struggles for freedom and the rights of **man**, I was able to see faith as more than just a comfort to the weary or a hedge against death, but rather as an active, palpable agent in the world. [82]
24. The nostalgia that I see around with silvering members of the civil rights movement, marchers, **spokespersons**, having hit it hard and recovered and sustained. [120]

In the first sentence (23), the expression *man* was used as generic. Looking at the context, it appears to be neutral. In (24), the politically correct term *spokespersons* was used instead of the politically incorrect *spokesmen* to refer to both males and females as well. Taking the above examples into account, we can conclude that the gender-neutral *person* in (24) was used in a similar context as the gender-biased *man* in (23). This finding is applicable to all occurrences where *man* and *person* were used.

In addition, several other terms which are unmarked for gender were identified in the speeches. These terms were, for example, *police officers* (121) and *firefighters* (124-125) which are more preferable terms than *policemen* and *firemen*. It is interesting to point out that according to the results of the analysis, some speakers used both gender-unmarked and gender-marked expressions in the same contexts. A few samples illustrating this are as follows:

25. Subsequently by the way, Chris has gone on as a serial entrepreneur to create a new company, Affinity Labs, which provides online job markets

and peer-support communities for nurses, **policemen**, **firefighters**, and many other public service professionals. [93, 125]

26. **Man** is a political and social animal, and individual men and women define their identity by their membership of groups. [71]

Apparently, the gender-biased expression *policemen* in (25) is neutral in the context. The fact that the term *policemen* includes women in this case might be supported by the occurrence of the gender-neutral term *firefighters* in the same sentence. Similarly, in the following example (26), the speaker used the generic noun *man* to mean *all human beings*, which can be supported by the following line where the phrase *men and women*, which relates to the term *man* at the beginning of the sentence, was used.

To sum up the content of this chapter, expressions including generic man have occurred more frequently than gender-neutral terms. However, it is necessary to point out that, as the analysis has shown, the expressions have been detected in neutral contexts in all cases and therefore they might not be considered to be used dysphemistically towards women.

### 6.1.3 Races and nationalities

As already discussed in chapter 3.2.4, the language for races and nationalities is a vulnerable linguistic area. With 53 (24%) occurrences in the analysed texts, the language referring to races and nationalities constitutes the third most frequently used linguistic area. The proportion of the terms in both types of the public speeches will be illustrated in chapter 6.2.

To begin with, Allan remarks that the dysphemistic term *nigger* is considered to be typically offensive. However, when people of colour use this term to refer to each other, it rather shows respect and expresses solidarity (2001:155). The same principle can be also applied to other racist terms, such as *black*. This dysphemism (126-143), as the outcomes of the analysis have shown, turned out to be the most frequently used dysphemistic expression referring to races as it was detected in 18 occurrences and thus constitutes 34% of all terms for races and nationalities. As far as the overall number of dysphemisms for races and nationalities is concerned, these have been detected in 38% (20 occurrences) of all terms for races and nationalities.

As mentioned above, the racist term *black* is not considered to be racist when used by people of colour to refer to one another. However, when used by speakers of



other races to refer to people of colour, the use of the term is dysphemistic. Thus, *black* should be commented on with regard to the speakers' race. Taking this into account, the term *black* was used by people of colour in 14 cases and by other speakers in 4 cases. It is important to say that, as the outcomes of the analysis have shown, *black* did not occur in negative contexts at all. This finding can be illustrated in the following examples:

27. Working-class **black** and white and Hispanic residents. All of us with different experiences. All of us with different beliefs. But all of us learned to work side by side because all of us saw in these neighborhoods other human beings who needed our help - to find jobs and improve schools. We were bound together in the service of others. [138]
28. So, I ask those of you graduating today, male or female, **black** or white or brown or yellow, young or old, straight or gay, to become soldiers in a new Union Army, an army dedicated to the preservation of this country's great ideals, a vanguard against this new separatism and disunion, a vanguard against those who, in the name of our great democracy, have managed to diminish it. [140]

In the first example (27), the term *black* has positive connotations because it was used by a speaker of colour who referred to other people of colour. In contrast to the previous case, *black* in (28) was used by a white person who used this term when referring to people of colour. Based on this, the audience might have been humiliated as their face was threatened. However, the term is obviously neutral in this context and was not used as a term of insult.

As the sources used for the theoretical part of this paper claim, there are no euphemistic expressions for races and nationalities. Therefore, the following section is devoted to their accurate expressions. Concerning the overall use of these, they have been detected in 33 occurrences (62%) of all terms for races and nationalities.

The most frequently used neutral term was *African-American* (144-154) which was detected in 20% (11 occurrences) of all terms referring to races and nationalities. In 4 of these occurrences, the term was used by people of colour and in 7 cases by other speakers. Additionally, it occurred in neutral contexts in all cases.

Concerning the use of the neutral term *African-American* and its dysphemistic counterpart *black*, it is important to comment on possible differences between the contexts in which these two terms occurred. Generally, it can be said, according to the outcomes of the analysis, that white speakers used the terms in neutral contexts only. As for their use by people of colour, the terms occurred in neutral contexts in the majority

of cases. Nonetheless, in 3 contexts, *black* was used positively. A few examples including *black* and *African-American* from the analysed texts are as follows:

29. He said the thing we need to focus on as a community, **black** folks I'm talking to, is ourselves. [141]
30. We ask **black** people: it's time. It's time for us to come together. It's time for us to rebuild a New Orleans, the one that should be a chocolate New Orleans. And I don't care what people are saying Uptown or wherever they are. This city will be chocolate at the end of the day. [142]
31. It's time for all of us good folk to stand up and say "We're tired of the violence. We're tired of **black** folks killing each other. [143]
32. And I asked him what does he think about **black** leaders always or most of the time tearing each other down publicly for the delight of many? And he said, "I really don't like that either." [134]
33. One of Michigan's best players was an **African American** student named Willis Ward. [152]
34. It is the same thing that gave me hope from the day we began this campaign for the presidency nearly two years ago; a belief that if we could just recognize ourselves in one another and bring everyone together - Democrats, Republicans, and Independents; Latino, Asian, and Native American; **black** and white, gay and straight, disabled and not - then not only would we restore hope and opportunity in places that yearned for both, but maybe, just maybe, we might perfect our union in the process. [136]

In the first three examples, the term *black* was used by a person of colour who addressed other people of colour. As already said in (27) and (28), when used like this, the term has positive connotations. Looking at the contexts in (29), (30), and (31), *black* was used in a supportive way. In (29) and (31), the use of *black* along with the word *folks* carries with it informal connotations. *Black* in (32) was also used by a person of colour. However, it can be seen that it is rather neutral in this context as it was not used in order to encourage as in the previous three examples. As for the terms in (33) and (34), they were used by white speakers. In (33), a neutral term was used whereas in (34) a dysphemistic term occurred. Nonetheless, the speaker did not mean to offend anyone, they only pointed to the fact that race and colour do not matter. Thus, the context is neutral.

As for politically correct terms, the detected ones were *woman of color* (165) and *people of all colors* (166). Both were neutral in the contexts in which they were found and, compared to the use of *black*, they were used as follows:

35. In Seattle, I met Lena Madsen, a young **woman of color** whom I won't soon forget. Lena was once a 15-year-old mother living with an abusive partner. The lawyers who represented her in family courts became heroes to Lena.

Today, with a scholarship financed by the Washington State Bar Foundation, Lena is attending Seattle University Law School, and someday she, too, will be a hero and protector to those in need. [165]

36. They murdered **people of all colors**, creeds, and nationalities -- and made war upon the entire free world. [166]
37. We know that many may want to know the relevance of establishing an exclusively **black** federation in a non-racial democracy. [127]

The terms in (35) and (36) are neutral in the contexts. By using the politically correct terms, the speaker saved the audience's face and did not lose their own face in the eyes of others. *Black* in (37) was used by a person of colour who referred to people of colour for whom, as already said in the previous examples, it has positive connotations.

So far, the analysis has been devoted to the language for people of colour. In the following section, the language for other nationalities and races detected in the samples will be discussed.

According to the results of the analysis, the most frequently used politically correct terms referring to other nationalities turned out to be the following ones: *Iraqi people* (159-160), *South Africans* (171-174), *Asian* (163-164), *Latino* (161-162), and *Haitian people* (157-158). These occurred in neutral contexts in all cases. As for the dysphemistic terms referring to other nationalities, these have been detected only in 2 cases. The terms in question are *brown* (169) and *yellow* (170). Both these terms are compared with their neutral counterparts in the following examples:

38. So, I ask those of you graduating today, male or female, black or white or **brown** or **yellow**, young or old, straight or gay to become soldiers in a new Union Army, an army dedicated to the preservation of this country's great ideals, a vanguard against this new separatism and disunion, a vanguard against those who, in the name of our great democracy, have managed to diminish it. [169, 170]
39. It is the same thing that gave me hope from the day we began this campaign for the presidency nearly two years ago; a belief that if we could just recognize ourselves in one another and bring everyone together - Democrats, Republicans, and Independents; Latino, **Asian**, and **Native American**; black and white, gay and straight, disabled and not - then not only would we restore hope and opportunity in places that yearned for both, but maybe, just maybe, we might perfect our union in the process. [164, 177]

Neither the term *brown* nor *yellow* in (38) is dysphemistic in the context of the speech. As it has been already said in (34), here the speaker also aimed to stress the fact that it does not matter what race or colour the students addressed are, all are equal. Therefore,

the context is neutral. In (39), the politically correct expressions *Asian* and *Native American* occurred. However, there is no difference in the use between these terms and their dysphemistic counterparts in (38).

As already suggested in chapter 3.2.4, terms which are considered to be racist are banned from use even in non-racist contexts. The occurrence of *black hole* in the data corresponds to this:

40. But it's all -- not all good news, as we know; like, for instance, our dropout rate is now between 15 and 30 percent. We don't even know exactly the number. Now this is not just a statistic, I remind you. These are children lost in a **black hole** of ignorance, poverty, and crime. [130]

It is obvious from the example that the speaker neither referred to a person of colour nor aimed to offend people of colour. The fact that the term was used in a context which does not suggest anything racist but might still be perceived as dysphemistic, makes political correctness an extreme and serious problem in the English language.

To conclude the part devoted to the language for races and nationalities, the only dysphemistic terms detected in the samples were the terms *black*, *brown*, and *yellow* even though these terms are considered to be strongly dysphemistic towards the races they refer to. The high frequency of occurrence of the term *black* might be explained by the fact that there was a high number of speeches made by people of colour. Without the context, *black* is claimed to be a dysphemism. However, this has not been proved in the analysis as it occurred in neutral and positive contexts only. Even though the sources suggest that *African-American* is a politically correct term for *black*, this is often criticised as not all black people are of African descent. This may be a reason for a higher frequency of occurrence of *black* than that of *African-American*.

#### **6.1.4 Mental and physical illness**

This chapter deals with the number of occurrences of politically correct and incorrect expressions for mental and physical illness which occurred in the analysed informative and special occasion speeches. The comparison of the two types of the speeches will be provided in chapter 6.2. With their 31 samples found, the expressions constitute 14% of all language means of political correctness used.

According to Allan and Burridge (1991:4), people prefer euphemisms when talking about illnesses as they associate them with death. Nonetheless, the analysis has

shown an obvious disproportion between the euphemistic and dysphemistic expressions. The dysphemistic terms have been detected in 11 cases, which represents 35% of all language for mental and physical illness, while the euphemistic terms have been detected in 5 occurrences (16%). The euphemisms used were *crazy* (208) and *people with disabilities* (179-182). To comment on *people with disabilities*, this euphemism was neutral in all cases, and it is further dealt with below in (43). As for *crazy*, it was found in the following context:

41. Moving people of all kinds to work with others they had never met, never would have cared to meet. They had conservative church groups hanging out with spokesmen from the gay community, all singing off the same hymn sheet on AIDS. See, miracles do happen. And we had hip-hop stars and country stars. This is what happens when God gets on the move: **crazy, crazy** stuff happens. [208]

According to McKnight, in a non-clinical usage, the euphemism *crazy* expresses the intensity of a feeling about something or someone (1969:274). Looking at the context, the term refers to miraculous things that happen. On this account, the context is considered to be euphemistic.

As far as dysphemistic terms are concerned, the detected ones were *disabled* (183-184), *mentally ill* (209), *fools* (194) and *silly* (207). However, it must be pointed out that all of these occurred in neutral contexts. On the other hand, the dysphemisms *foolish* (193), *dumb* (195-198), and *cripple* (199) occurred in negative contexts. In the following examples, the dysphemistic expressions are contrasted in the neutral and negative contexts as well as are contrasted with the euphemistic terms:

42. Protection Cluster members had provided assistance to more than 3,500 households headed by vulnerable individuals, such as women, children, and **disabled** persons to access relief services in camps. UNHCR has also established child protection monitors to identify and arrange care for separated children in camps. [183]
43. The programs ensure that the treatment and equipment used are appropriate and effective in increasing the mobility of **people with disabilities** who live in developing countries. [179]
44. But what I was truly struck by was if his Attorney General thinks we're a nation of cowards, his administration thinks we're just plain **dumb**. [195]
45. They have shared openly and honestly with us their vision of higher taxes, bigger government, more bureaucracy, greater corruption, more political power by people unworthy of doing it, and a policy which will kill jobs, **cripple** the economy, trap children in schools that are disastrous, and weaken America's future. [199]

The terms in (42) and (43) appear to be neutral in the contexts as the speakers did not refer to a particular person/people directly. Nonetheless in (42), physically/mentally challenged people could have been offended as they were not referred to by a euphemism. The terms in (44) and (45), on the other hand, were obviously used in an offensive manner. Even though in (44) the speaker used *dumb* to refer to himself/herself, the word is dysphemistic in the context as it has negative connotations attached to it. Similarly, despite the fact that the derogatory term *cripple* in (45) was not used as an insult directed towards a particular person but was used in connection with economy, the term can be perceived as dysphemistic in the context as well. Looking at other language means used in (45), such as the expressions and collocations *bureaucracy*, *corruption*, *disastrous*, *higher taxes* etc., they also have negative connotations. Moreover, as dysphemistic terms were used in the last two examples, the audience's and the speaker's face was threatened and might have been lost. The speakers should have managed their verbal behaviour more carefully. As people need their face to be appreciated, euphemistic or neutral terms should have been used.

As the neutral terms constitute 48% of all expressions for mental and physical illness, these will be examined in the following section. The outcomes of the analysis have shown that the neutral expressions detected were the following ones: *cancer* (200-206), and *HIV/AIDS* (185-192). It must be pointed out that these terms were neutral in their contexts in all cases.

As already mentioned above, euphemistic expressions for illnesses are often more preferable than neutral or dysphemistic ones as people associate some illnesses with death. This can be applied to the word *cancer*. According to Allan and Burrige (1991:4), terms such as *growth* and *tumor* are more preferable because these can be benign. Nevertheless, no euphemistic expressions referring to *cancer* were used by the speakers. The term *AIDS* was also referred to by its neutral expression only. The fact that the terms were not used in connection with a particular person might be an explanation for it. The contexts in which these two occurred may be illustrated in the following samples:

46. Over the next decade we can lead the way in beating **cancer** and other diseases - a great endeavour worthy of a great country: proud because we have a health service focused on 21st century needs. [203]

47. Universal check-ups and new help to fight **cancer** - these are all causes worth fighting for. [204]
48. That is why, five years ago, the UN Millennium Summit adopted a set of goals - the "Millennium Development Goals" - to be reached by 2015: goals such as halving the proportion of people in the world who do not have clean water to drink; making sure all girls, as well as boys, receive at least primary education; slashing infant and maternal mortality; and stopping the spread of **HIV/Aids** [185]
49. On Wednesday, the United States demonstrated leadership on another crisis affecting Africa: **HIV/AIDS**. [186]

Due to the collocations *beating cancer* in (46), *fight cancer* in (47), and *stopping the spread of HIV/Aids* in (48), the terms are not perceived as negative in the contexts. In most cases, these terms were used by the speakers this way. In other cases, such as in (49), the illnesses were referred to in general as well.

To sum up this chapter, the outcomes of the analysis have shown that dysphemistic and neutral terms referring to mental and physical illness have been detected in more cases than euphemistic ones. However, it must be emphasized that in the majority of cases, the terms were used in neutral contexts as the speakers used them to talk about the illnesses and people suffering from them in general. On the other hand, 6 euphemisms have been detected but only one occurred in a euphemistic context.

### 6.1.5 Homosexuality

The outcomes of the analysis have shown that the language for homosexuality (see chapter 3.2.5) constitutes 4% of all samples. The comparison of the frequency of occurrence of the expressions in both types of the speeches will be provided in chapter 6.2.

According to the sources, the most frequently used terms referring to homosexuals in the English language are the neutral term *queer* and the euphemism *gay* (Allan and Burridge 2006:156). Nevertheless, it must be said that according to the results of the analysis, there was no *queer* detected in the samples. On the other hand, the euphemism *gay* (210-217) was detected in 8 occurrences and was the only term referring to homosexuality found in the data. This euphemism occurred in neutral contexts in the majority of cases. However, one context was euphemistic.

As far as the neutral contexts are concerned, the term *gay* occurred in the following case:

50. So, I ask those of you graduating today, male or female, black or white or brown or yellow, young or old, straight or **gay** to become soldiers in a new Union Army, an army dedicated to the preservation of this country's great ideals, a vanguard against this new separatism and disunion, a vanguard against those who, in the name of our great democracy, have managed to diminish it. [214]
51. 18 million of you from all walks of life - women and men, young and old, Latino and Asian, African-American and Caucasian, rich, poor and middle class, **gay** and straight - you have stood strong with me. [210]
52. Moving people of all kinds to work with others they had never met, never would have cared to meet. They had conservative church groups hanging out with spokesmen from the **gay** community, all singing off the same hymn sheet on AIDS. See, miracles do happen. And we had hip-hop stars and country stars. [215]

With regard to the words such as *black or white, male or female* in (50) and (51), it can be said that the speakers wanted to stress the fact that it does not matter what race, gender, or sexuality people are/have. In (52), the phrase *gay community* may be interpreted as a *community of homosexual people*. To conclude, the above contexts are neutral.

As it has been already stated above, the term was also detected in one positive context:

53. Recommendation 104C calls on states to find appropriate and supportive families for **gay**, bisexual, transgender and what we call questioning youth. These youngsters make up a disproportionate share of the foster care population, and they also are especially vulnerable to harassment and documentation. [213]

In this case, the term *gay* might be said to be euphemistic despite the fact that the speaker did not use it to refer to particular individuals. Looking at the context in which the term was used, it can be seen that the speaker talked about abandoned homosexual children and did so in a supportive way. What is more, as the speaker used a euphemism in this case, they protected the audience from being offended and managed to save face.

To sum up this chapter, the euphemism *gay* was the only expression referring to homosexuals which has been detected in the speeches. The fact that the speakers preferred it to neutral terms, *homosexual* for example, can be explained by Stewart who writes that *gay* is preferred when referring to “a same-gender orientation [...] because homosexual implicitly emphasizes the sexual and diminishes the other aspects of gender orientation.” (2001:127). As far as dysphemistic terms are concerned, these have not



been detected at all. The low occurrence of terms for homosexuality might be explained by the fact that homosexuality was not the topic of the analysed speeches.

#### **6.1.6 Sex and body parts**

As the outcomes of the analysis have shown, the language for sex and body parts constitutes the second least frequently used linguistic area of a social taboo. As 2 occurrences of expressions have been detected in the data, the language for sex and body parts represents 1% of all language means of political correctness analysed in this paper.

When considering the language for sex and the associated body parts, Allan and Burridge claim that the term *fuck* is one of the most frequently used terms for these. Additionally, there is also a nonliteral meaning of the word and with this meaning, the word is used predominantly in the English language nowadays (1991:90-91). Nevertheless, the results of the analysis have shown that this term did not occur in the analysed speeches at all. As this term is regarded as strongly dysphemistic and may cause strong offence, the fact that it did not occur might be explained by the fact that the public speakers did not want to risk the loss of their or the listeners' face (*face* is dealt with in chapter 3.1.1).

Turning to the outcomes of the analysis, it has shown that there were no euphemistic or dysphemistic expressions referring to sex and body parts. However, there were 2 neutral expressions found in the same special occasion speech. The terms *sex* (218) and *sexual encounter* (219) occurred in the following sentences:

54. It does not mean that people do not have to practice safer **sex**. [218]

55. It does not mean that people should not use condoms consistently and correctly during every **sexual encounter**. [219]

From the examples above, it can be said that both terms were used in neutral contexts.

To sum up the content of this chapter, the terms *sex* and *sexual encounter* have been the only expressions referring to sex and body parts detected in the analysed speeches. The contexts in which these occurred were neutral.

#### **6.1.7 Gender-neutral they**

Since there are many problems with generic *he* in the English language, the use of gender-neutral *they* or doublets *he/she*, *him/her* etc. is suggested (see chapter 4.3.2). When considering the use of gender-neutral *they* and gender-neutral doublets in the sample speeches, it has been found out, on the basis of the outcomes of the analysis, that gender-neutral pronouns constitute the least frequently used linguistic area with its 1 occurrence in the public speeches. Only one doublet occurred in a neutral context and was used as follows:

56. The apprentice watches each movement of the craftsman, emulates those movements over and over again to gain the knowledge needed for **his or her** particular craft. [220]

The *his or her* doublet in (56) refers to the word *apprentice* at the beginning of the sentence. The speaker did not talk about any particular apprentice. For the purpose of what the speaker talked about, it did not matter whether the person referred was male or female.

To sum up the results of the analysis concerning the occurrence of gender-neutral *they*, only one doublet has been detected in a special occasion speech. Such a low occurrence of gender-neutral pronouns might be explained by the fact that the analysed public speeches consisted of a majority of political speeches in which the speakers referred to people in general and talked about high numbers of people rather than about certain individuals.

## 6.2 Summary of results

This chapter deals with the summary of results of the analysis and it also illustrates the proportion of the language means of political correctness in informative and special occasion speeches.

Based on the analysis, it has been found out that the linguistic area of death and killing represents the most frequently used language detected in the data. The data corpus consists of 220 occurrences of the language means of political correctness. Out of this total number, expressions for death and killing have occurred in 32% (70 cases). With its 11 occurrences, euphemistic terms for this linguistic area have been detected in 16% of all terms for death and killing while dysphemistic terms have been detected in 4% (3 occurrences). As for neutral terms, these have been identified in 80% (56

occurrences). Nevertheless, it is important to point out that all these terms were used in neutral contexts in the majority of cases. As for the euphemistic terms, these occurred in euphemistic contexts in all cases. The fact that the issues of death and killing are frequently discussed topics nowadays may be an explanation for the high frequency of occurrence of the terms.

To sum up the results concerning generic man, there have been 55 occurrences, which represents 25% of all samples. Out of this number, gender-biased terms have been detected in 64% (35 occurrences) and gender-neutral terms in 36% (20 occurrences). However, it is important to say that these terms occurred in neutral contexts in all cases and thus they do not express linguistic bias against women. This finding can be caused by the types of the analysed speeches in which the speakers referred to large groups of people in general.

As for terms for races, these have been identified in 53 cases, which represents 24% of all samples. Since the literature claims that there are no euphemistic terms referring to races and nationalities, it can be said that neutral terms have occurred in 62% (33 cases) and dysphemistic ones in 38% (20 cases) of all terms for this linguistic area. According to the results, these terms were used in neutral contexts in the majority of cases. In 3 contexts, they were identified as positive. The high number of occurrence of the term *black* may be explained by the fact that there have been a high number of speeches made by people of colour who used the term to address other people of colour. As it has been already noted, *black* has positive connotations for people of colour (see chapter 3.2.4).

As the fourth most frequently used linguistic area, terms for mental and physical illness have been identified in 14% (31 occurrences) of all analysed terms. Dysphemisms have been found in 35% (11 cases) and neutral terms in 48% (15 occurrences) of all terms for illnesses. The speakers used the neutral terms in neutral contexts in all cases while the dysphemistic terms were identified as negative in the contexts in 6 cases. In contrast, euphemisms have been found in 16% (5 occurrences). The contexts in which these occurred were identified as neutral, one was positive. As illnesses such as cancer and AIDS are considered to be serious global problems, this may explain the high occurrence of terms for this linguistic area.

Concerning the language for homosexuality, the only term detected was the euphemism *gay* which occurred in 8 cases. In one context it was identified as positive, the others were neutral. As homosexuality was not the subject of the public speeches, this may explain the low occurrence of terms for this linguistic area.

The language for sex and body parts represents the second least used linguistic area of a social taboo as only 2 neutral terms have been detected. These were used in neutral contexts. The fact that sex is considered to be a strong social taboo might be an explanation for it. Another explanation might be the fact that public speakers should avoid dysphemistic language so that they do not lose their face and do not threaten the audience's face.

And to conclude this part, the least frequently used linguistic area was gender-neutral they which was identified in 1 neutral context in a special occasion speech. A possible explanation for such a low occurrence of gender-neutral pronouns may be the nature of the public speeches as these were mainly political and the speakers talked about large groups of people in general.

In the following charts, the proportion of euphemistic, dysphemistic, and neutral terms for the selected areas of linguistic taboo in both types of the analysed public speeches is shown. The percentages in brackets refer to the overall number of expressions found in the particular linguistic area.

### **Informative speeches**

Linguistic area	Euphemisms	Dysphemisms	Neutral terms
Death and killing	8 (17%)	2 (4%)	36 (78%)
Generic <i>man</i>		12 (60%)	8 (40%)
Races and nationalities		5 (25%)	15 (75%)
Mental and physical illness	4 (19%)	7 (33%)	10 (48%)
Homosexuality	4 (100%)		
Sex and body parts			

Gender-neutral <i>they</i>			
----------------------------	--	--	--

In all analysed informative speeches, expressions referring to death and killing have been identified in 46 cases (42%). Expressions with generic man have occurred in 20 cases (18%), and the language for races and nationalities represents 18% of occurrence as it has been detected in 20 cases as well. As for mental and physical illness, terms for these have been found in 21 occurrences (19%). The language for homosexuality represents the least used linguistic area as it has been detected in 4 occurrences. Neither gender-neutral they nor terms for sex and body parts have been identified.

Taking the results into account, it can be concluded that neutral terms prevailed in the informative speeches as these have been detected in 69 occurrences (63%). On the other hand, dysphemistic terms have occurred in 26 cases (24%) of all terms detected in the informative speeches. Only 16 euphemistic terms (15%) have been found. However, the dysphemistic terms were used in neutral contexts in the majority of cases. This type of the public speech may be an explanation for these findings. The speeches were mainly political speeches and, as already stated, politicians should avoid offensive language.

### Special occasion speeches

Linguistic area	Euphemisms	Dysphemisms	Neutral terms
Death and killing	3 (13%)	1 (4%)	20 (83%)
Generic <i>man</i>		24 (68%)	11 (31%)
Races and nationalities		15 (45%)	18 (55%)
Mental and physical illness	1 (10%)	4 (40%)	5 (50%)
Homosexuality	4 (100%)		
Sex and body parts			2 (100%)
Gender-neutral <i>they</i>			1 (100%)

In the analysed special occasion speeches, it has been found out that the language for death and killing have occurred in 24 cases (22%). Concerning the use of generic man, it has been found in 35 occurrences (32%). Terms for races and nationalities have occurred in 33 cases (30%), and mental and physical illness represents 9% of occurrence with its 10 samples found. Expressions for homosexuals have been identified in 4 occurrences (4%), and terms for sex have occurred in 2 cases. The least used linguistic area detected in special occasion speeches turned out to be gender-neutral they with its 1 occurrence.

In the special occasion speeches, neutral terms have been found in the majority of cases as well. These constitute 52% of occurrence of all terms detected in special occasion speeches as they have been identified in 57 cases. Dysphemistic terms have occurred in 44 cases (40%), however, these were neutral in the contexts in most cases. Euphemistic expressions have been identified in 8 cases (7%). These were used in eulogy speeches or when talking about vulnerable issues.

## 7. Conclusion

To conclude this paper, the summary of both theoretical and practical part will be made. The primary aim of this diploma paper was to examine euphemism, dysphemism, and genderlect and also to prove whether these language means of political correctness correspond to the expressions detected in the data.

To summarize the theoretical part, general characteristics and a brief introduction into the issue of political correctness were dealt with. Furthermore, the above-mentioned language means of political correctness were discussed and examined on lexical and semantic level. All the expressions dealt with in the theoretical part were chosen based on the fact that the sources claimed these are the most frequently used terms in the English language today. All the presented language means of political correctness served as a basis for the analytical part of this paper and were supported by many examples taken from the data. As for the purpose of the analysis public speeches were chosen, their general characteristics as well as main goals and functions were discussed in chapter 5.

In the practical part, the theory discussed in the theoretical part was applied to two types of public speeches: informative speeches and special occasion speeches which were taken from various online sources. The data corpus consisted of 220 samples of occurrences of the language means of political correctness. The same number of occurrences was analysed in both informative and special occasion speeches. The contexts in which the terms occurred as well as face (see chapter 3.1.1) were taken into account. To sum up the results of the qualitative analysis, it proved that all the language means examined in the theoretical part were detected in the analysed speeches. Out of all samples, the overall number of neutral terms was 126 (57%), euphemistic terms occurred in 24 cases (11%), and dysphemistic terms occurred in 69 cases (32%). However, the fact that the expressions occurred in neutral contexts in the majority of cases must be emphasized. Although the sources claimed that the dysphemistic expressions are primarily used in order to insult and offend other people, this was not proved in the analysis, probably due to the fact that public speakers should avoid dysphemistic language so that they do not offend their audience. As the public speakers addressed large groups of people, they did not risk using dysphemistic expressions as it

might have resulted in the loss of either their own or the audience's face (see chapter 3.1.1).

The quantitative analysis showed the dominant usage of the language for death and killing, probably because of the fact that these are widely discussed topics nowadays. With their 70 samples out of total 220, the language for death and killing constituted 32% of the data corpus. Only in 1%, gender-neutral they was detected. With its 1 sample, it was identified as the least used linguistic area. Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that a larger amount of data would have to be analysed so that definite conclusions could be drawn. Additionally, the analysis would have probably shown different results if a newspaper reporting, for example, had been used as the basis for the analysis.



## 8. Resumé

Tato diplomová práce se zabývá politicky korektním jazykem v mluvených projevech. Politická korektnost je středem zájmu nejen pro lingvisty a sociolingvisty. Jedním z hlavních cílů této práce je zmapovat četnost výskytu dvou jazykových prostředků politické korektnosti v anglických mluvených projevech. Tyto prostředky jsou eufemismy/dysfemismy a genderlects. Dalším hlavním cílem je zjistit, zda se dané jazykové prostředky vyskytují ve vybraných mluvených projevech. Oba jazykové prostředky politické korektnosti byly vybrány na základě relevantních publikací z oblasti lingvistiky a sociolingvistiky a sloužily jako základ pro praktickou část této práce. Jazykové prostředky jsou klasifikovány a charakterizovány na rovině lexikální a sémantické.

Tato diplomová práce je rozdělena na dvě části – část teoretickou a praktickou. V teoretické části je nejprve vysvětlen termín *politicky korektní*. Teoretická část se dále zabývá definicemi a základní charakteristikou politicky korektního jazyka. Také je zde představena historie politické korektnosti a její původ. Ve třetí podkapitole jsou prezentovány jak kladné tak i záporné postoje vůči politicky korektnímu jazyku.

Zaměříme-li se na obsahy kapitol 3 a 4, ty jsou věnovány již zmíněným dvěma jazykovým prostředkům politické korektnosti. Tyto prostředky jsou nejen podrobně definovány a představeny v teoretické části této práce, ale jsou také demonstrovány na praktických příkladech v analytické části. Obě kapitoly se zabývají teoretickým úvodem daných jazykových prostředků z lingvistického a sociolingvistického hlediska. Třetí kapitola se dále věnuje popisu vybraných oblastí lingvistického tabu – výrazy pro sex a části těla, smrt a zabíjení, mentální a fyzické nemoci, rasy a národnosti, a homosexualitu. V této kapitole jsou představeny eufemistické, dysfemistické, a neutrální výrazy pro tyto jazykové oblasti. Co se týče čtvrté kapitoly, ta se zaměřuje na možné způsoby vyjádření genderové neutrality v anglickém jazyce, konkrétně na použití generického *man* (generic man) a genderově neutrálního *they* (gender-neutral they). Všechny zmíněné lingvistické oblasti stejně tak jako jednotlivé výrazy, které jsou v teoretické části diskutovány, byly vybrány na základě toho, že je literatura označuje jako nejčastěji používané v dnešním anglickém jazyce. Vzhledem k tomu, že jazykové prostředky politicky korektního jazyka jsou v této práci aplikovány na mluvené projevy, konec teoretické části této práce je věnovám obecnému popisu a základním

charakteristickým rysům mluvených projevů. Jsou zde představeny základní druhy mluvených projevů a dále jsou zmíněny jejich hlavní funkce a cíle.

Praktická část této diplomové práce obsahuje hodnocení výsledků analýzy a demonstrování převažujících tendencí v používání politicky korektního a nekorektního jazyka ve dvou typech mluvených projevů – v informativních projevech (informative speeches) a projevech ke zvláštním příležitostem (special occasion speeches). Vlastní analýza byla založena na výběru vzorků, které byly vybrány z různých elektronických zdrojů. Hlavním cílem této analýzy bylo hodnocení a objasnění výskytu jazykových prostředků politické korektnosti v anglických mluvených projevech a dále zmapování četnosti výskytu eufemismů, dysfemismů a genderlects pro již zmíněné jazykové oblasti. Jednotlivé výrazy, které se v obou typech projevů vyskytly, byly analyzovány vzhledem ke kontextům, ve kterých byly použity a zároveň s ohledem na posluchače. Na závěr byla porovnána četnost výskytu v obou typech mluvených projevů.

Zkoumaný soubor dat představuje 220 výskytů jazykových prostředků politické korektnosti. Stejný počet výskytů byl analyzován v obou typech projevů. Na základě výsledků kvalitativní analýzy bylo zjištěno, že všechny jazykové prostředky popsány v teoretické části této práce se ve zkoumaných mluvených projevech vyskytly. Dále bylo zjištěno, že neutrální výrazy byly zjištěny v 57% (126 výskytů), eufemismy se vyskytly v 11% (24 výskytů) a dysfemismy v 32% (69 výskytů). Navzdory tomu, že literatura použitá pro teoretickou část této práce tvrdí, že zejména dysfemistické výrazy, které byly v teorii popsány, se používají hlavně jako urážky, toto nebylo v analýze potvrzeno. Možným vysvětlením může být fakt, že veřejní mluvčí ve svých projevech adresovali širokou veřejnost a z tohoto důvodu by se měli vyhnout dysfemistickým termínům, aby posluchače neurazili.

Na základě výsledků kvantitativní analýzy bylo zjištěno, že výrazy pro smrt a zabíjení se ve zkoumaných mluvených projevech vyskytly nejčastěji. Výrazy pro tuto lingvistickou oblast byly určeny v 70 případech a představují tak 32% z celkového množství zkoumaných jazykových prostředků, které se v projevech vyskytly. V této jazykové oblasti se nejčastěji vyskytly neutrální výrazy, které byly zjištěny v 80% (56 výskytů) ze všech výrazů pro smrt a zabíjení, zatímco eufemismy byly určeny v 16% (11 výskytů) a dysfemismy ve 4% (3 výskytů). Je nutné říci, že ve většině případů byly tyto výrazy použity v neutrálních kontextech.

Druhou nejčastěji se vyskytující jazykovou oblastí bylo generické *man*, které bylo zjištěno v 24% (55 případů) z celkového množství zkoumaného vzorku. Genderově neutrální výrazy se objevily v 36% (20 případů) ze všech výrazů spadajících do této oblasti, a genderově předpojaté výrazy se objevily v 64% (35 případů). Nicméně je nutné zdůraznit, že ve všech případech byly tyto výrazy identifikovány jako neutrální a nejsou tak považované za dysfemistické vůči ženám. Toto zjištění může být vysvětleno typem analyzovaných mluvených projevů, ve kterých mluvčí hovořili o skupinách lidí obecně.

Výrazy pro rasy a národnosti se objevily v 53 výskytech a tvoří tak 24% ze všech analyzovaných výrazů. Pro tuto jazykovou oblast se neutrální výrazy vyskytly v 62% (33 výskytů) a dysfemismy byly zjištěny v 38% (20 výskytů). Podle výsledků analýzy se tyto výrazy ve většině případů vyskytly v neutrálních kontextech a 3 byly identifikovány jako pozitivní. Nejčastěji používaným dysfemismem bylo slovo *black*, což může být vysvětleno tím, že velká část zkoumaných projevů byla pronesena Afro-Americkými mluvčími, pro které má tento výraz pozitivní konotace (tento termín je vysvětlen v kapitole 3.2.4) a vyjadřuje solidaritu a respekt.

Výrazy pro mentální a fyzické nemoci představují čtvrtou nejčastěji používanou oblast lingvistického tabu. Výrazy z této oblasti se vyskytly ve 14% (31 výskytů). Dysfemistické výrazy byly nalezeny v 35% (11 výskytů) ze všech výrazů pro tuto oblast a neutrální výrazy se vyskytly v 48% (15 výskytů). V převážné většině byly kontexty, ve kterých byly výrazy použity, neutrální, a 6 bylo hodnoceno jako negativní. Co se týče eufemismů pro tuto oblast, ty tvoří 16% (5 výskytů). Nemoci jako rakovina nebo AIDS jsou globálním problémem, což může být příčina častějšího výskytu termínů z této oblasti.

Co se týče výrazů pro homosexualitu, jediním použitým výrazem bylo slovo *gay*, které se vyskytlo v neutrálních a jednom pozitivním kontextu. Celkový počet výskytů byl 8 (4%). Fakt, že homosexualita nebyla tématem zkoumaných projevů může být příčinou pro malý výskyt výrazů z této oblasti.

Výrazy pro sex a části těla byly identifikovány pouze ve dvou případech (2%) a představují tak druhou nejméně používanou oblast lingvistického tabu, což může být vysvětleno tím, že výrazy z této oblasti se považují za silně dysfemistické a proto by je veřejní mluvčí neměli používat pokud promlouvají k široké veřejnosti.

Nejméně používanou lingvistickou oblast představuje genderově neutrální zájmeno *they*, které bylo zjištěno pouze v 1 případě a tvoří tak 1% ze zkoumaných výrazů. Možným vysvětlením pro toto zjištění může být povaha mluvených projevů, ve kterých mluvčí hovořili o lidech obecně, ne o jednotlivcích.

Jak již bylo zmíněno, v závěru praktické části byl porovnán počet výskytů v obou typech mluvených projevů. Na základě výsledků analýzy můžeme říci, že termíny pro smrt a generické *man* byly nejčastěji používané v obou typech projevů. Výrazy pro sex a části těla a genderově neutrální *they* byly zjištěny pouze v projevech ke zvláštním příležitostem.

V závěru práce je shrnuta jak část teoretická, tak část praktická. V přílohách jsou přiloženy části mluvených projevů obsahujících všechny výskyty a dále potom elektronické zdroje mluvených projevů.

Závěrem lze říci, že vzhledem k velikosti zkoumaného vzorku mluvených projevů je těžké vyvozovat definitivní závěry. Zjištění, že se většina zkoumaných jazykových oblastí vyskytla v neutrálních kontextech by bylo jiné, pokud by tyto oblasti byly zkoumány například v novinových článcích.

## 9. Bibliography

ALGEO, John; PYLES, Thomas. *The Origins and Development of the English Language*. 6th edition. Belmont, CA : Wadsworth Publishing, 2009. 347 s. ISBN 978-1-4282-3145-0.

ALLAN, Keith; BURRIDGE, Kate. *Euphemism and Dysphemism: Language Used as Shield and Weapon*. New York : Oxford University Press, 1991. 263 s. ISBN 0-19-506622-7.

ALLAN, Keith; BURRIDGE, Kate. *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language*. New York : Cambridge University Press, 2006. 303 s. ISBN 0-521-52564-0.

ALLAN, Keith; BURRIDGE, Kate. 'RAISING GOOSEFLESH' 'DIRTY' WORDS AND LANGUAGE CHANGE. *La Trobe Papers in Linguistics* [online]. 2005, volume 5, [cit. 2009-10-28]. Dostupný z WWW: <latrobe.edu.au/linguistics/LaTrobePapersinLinguistics/Vol 05/04Allan&Buridge.pdf>.

ALLAN, Keith; BURRIDGE, Kate. EUPHEMISM, DYSPEMISM, AND CROSS-VARIETAL SYNONYMY. *La Trobe Papers in Linguistics* [online]. 2001, volume 1, [cit. 2009-09-21]. Dostupný z WWW: <latrobe.edu.au/linguistics/LaTrobePapersinLinguistics/Vol 01/1AllanandBurridge.pdf>.

ALLAN, Keith. *Natural Language Semantics*. 1st edition. Malden, MA : Wiley-Blackwell, 2001. 529 s. ISBN 0-631-19297-2.

*The American Heritage Book of English Usage: A Practical and Authoritative Guide to Contemporary English*. Boston : Houghton Mifflin, 1996. 290 s. ISBN 0-395-76786-5.

ANDREWS, Larry. *Linguistics for L2 Teachers*. 1st edition. Mahwah, NJ : Lawrence Erlbaum, 2008. 146 s. ISBN 0-8058-3818-X.

ATTWOOD, Sarah. *Making Sense of Sex*. Philadelphia : Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2008. 320 s. ISBN 978-1-84642-797-8.

BAKER, Paul. *Polari - The Lost Language of Gay Men (Routledge Studies In linguistics)*. 1st edition. New York : Routledge, 2002. 215 s. ISBN 0-415-26180-5.

BATE, Barbara. *Communication and the Sexes*. 1st edition. Long Grove, IL : Waveland Press, 1988. 258 s. ISBN 9780060405434.

BROWN, Penelope; LEVINSON, Stephen, C. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage (Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics)*. New York : Cambridge University Press, 1987. 345 s. ISBN 0-521-31355-4.

BURRIDGE, Kate. *Blooming English: Observations on the Roots, Cultivation and Hybrids of the English Language*. New York : Cambridge University Press, 2005. 242 s. ISBN 0-521-54832-2.

BURRIDGE, Kate. *Weeds in the Garden of Words: Further Observations on the Tangled History of the English Language*. New York : Cambridge University Press, 2005. 196 s. ISBN 0-521-61823-1.

CAMERON, Deborah. *The Feminist Critique of Language: A Reader*. 2nd edition. New York : Routledge, 2000. 368 s. ISBN 0-415-16400-1.

*COMPACT EDITION OF THE OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY, COMPLETE TEXT REPRODUCED MICROGRAPHICALLY*. London : Oxford University Press, 1971. 4116 s. ISBN 0198612583.

CORBETT, Greville. *Gender*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1991. 363 s. ISBN 0-521-33845-X.

CRAWFORD, Mary. *Talking Difference: On Gender and Language*. 1st edition. Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage Publications Ltd, 1995. 207 s. ISBN 0-8039-8828-1.

CRYSTAL, David. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. New York : Cambridge University Press, 2003. 489 s. ISBN 0-521-59655-6.

DUIGNAN, Peter.; Gann, Lewis H. *Political Correctness: A Critique*. Palo Alto : Hoover Institution Press, 2005. 47 s. ISBN 0-81793742-0.

FEAGIN, Joe, R. *Racist America: Roots, Current Realities and Future Reparations*. 1st edition. New York : Routledge, 2001. 311 s. ISBN 0-415-92531-2.

GRIFFIN, Cindy, L. *Invitation to Public Speaking*. 3rd edition. Belmont, CA : Wadsworth Publishing, 2009. 474 s. ISBN 0-495-56568-7.

GRIFFIN, Michael. *Public Speaking Basics*. Lanham, MD : University Press Of America, 2008. 142 s. ISBN 0-7618-4350-7.

HELLMAN, Hugo, E.; STAUDACHER, Joseph, M. *Fundamentals of speech;: A group speaking approach*. New York : Random House, 1969. 278 s.

HUDSON, Richard, A. *Sociolinguistics*. 2nd edition. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1996. 279 s. ISBN 0-521-56514-6.

CHAMBERS, William. *Chambers's Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*. London : Elibron Classics, 2001. 611 s. ISBN 1-4212-8257-7.

JAFFE, Clella. *Cengage Advantage Books: Public Speaking : Concepts and Skills for a Diverse Society 6th Edition*. California : Wadsworth, 2009. 405 s. ISBN 0-495-56664-0.

- JAY, Timothy. *Cursing in America: A Psycholinguistic Study of Dirty Language in the Courts, in the Movies, in the Schoolyards and on the Streets*. Chapel Hill : John Benjamins Publishing Co, 2000. 273 s. ISBN 978-1556194511.
- JAY, Timothy. *Why We Curse: A Neuro-Psycho-Social Theory of Speech*. Chapel Hill : John Benjamins Publishing Co, 2000. 328 s. ISBN 1-55619-758-6.
- JEMIE, Onwuchekwa. *Yo' Mama: New Raps, Toasts, Dozens, Jokes, and Children's Rhymes from Urban Black America*. Philadelphia : Temple University Press, 2003. 311 s. ISBN 1-59213-028-3.
- JONES, Darolyn, E. *Painless Reading Comprehension*. Hauppauge NY : Barron's Educational Series, 2004. 213 s. ISBN 0-7641-2766-7
- LAKOFF, Robin. *Language and Woman's Place: Text and Commentaries* . New York : Oxford University Press, 2004. 309 s. ISBN 0-19-516757-0.
- LITTLE, William; ONIONS, C. T. *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1970. 2515 s. ISBN 978 0 19 920687 2.
- MCKNIGHT, George, Harley. *English Words and Their Background*. New York : Geordian Press, 1969. 449 s. ISBN 0877520712.
- PARSONS, Les. *Grammarama!*. Markham, Ontario, CA : Pembroke Publishers, 2004. 112 s. ISBN 1-55138-171-0.
- PERRY, Linda, A. M. *Constructing and Reconstructing Gender: The Links Among Communication, Language, and Gender*. Albany, New York : State University Of New York Press, 1992. 310 s. ISBN 0-7914-1009-9.
- ROMAINE, Suzanne. *Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. 2nd edition. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2000. 268 s. ISBN 0-19-873192-2.
- SAMPSON, Geoffrey. *Empirical Linguistics (Open Linguistics)*. New York : International Publishing Group, 2002. 226 s. ISBN 0-8264-5794-0.
- STEIN, Howard, F. *Euphemism, Spin, and the Crisis in Organizational Life*. Westport : Quorum Books, 1998. 172 s. ISBN 1-56720-124-5.
- STEWART, Chuck. *Homosexuality And The Law: A Dictionary (Contemporary Legal Issues)*. Santa Barbara : Abc-Clio Inc, 2001. 429 s. ISBN 1-57607-267-3.
- STOCKWELL, Peter. *Sociolinguistics: A Resource Book for Students*. 1st edition. New York : Routledge, 2002. 213 s. ISBN 0-415-23453-0.
- SULLIVAN, Nikki. *A Critical Introduction to Queer Theory*. London : NYU Press, 2003. 232 s. ISBN 0-7486-1597-0.

TSOHATZIDIS, Savas, L. *Meanings and Prototypes: Studies in Linguistics Categorization*. New York : Routledge, 1990. 584 s. ISBN 0-415-03612-7.

WARDHAUGH, Ronald. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Malden, MA : Blackwell Publishing, 2006. 450 s. ISBN 978-1-4051-8668-1.

WINTER, Irvah, Lester. *Public speaking; principles and practice*. Albany New York : Bibliolife, 2009. 444 s. ISBN 9781115376754.

## **Electronic sources**

ATKINSON, Philip. *Ourcivilisation.com* [online]. 2000 [cit. 2009-10-25]. A Theory of Civilization: A Study of Our Decline.

Dostupné z WWW: <<http://www.ourcivilisation.com/pc.htm>>

SULLIVAN, Justin. *Justin Sullivan* [online]. 1992 [cit. 2009-11-12]. JustinSullivan.com.

Dostupné z WWW: <<http://justin.justnet.com.au/rudestuff/uses-of-the-word-fuck.html>>

*Webster's New World College Dictionary* [online]. 1996 [cit. 2010-03-03]. YourDictionary.com.

Dostupné z WWW: <<http://www.yourdictionary.com/dicthelp.html>>.

*Online Etymology Dictionary* [online]. 2001 [cit. 2009-11-04]. Fuck.

Dostupné z WWW: <<http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?search=fuck&searchmode=none>>.



## 10. Appendices

### 10.1 Appendix 1: The data corpus

1. Coalition and Iraqi operations have helped reduce ethno-sectarian violence, as well, bringing down the number of ethno-sectarian **deaths** substantially in Baghdad and across Iraq since the height of the sectarian violence last December.
2. I received one of those letters a few days ago. It was from our beloved friend and colleague Ted Kennedy. He had written it back in May, shortly after he was told that his illness was terminal. He asked that it be delivered upon his **death**.
3. Our troops engaged in pitched battles with Fedayeen Saddam, **death** squads acting on the orders of Saddam Hussein, that obeyed neither the conventions of war nor the dictates of conscience.
4. These **death** squads hid in schools, and they hid in hospitals, hoping to draw fire against Iraqi civilians.
5. The number of overall civilian **deaths** has also declined during this period, although the numbers in each area are still at troubling levels.
6. And their commander said to them, the password tonight is victory or **death**.
7. Civilian **deaths** of all categories, less natural causes, have also declined considerably, by over 45% Iraq-wide since the height of the sectarian violence in December. This is shown by the top line on this chart, and the decline by some 70% in Baghdad is shown by the bottom line.
8. We know that there are more challenges to face in Africa. We know that too many mothers and children are still dying preventable **deaths**.
9. That collaboration has resulted in a reducing the number of **deaths** of children under five from over 15 million in the 1980s to an estimated 9.2 million in 2008.
10. Periodic mass casualty attacks by Al Qaeda have tragically added to the numbers outside Baghdad, in particular. Even without the sensational attacks, however, the level of civilian **deaths** is clearly still too high and continues to be of serious concern.
11. As the next chart shows, the number of ethno-sectarian **deaths**, an important subset of the overall civilian casualty figures, has also declined significantly since the height of the sectarian violence in December.
12. The gains we have made are fragile and reversible. But on this anniversary, the American people should know that since the surge began, the level of violence is significantly down, civilian **deaths** are down, sectarian killings are down, attacks on American forces are down.
13. No one can deny the success of freedom, but some men rage and fight against it. And one of the main sources of reaction and opposition is radical Islam; the perversion by a few of a noble faith into an ideology of terror and **death**.
14. War and civil strife continue to cause **death** and destruction around the world.
15. In many of the world's conflict zones, 10 or more people succumb to war-exacerbated disease and malnutrition for every combat **death**.
16. One direct consequence of war and conflict is the destruction of clinics and hospitals, schools, farm land, bridges, roads, and other critical infrastructure.

- With these losses, immunization campaigns are often interrupted, malnutrition and disease exacerbated, and further **death** and injuries result.
17. And then there are the 10 years since our mother's **death**.
  18. This is how Ted Kennedy lived. This is his legacy. He once said of his brother Bobby that he need not be idealized or enlarged in **death** beyond what he was in life, and I imagine he would say the same about himself.
  19. And now **death** has done its part to reveal this man and the President for what he was.
  20. I'd like to read a phrase from Khalil Gibran, that I lifted, on **death**.
  21. Now, I, myself, don't use the term "**death**," but "transition."
  22. And we know that if they were able to get their hands on weapons of mass destruction, they would use them against us. We face an enemy determined to bring **death** and suffering into our homes.
  23. Millions of people are working on behalf of strangers, even if the evening news is usually about the **death** of strangers.
  24. The bigger problem is not the plane crash, but the millions of preventable **deaths**.
  25. We don't read much about these **deaths**. The media covers what's new-and millions of people dying is nothing new. So it stays in the background, where it's easier to ignore.
  26. I tell you, this Labour government will not allow the world to stand by as more than 20,000 children **die** today from diseases we know how to cure. We will not pass by as 100 million men, women and children face a winter of starvation.
  27. Our commanders on the ground will continue to make progress and provide time for the development of a grand strategy. That will be wasted effort, as we have seen repeatedly since 2003. In the meantime our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines will continue to **die**.
  28. After all, as he said then, it takes *no resources* and *no effort* on our part to let a baby with pneumonia or malaria **die** without getting treatment, to let a little girl remain undernourished, to let her mother die in childbirth, or to fail to prevent an HIV-infected mother from passing her infection on to her baby.
  29. After all, as he said then, it takes *no resources* and *no effort* on our part to let a baby with pneumonia or malaria die without getting treatment, to let a little girl remain undernourished, to let her mother **die** in childbirth, or to fail to prevent an HIV-infected mother from passing her infection on to her baby.
  30. We know that there are more challenges to face in Africa. We know that too many mothers and children are still **dying** preventable deaths.
  31. We live in a world where if we gamble wrong and the current proposed defense budget is much too small, if we gamble wrong, whether it is a major power like China or Russia, a medium size power like North Korea, Pakistan, and Iran. And North Korea is a medium size power by possession of nuclear weapons. Or it is a fanatic group willing to **die** in the process of killing us.
  32. Our deficit will grow, more families will go bankrupt, more businesses will close, more Americans will lose their coverage when they are sick and need it the most, and more will **die** as a result. We know these things to be true.
  33. During our discussions on this question, Melinda and I read an article about the millions of children who were **dying** every year in poor countries from diseases that we had long ago made harmless in this country.

34. We were shocked. We had just assumed that if millions of children were **dying** and they could be saved, the world would make it a priority to discover and deliver the medicines to save them.
35. But if the officials were brutally honest, they would say: "Of all the people in the world who **died** today from preventable causes, one half of one percent of them were on this plane. We're determined to do everything possible to solve the problem that took the lives of the one half of one percent."
36. The media covers what's new - and millions of people **dying** is nothing new.
37. You have to be able to show a decline in the number of children **dying** from these diseases. This is essential not just to improve the program, but also to help draw more investment from business and government.
38. Should Harvard students learn about the depth of global poverty the prevalence of world hunger the scarcity of clean water the girls kept out of school the children who **die** from diseases we can cure?
39. We know that the average life expectancy of South Africans has been falling, and that South Africans are **dying** at a young age.
40. I've told you before about Florence Steen of South Dakota, who was 88 years old, and insisted that her daughter bring an absentee ballot to her hospice bedside. Her daughter and a friend put an American flag behind her bed and helped her fill out the ballot. She **passed away** soon after, and under state law, her ballot didn't count.
41. But those of us who loved him, and ache with his **passing**, know Ted Kennedy by the other titles he held: Father. Brother. Husband. Uncle Teddy, or as he was often known to his younger nieces and nephews, "The Grand Fromage," or "The Big Cheese." I, like so many others in the city where he worked for nearly half a century, knew him as a colleague, a mentor, and above all, a friend.
42. If a family **loses** its primary income provider, ACAP may assist surviving family members by providing vocational or business training; replacing of the family's source of income, such as its herd of livestock or its fruit orchard; or assisting in establishing a new small business.
43. Ted Kennedy has gone home now, guided by his faith and by the light of those he has loved and **lost**.
44. As you know so well, the passage of time never really heals the tragic memory of such a great **loss**, but we carry on, because we have to, because our loved one would want us to, and because there is still light to guide us in the world from the love they gave us.
45. ACAP is flexible enough to provide this type of assistance, to fund the repair of a damaged home, or to ensure that children are able to continue their education when one or both parents are **lost**.
46. But the relative calm in the immediate aftermath of the Cold War served only to mask new threats to the security of democratic nations: ethnic conflicts, new **genocides**, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction -- especially by rogue states -- and, above all, a new, more formidable, and more malignant form of terrorism embraced by Islamic extremists.
47. Some of this is already beginning to happen. Pastors, friends of mine like Rick Warren and T.D. Jakes are wielding their enormous influences to confront AIDS, Third World debt relief, and the **genocide** in Darfur.

48. Above all we must not wait to take action until **genocide** is actually happening, by which time it is often too late to do anything effective about it.
49. I suspect many in this audience, and most members of Congress, look back at America's failure to act to prevent **genocide** in Rwanda with shame.
50. Two years ago I announced an action plan for the prevention of **genocide**, and appointed a Special Adviser to help me implement it.
51. Unless we fight to prevent it, our withdrawal will be coupled with a **genocide** in which we are complicit.
52. That is why there should never be amnesty for **genocide**, crimes against humanity and massive violations of human rights.
53. But I fear the potential for **genocide** and ethnic cleansing in Iraq is even worse.
54. It also includes our shared responsibility to protect populations from **genocide**, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity - a responsibility solemnly accepted by all nations at last year's UN summit.
55. On Tuesday, America took new actions to address the ongoing **genocide** in Darfur.
56. As you know, last year's World Summit formally endorsed that momentous doctrine – which means, in essence, that respect for national sovereignty can no longer be used as an excuse for inaction in the face of **genocide**, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity.
57. Even after the horrors of the Holocaust and the lessons of Hiroshima some six decades ago, **genocide** continues unstopped in the deserts of Darfur, and the world community continues to play a very dangerous game of brinksmanship with weapons of mass destruction.
58. We respond to humanitarian crises, protect world shipping and energy lanes, deter terrorism, prevent **genocide** and lead peace-keeping missions. He stood as both a lighthouse and a crossroads - unafraid to speak his mind on moral issues ranging from poverty, AIDS, and abortion to the death penalty and nuclear war.
59. Rather, it is a museum dedicated to the memory of a particular **genocide**, an event of such magnitude, it actually gave birth to the word "genocide" itself.
60. Rather, it is a museum dedicated to the memory of a particular genocide, an event of such magnitude, it actually gave birth to the word "**genocide**" itself.
61. We have used our military to eliminate governments seen as a threat to our national security, to undo aggression, to end **ethnic slaughter**, and to prevent chaos.
62. But I fear the potential for genocide and **ethnic cleansing** in Iraq is even worse.
63. It also includes our shared responsibility to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, **ethnic cleansing**, and crimes against humanity - a responsibility solemnly accepted by all nations at last year's UN summit.
64. As you know, last year's World Summit formally endorsed that momentous doctrine – which means, in essence, that respect for national sovereignty can no longer be used as an excuse for inaction in the face of genocide, war crimes, **ethnic cleansing** and crimes against humanity.
65. A journalist once described me as the Eeyore of national security -- able to find the darkest cloud in any silver lining. I used to joke that when an intelligence officer smelled the flowers, he'd look around for the **coffin**.
66. That would only encourage today's **mass murderers** – and tomorrow's would-be mass murderers – to continue their vicious work.

67. That would only encourage today's mass murderers – and tomorrow's would-be **mass murderers** – to continue their vicious work.
68. And, by focusing on the human story, this museum will, we hope, become a moral platform attesting to the indefensibility of terrorism, to the absolute unacceptability of indiscriminate **mass murder** as a response to grievance.
69. And across the Iraqi countryside, they uncovered mass graves of thousands **executed** by the regime.
70. We respond to humanitarian crises, protect world shipping and energy lanes, deter terrorism, prevent genocide and lead peace-keeping missions. He stood as both a lighthouse and a crossroads - unafraid to speak his mind on moral issues ranging from poverty, AIDS, and abortion to the **death penalty** and nuclear war.
71. **Man** is a political and social animal, and individual men and women define their identity by their membership of groups.
72. No one can deny the success of freedom, but some **men** rage and fight against it. And one of the main sources of reaction and opposition is radical Islam; the perversion by a few of a noble faith into an ideology of terror and death.
73. Clearly, a renewed and concerted effort from the Haitian government and its international partners is required to regain the hard-earned progress lost to **man-made** and natural disasters, and to lay the foundation for sustained economic growth.
74. It's a plan that asks everyone to take responsibility for meeting this challenge, not just government, not just insurance companies, but everybody, including employers and individuals. And it's a plan that incorporates ideas from senators and **congressmen**, from Democrats and Republicans, and yes, from some of my opponents in both the primary and general election.
75. Ambassador from Iraq is with us; Mr. Ambassador, we're proud to have you here. Soldiers, sailors, marines, **airmen**, and coast men—coast guard men, thanks for coming; thanks for wearing the uniform.
76. Ambassador from Iraq is with us; Mr. Ambassador, we're proud to have you here. Soldiers, sailors, marines, airmen, and **coast men**—coast guard men, thanks for coming; thanks for wearing the uniform.
77. In the last three decades, since making the first tentative moves toward liberalization, China has been witness to the greatest surge in general prosperity in the history of **mankind**.
78. But there is a different perspective if we step back and look at the world through a wider lens -- a perspective that shows a dramatic growth in human freedom and democracy in just the time since this fall's college **freshmen** were born.
79. I also want to acknowledge all of our soldiers, sailors, **airmen** and Marines serving in Iraq and Afghanistan.
80. That will be wasted effort, as we have seen repeatedly since 2003. In the meantime our soldiers, sailors, **airmen** and marines will continue to die.
81. Our soldiers, sailors, **airmen** and marines were destined to endure decades of fighting and killing people without the focused, synchronized application of all elements of national power.
82. And in its historical struggles for freedom and the rights of **man**, I was able to see faith as more than just a comfort to the weary or a hedge against death, but rather as an active, palpable agent in the world.

83. There was the time he courted Orrin Hatch's support for the Children's Health Insurance Program by having his Chief of Staff serenade the Senator with a song Orrin had written himself; the time he delivered shamrock cookies on a china plate to sweeten up a crusty Republican colleague; and the famous story of how he won the support of a Texas Committee Chairman on an immigration bill. Teddy walked into a meeting with a plain manila envelope, and showed only the **Chairman** that it was filled with the Texan's favorite cigars.
84. I'd like to talk about the -- the laws of **man**, here in this city, where those laws are written.
85. I'd like to talk about higher laws. It would be great to assume that once there's the other, that the laws of **man** serve these higher laws, but, of course, they don't always. I presume that, in a way, is why you're all here.
86. Moving people of all kinds to work with others they had never met, never would have cared to meet. They had conservative church groups hanging out with **spokesmen** from the gay community, all singing off the same hymn sheet on AIDS. See, miracles do happen. And we had hip-hop stars and country stars.
87. We're asking for an extra one percent to change the world, to transform millions of lives, but not just that -- and I say this to the military **men** now -- not just transform hundreds of thousands, indeed millions, of communities, but transform the way they see us, which might be smart in these dangerous times.
88. Because of what America did in the 20th century, there are hundreds of millions of people around the world who now live in freedom -- who, but for the price paid by the United States, would have lived in despair. I know of no other such example of national selflessness in the history of **mankind**.
89. Remember that in the end, we are all **fishermen**.
90. Gerald Ford was born and reared in the American heartland. He belonged to a generation that measured **men** by their honesty and their courage.
91. Now, on the sixth day of Creation, we all know that God created **Man** in His image.
92. When the negotiations were going well, he would inch the envelope closer to the **Chairman**. When they weren't, he would pull it back. Before long, the deal was done.
93. Subsequently by the way, Chris has gone on as a serial entrepreneur to create a new company, Affinity Labs, which provides online job markets and peer-support communities for nurses, **policemen**, firefighters, and many other public service professionals.
94. Enslaving each other was what human beings had done for ages. And the abolitionist movement was greeted with incredulity. Conservative **spokesmen** ridiculed the abolitionists as liberals, progressives, do-gooders, meddlers, and activists.
95. One of the things that I picked up from my father and my mother was the sense that religion often gets in the way of God; for me, at least, it got in the way -- seeing what religious people, in the name of God, did to my native land. And even in this country, seeing God's second-hand car **salesmen** on their TV cable channels offering indulgences for cash.
96. Every day, I saw more evidence about the evils **humankind** will inflict on their fellow humans, to gain or maintain power. I began to have nightmares, literal nightmares, about some of the things I saw, heard, and read.

97. As a **freshman** at Sarah Lawrence, I read Tonio Kröger with my don, Harold S. L. Wiener, and that one remarkable short story helped frame for me the core (and continuing) challenge of modern Europe in terms of the urgent need to bridge nationalistic divisions as a prerequisite for economic and social vitality, creativity and productivity.
98. America, right now, needs you. We need an army of the smartest, most passionate young people to try their hand at a business -- people who will take their hearts and their heads into the market, founding companies that will bring forth new products and services that will help **mankind**.
99. They reflect the striving for human authenticity and commercial ways which benefit all **mankind**.
100. He took some time out from our traditional and incredibly difficult English class to teach us about the old ancient apprentice and master **craftsmen** roles. While it was very interesting, I could not for the life of me see its relevance to English, or my college degree or anything else for that matter.
101. Nonetheless, we went over that material in great detail for hours. It was only later that I realized that the lesson of the apprentice and the master **craftsman** was an invaluable lesson for me to learn.
102. The apprentice watches each movement of the **craftsman**, emulates those movements over and over again to gain the knowledge needed for his or her particular craft.
103. The education doesn't stop there; the apprentice not only learns the activity but learns thoroughly the process, the ethics, the rules, and everything that pertains to the craft. In the ancient times, it seemed that master **craftsmen** had little choice but to dedicate themselves to the responsibility of passing knowledge on to their apprentice.
104. As I translate the master **craftsman** principle to our culture today, I believe that the educated professional person is charged with the responsibility of passing on knowledge and experiences to others.
105. As the ancient master **craftsmen** knew, doing the job and performing the tasks is simply not enough, the apprentice must know the process and the ethics.
106. Like the ancient master **craftsman**, we have little choice; we are called as professionals to share our knowledge and ability with others, essentially it is our duty.
107. As you know, last year's World Summit formally endorsed that momentous doctrine – which means, in essence, that respect for national sovereignty can no longer be used as an excuse for inaction in the face of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against **humanity**.
108. It also includes our shared responsibility to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against **humanity** - a responsibility solemnly accepted by all nations at last year's UN summit.
109. As you know, last year's World Summit formally endorsed that momentous doctrine – which means, in essence, that respect for national sovereignty can no longer be used as an excuse for inaction in the face of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against **humanity**.
110. But if our different communities are to live together in peace we must stress also what unites us: our common **humanity**, and our shared belief that human dignity and rights should be protected by law.

111. **Chairperson**, Prime Minister Berlusconi; Secretary-General of the United Nations, Ban Ki Moon; Your Excellencies Heads of States and Governments; The Director-General of FAO, Dr. Diouf; Heads of Delegations Excellencies; Distinguished guests; Ladies and gentlemen.
112. Firstly, allow me, **chairperson** to congratulate you on your election to facilitate the proceedings of this important summit. We are participating here with a sincere hope that this gathering will mark a departure from the past by producing a clear programme of action with measurable targets and monitoring mechanisms to track progress.
113. **Chairperson**, this gathering dare not fail! It must create conditions for eliminating hunger and food insecurity. Consequently, only an agreement on a set of practical measures that must address in a concise and comprehensive manner, the challenge of food insecurity and poverty eradication, will meet the expectations of the one billion starving people across the globe.
114. **Chairperson**, in Africa there is a general consensus that agricultural reforms within the framework of Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) remains an effective means to achieve, among other things, targeted investments in agricultural production, irrigation infrastructure, access to fertilizer and seeds, agro-processing and market development including extension services, general human resource and meaningful involvement of women.
115. Hopefully not a political party. Life is creating the conditions that are conducive to life inside you, just as in all of nature. What I want you to imagine is that collectively **humanity** is evincing a deep innate wisdom in coming together to heal the wounds and insults of the past.
116. Together we fought and defeated a system so corrupt and reviled that it was described as a crime against **humanity**.
117. But **humanity's** greatest advances are not in its discoveries-but in how those discoveries are applied to reduce inequity.
118. I hope you will judge yourselves not on your professional accomplishments alone, but also on how well you have addressed the world's deepest inequities on how well you treated people a world away who have nothing in common with you but their **humanity**.
119. Deputy **Chairperson** of the SA National Aids Council, Mark Heywood, Members of the diplomatic corps, UN Aids Executive Director Michel Sedibe and all representatives of international agencies.
120. The nostalgia that I see around with silvering members of the civil rights movement, marchers, **spokespersons**, having hit it hard and recovered and sustained.
121. For many of our citizens, the wounds of that morning are still fresh. I've met firefighters and **police officers** who choke up at the memory of fallen comrades.
122. I'd been in television since I was 19 and a sophomore. Granted, I was the only television **anchorperson** that had an 11 o'clock curfew doing the 10 o'clock news.
123. You will be nurses, and lawyers, and professors, architects, scientists, designers, **salespeople**, and builders.
124. For many of our citizens, the wounds of that morning are still fresh. I've met **firefighters** and police officers who choke up at the memory of fallen comrades.



125. Subsequently by the way, Chris has gone on as a serial entrepreneur to create a new company, Affinity Labs, which provides online job markets and peer-support communities for nurses, policemen, **firefighters**, and many other public service professionals.
126. And if it weren't for the particular attributes of the historically **black** church, I may have accepted this fate. But as the months passed in Chicago, I found myself drawn - not just to work with the church, but to be in the church.
127. We know that many may want to know the relevance of establishing an exclusively **black** federation in a non-racial democracy.
128. The accumulation process under Apartheid confined the creation of wealth to a racial minority and imposed underdevelopment on **black** communities.
129. The overwhelming majority of our **black** population still lags behind in terms of:
130. But it's all -- not all good news, as we know; like, for instance, our dropout rate is now between 15 and 30 percent. We don't even know exactly the number. Now this is not just a statistic, I remind you. These are children lost in a **black hole** of ignorance, poverty, and crime.
131. Then I asked him to analyze the state of **black** America and black New Orleans today and to give me a critique of black leadership today.
132. Then I asked him to analyze the state of black America and **black** New Orleans today and to give me a critique of black leadership today.
133. Then I asked him to analyze the state of black America and black New Orleans today and to give me a critique of **black** leadership today.
134. And I asked him what does he think about **black** leaders always or most of the time tearing each other down publicly for the delight of many? And he said, "I really don't like that either."
135. Georgia Tech said they would not take the field if a **black** man were allowed to play. Gerald Ford was furious at Georgia Tech for making the demand, and for the University of Michigan for caving in. He agreed to play only after Willis Ward personally asked him to.
136. It is the same thing that gave me hope from the day we began this campaign for the presidency nearly two years ago; a belief that if we could just recognize ourselves in one another and bring everyone together - Democrats, Republicans, and Independents; Latino, Asian, and Native American; **black** and white, gay and straight, disabled and not - then not only would we restore hope and opportunity in places that yearned for both, but maybe, just maybe, we might perfect our union in the process.
137. And then they really didn't like the way I looked, 'cause now I am **black** and bald and sitting on TV. Not a pretty picture.
138. Working-class **black** and white and Hispanic residents. All of us with different experiences. All of us with different beliefs. But all of us learned to work side by side because all of us saw in these neighborhoods other human beings who needed our help - to find jobs and improve schools. We were bound together in the service of others.
139. But surely he's upset at **black** America, also.
140. So, I ask those of you graduating today, male or female, **black** or white or brown or yellow, young or old, straight or gay to become soldiers in a new Union Army, an army dedicated to the preservation of this country's great ideals, a

- vanguard against this new separatism and disunion, a vanguard against those who, in the name of our great democracy, have managed to diminish it.
141. He said the thing we need to focus on as a community, **black** folks I'm talking to, is ourselves.
  142. We ask **black** people: it's time. It's time for us to come together. It's time for us to rebuild a New Orleans, the one that should be a chocolate New Orleans. And I don't care what people are saying Uptown or wherever they are. This city will be chocolate at the end of the day.
  143. It's time for all of us good folk to stand up and say "We're tired of the violence. We're tired of **black** folks killing each other.
  144. For one thing, I believed and still believe in the power of the **African-American** religious tradition to spur social change, a power made real by some of the leaders here today.
  145. A hopeful society acts boldly to fight diseases like HIV/AIDS, which can be prevented and treated and defeated. More than a million Americans live with HIV, and half of all AIDS cases occur among **African-Americans**.
  146. We were in an **African-American** seat in the middle of New Orleans and our candidate was a South Vietnamese American.
  147. We will also lead a nationwide effort, working closely with **African-American** churches and faith-based groups, to deliver rapid HIV tests to millions, end the stigma of AIDS and come closer to the day when there are no new infections in America.
  148. 18 million of you from all walks of life - women and men, young and old, Latino and Asian, **African-American** and Caucasian, rich, poor and middle class, gay and straight - you have stood strong with me.
  149. Because it does not matter whether you are Italian American or **African American** or Korean American. It does not matter whether you are Muslim or Presbyterian or Jewish or Catholic. What matters is that you are American and you are devoted to an ideal and to a set of beliefs that unites us.
  150. This city will be a majority **African-American** city. It's the way God wants it to be.
  151. It was quite an eclectic crew. Catholic and Protestant churches. Jewish and **African-American** organizers.
  152. One of Michigan's best players was an **African American** student named Willis Ward.
  153. After all, I stand here today, as President and as an **African-American**, on the 55th anniversary of the day that the Supreme Court handed down the decision in Brown v. the Board of Education. Brown was of course the first major step in dismantling the "separate but equal" doctrine, but it would take a number of years and a nationwide movement to fully realize the dream of civil rights for all of God's children.
  154. There were six members of the commission. It included five whites and one **African-American**; Democrats and Republicans; two Southern governors, the dean of a Southern law school, a Midwestern university president, and your own Father Ted Hesburgh, President of Notre Dame.
  155. Because it does not matter whether you are Italian American or African American or **Korean American**. It does not matter whether you are Muslim or

- Presbyterian or Jewish or Catholic. What matters is that you are American and you are devoted to an ideal and to a set of beliefs that unites us.
156. Because it does not matter whether you are **Italian American** or African American or Korean American. It does not matter whether you are Muslim or Presbyterian or Jewish or Catholic. What matters is that you are American and you are devoted to an ideal and to a set of beliefs that unites us.
157. The United States enjoys many ties with Haiti, and as a member of the community of democracies, we are committed to helping the **Haitian people** and their democratically-elected government build a more prosperous nation and a brighter future.
158. This is vital-not only to maintain continued stability in Haiti, but also to provide opportunities to the hard working **Haitian people** to mold a better life for themselves and for their families.
159. As the campaign unfolded, tens and thousands of our troops poured across the Iraqi border to liberate **the Iraqi people** and remove a regime that threatened free nations.
160. General David Petraeus took command with a new mission: Work with Iraqi forces to protect the **Iraqi people**; pressure the enemy into strongholds; and deny the terrorists sanctuary anywhere in the country. And that is precisely what we have done.
161. 18 million of you from all walks of life - women and men, young and old, **Latino** and Asian, African-American and Caucasian, rich, poor and middle class, gay and straight - you have stood strong with me.
162. It is the same thing that gave me hope from the day we began this campaign for the presidency nearly two years ago; a belief that if we could just recognize ourselves in one another and bring everyone together - Democrats, Republicans, and Independents; **Latino**, Asian, and Native American; black and white, gay and straight, disabled and not - then not only would we restore hope and opportunity in places that yearned for both, but maybe, just maybe, we might perfect our union in the process.
163. 18 million of you from all walks of life - women and men, young and old, Latino and **Asian**, African-American and Caucasian, rich, poor and middle class, gay and straight - you have stood strong with me.
164. It is the same thing that gave me hope from the day we began this campaign for the presidency nearly two years ago; a belief that if we could just recognize ourselves in one another and bring everyone together - Democrats, Republicans, and Independents; Latino, **Asian**, and Native American; black and white, gay and straight, disabled and not - then not only would we restore hope and opportunity in places that yearned for both, but maybe, just maybe, we might perfect our union in the process.
165. In Seattle, I met Lena Madsen, a young **woman of color** whom I won't soon forget.
166. Good evening. Five years ago, this date -- September the 11th -- was seared into America's memory. Nineteen men attacked us with a barbarity unequalled in our history. They murdered **people of all colors**, creeds, and nationalities -- and made war upon the entire free world.

167. It is you - **Americans** of every race and region and station who came here because you believe in what this country can be and because you want to help us get there.
168. We hear that call in the ONE Campaign, a growing movement of more than two million **Americans** -- five million by the next election, I promise you -- united in the belief that where you live should no longer determine whether you live.
169. So, I ask those of you graduating today, male or female, black or white or **brown** or yellow, young or old, straight or gay to become soldiers in a new Union Army, an army dedicated to the preservation of this country's great ideals, a vanguard against this new separatism and disunion, a vanguard against those who, in the name of our great democracy, have managed to diminish it.
170. So, I ask those of you graduating today, male or female, black or white or brown or **yellow**, young or old, straight or gay to become soldiers in a new Union Army, an army dedicated to the preservation of this country's great ideals, a vanguard against this new separatism and disunion, a vanguard against those who, in the name of our great democracy, have managed to diminish it.
171. We must also consider the historic mission for which the ANC was founded almost a century ago - to unite the **South African people** to eradicate racial oppression and other forms of discrimination and exploitation.
172. This is a great achievement. It is an achievement that belongs to all **South Africans**. It is only through meaningful partnership that we have been able to come this far.
173. We know that the average life expectancy of **South Africans** has been falling, and that South Africans are dying at a young age.
174. We know that the average life expectancy of South Africans has been falling, and that **South Africans** are dying at a young age.
175. That kind of disparity also holds true for the cost of building submarines, artillery pieces, tanks, and other military platforms. Taking into account the difference in costs, our advantage over the **Russians** and Chinese is not 10 to one; it's more like two to 1. They are closer to half our level than they are to one tenth.
176. That kind of disparity also holds true for the cost of building submarines, artillery pieces, tanks, and other military platforms. Taking into account the difference in costs, our advantage over the Russians and **Chinese** is not 10 to one; it's more like two to 1. They are closer to half our level than they are to one tenth.
177. It is the same thing that gave me hope from the day we began this campaign for the presidency nearly two years ago; a belief that if we could just recognize ourselves in one another and bring everyone together - Democrats, Republicans, and Independents; Latino, Asian, and **Native American**; black and white, gay and straight, disabled and not - then not only would we restore hope and opportunity in places that yearned for both, but maybe, just maybe, we might perfect our union in the process.
178. We were in an African-American seat in the middle of New Orleans and our candidate was a **South Vietnamese American**.
179. The World Health Organization conservatively estimates that 10 percent of a **population has some sort of disability**. In conflict-affected countries, that number may be closer to 25 percent.

180. The programs ensure that the treatment and equipment used are appropriate and effective in increasing the mobility of **people with disabilities** who live in developing countries.
181. They design and change the policies relating to **people with disabilities**.
182. Meaningful social and political integration is realized when **people with disabilities** have legal protections and the ability to advocate on their own behalf. USAID's 1997 disability policy advances a clear vision and framework for all of our efforts in the area of disability-related issues.
183. Protection Cluster members had provided assistance to more than 3,500 households headed by vulnerable individuals, such as women, children, and **disabled persons**, to access relief services in camps.
184. It is the same thing that gave me hope from the day we began this campaign for the presidency nearly two years ago; a belief that if we could just recognize ourselves in one another and bring everyone together - Democrats, Republicans, and Independents; Latino, Asian, and Native American; black and white, gay and straight, **disabled** and not - then not only would we restore hope and opportunity in places that yearned for both, but maybe, just maybe, we might perfect our union in the process.
185. That is why, five years ago, the UN Millennium Summit adopted a set of goals - the "Millennium Development Goals" - to be reached by 2015: goals such as halving the proportion of people in the world who do not have clean water to drink; making sure all girls, as well as boys, receive at least primary education; slashing infant and maternal mortality; and stopping the spread of **HIV/Aids**.
186. On Wednesday, the United States demonstrated leadership on another crisis affecting Africa: **HIV/AIDS**.
187. So I've asked Congress to double our initial commitment for **HIV/AIDS** prevention to \$30 billion over the next five years.
188. We show compassion abroad because Americans believe in the God-given dignity and worth of a villager with **HIV/AIDS**, or an infant with malaria, or a refugee fleeing genocide, or a young girl sold into slavery.
189. In recent years, you and I have taken unprecedented action to fight **AIDS** and malaria, expand the education of girls, and reward developing nations that are moving forward with economic and political reform.
190. I can still remember him speaking at one of the first organizing meetings I attended on the South Side. He stood as both a lighthouse and a crossroads - unafraid to speak his mind on moral issues ranging from poverty, **AIDS**, and abortion to the death penalty and nuclear war.
191. Moving people of all kinds to work with others they had never met, never would have cared to meet. They had conservative church groups hanging out with spokesmen from the gay community, all singing off the same hymn sheet on **AIDS**. See, miracles do happen. And we had hip-hop stars and country stars.
192. Unlike many others, **HIV and AIDS** cannot be overcome simply by improving the quality of drinking water, or eradicating mosquitoes, or mass immunisation.
193. And I think that, I thought maybe we would get here in May or June. I did not believe that they were arrogant enough and **foolish** enough to force this confrontation in the first 30 days of a new presidency.
194. Climbing out of poverty by your own efforts, that is something on which to pride yourself, but poverty itself is romanticized only by **fools**.

195. But what I was truly struck by was if his Attorney General thinks we're a nation of cowards, his administration thinks we're just plain **dumb**.
196. And so she jumped up and she applauded his attack on private planes. And I thought to myself, how **dumb** do they think we are.
197. She should have the same... and I wondered how **dumb** they thought we were.
198. And I thought to myself, how **dumb** do they think we are that they can pretend that an energy tax isn't an energy tax.
199. They have shared openly and honestly with us their vision of higher taxes, bigger government, more bureaucracy, greater corruption, more political power by people unworthy of doing it, and a policy which will kill jobs, **cripple** the economy, trap children in schools that are disastrous, and weaken America's future.
200. And insurance companies will be required to cover, with no extra charge, routine checkups and preventive care, like mammograms and colonoscopies, because there's no reason we shouldn't be catching diseases like **breast cancer** and colon cancer before they get worse.
201. And insurance companies will be required to cover, with no extra charge, routine checkups and preventive care, like mammograms and colonoscopies, because there's no reason we shouldn't be catching diseases like breast cancer and **colon cancer** before they get worse.
202. And when we talk about the 240,000 lives that are saved by the progress Labour's NHS has made in fighting **cancer** and heart disease, that's not just a number - that's the dad who lives to walk his daughter up the aisle and the gran who is there to clap and cry at her grandson's graduation.
203. Over the next decade we can lead the way in beating **cancer** and other diseases - a great endeavour worthy of a great country: proud because we have a health service focused on 21st century needs.
204. Universal check-ups and new help to fight **cancer** - these are all causes worth fighting for. This is the future we're fighting for.
205. After a series on colon **cancer** and my up close and personal on-air colonoscopy (by the way, I feel very close to all of you now), colon cancer screenings increased 20 percent, and medical researchers have actually called this "The Couric Effect."
206. After a series on colon cancer and my up close and personal on-air colonoscopy (by the way, I feel very close to all of you now), colon **cancer** screenings increased 20 percent, and medical researchers have actually called this "The Couric Effect."
207. She kissed us last thing at night. Her beaming smile greeted us from school. She laughed hysterically and uncontrollably when sharing something **silly** she might have said or done that day. She encouraged us when we were nervous or unsure.
208. Moving people of all kinds to work with others they had never met, never would have cared to meet. They had conservative church groups hanging out with spokesmen from the gay community, all singing off the same hymn sheet on AIDS. See, miracles do happen. And we had hip-hop stars and country stars. This is what happens when God gets on the move: **crazy, crazy** stuff happens.
209. I shall never forget the African torture victim, a young man no older than I was at the time, who had become **mentally ill** after all he had endured in his homeland.

210. 18 million of you from all walks of life - women and men, young and old, Latino and Asian, African-American and Caucasian, rich, poor and middle class, **gay** and straight - you have stood strong with me.
211. Conservative leaders have been all too happy to exploit this gap, consistently reminding evangelical Christians that Democrats disrespect their values and dislike their Church, while suggesting to the rest of the country that religious Americans care only about issues like abortion and **gay** marriage; school prayer and intelligent design.
212. The doctor described himself as a Christian who understood his commitments to be "totalizing." His faith led him to a strong opposition to abortion and **gay** marriage, although he said that his faith also led him to question the idolatry of the free market and quick resort to militarism that seemed to characterize much of the Republican agenda.
213. Recommendation 104C calls on states to find appropriate and supportive families for **gay**, bisexual, transgender and what we call questioning youth.
214. So, I ask those of you graduating today, male or female, black or white or brown or yellow, young or old, straight or **gay**, to become soldiers in a new Union Army, an army dedicated to the preservation of this country's great ideals, a vanguard against this new separatism and disunion, a vanguard against those who, in the name of our great democracy, have managed to diminish it.
215. Moving people of all kinds to work with others they had never met, never would have cared to meet. They had conservative church groups hanging out with spokesmen from the **gay** community, all singing off the same hymn sheet on AIDS. See, miracles do happen.
216. It is the same thing that gave me hope from the day we began this campaign for the presidency nearly two years ago; a belief that if we could just recognize ourselves in one another and bring everyone together - Democrats, Republicans, and Independents; Latino, Asian, and Native American; black and white, **gay** and straight, disabled and not - then not only would we restore hope and opportunity in places that yearned for both, but maybe, just maybe, we might perfect our union in the process.
217. This liberating discovery enables me to proceed without any fear that I might inadvertently influence you to abandon promising careers in business, the law, or politics for the giddy delights of becoming a **gay** wizard.
218. It does not mean that people do not have to practice safer **sex**.
219. It does not mean that people should not use condoms consistently and correctly during every **sexual encounter**.
220. The apprentice watches each movement of the craftsman, emulates those movements over and over again to gain the knowledge needed for **his or her** particular craft.

## 10.2 Appendix 2: Electronic sources of the public speeches

### A Informative speeches

*Responsibly ending the war in Iraq* [online]. American Rhetoric Online Speech Bank: Barack Obama: 27 February 2009, [accessed 2009-11-21]. Available at: <<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/barackobama/barackobamacamplejeune2009.htm>>

*Military Reporters and Editors Forum Luncheon Address* [online]. American Rhetoric Online Speech Bank: Lieutenant General (Ret.) Ricardo S. Sanchez: 12 October 2007, [accessed 2009-11-21]. Available at: <<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/wariniraq/ricardosanchezmilitaryreportersforum.htm>>

*Opening Statement to Joint House Committee on the Situation in Iraq* [online]. American Rhetoric Online Speech Bank: General David H. Petraeus: 10 September 2007, [accessed 2009-11-21]. Available at: <<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/wariniraq/davidpetraeusoniraq.htm>>

*State of the State Address* [online]. American Rhetoric Online Speech Bank: Arnold Swcharzenegger: 3 January 2008, [accessed 2009-11-21]. Available at: <<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/arnoldschwarzeneggerstateofthestate.htm>>

*2006 State of the Union Address* [online]. American Rhetoric Online Speech Bank: George W. Bush: 31 January 2006, [accessed 2009-11-21]. Available at: <<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/stateoftheunion2006.htm>>

*Concession speech* [online]. American Rhetoric Online Speech Bank: John McCain: 4 November 2008, [accessed 2009-11-25]. Available at: <<http://americanrhetoric.com/speeches/convention2008/johnmccainconcessionspeech.htm>>

*Address to the Conservative Political Action Committee* [online]. American Rhetoric Online Speech Bank: Newt Gingrich: 27 February 2009, [accessed 2009-11-25]. Available at: <<http://americanrhetoric.com/speeches/newtgingrichcpac2009.htm>>

*Address to the World Forum on the Future of Democracy* [online]. American Rhetoric Online Speech Bank: Robert M. Gates: 17 September 2007, [accessed 2009-11-25]. Available at: <<http://americanrhetoric.com/speeches/robertgatesworlddemocracyforum.htm>>

*Statement for the Record by Jon C. Brause* [online]. USAID From The American People: 16 June 2009, [accessed 2009-10-03]. Available at: <<http://www.usaid.gov/press/speeches/2009/ty090616.html>>

*Remarks by Alonzo L. Fulgham* [online]. USAID From The American People: 9 August 2009, [accessed 2009-10-03]. Available at: <<http://www.usaid.gov/press/speeches/2009/sp090809.html>>



*Statement of Dirk Dijkerman* [online]. USAID From The American People: 1 April 2009, [accessed 2009-10-03].

Available at: <<http://www.usaid.gov/press/speeches/2009/ty090401.html>>

*Remarks by Gloria Steele* [online]. USAID From The American People: 16 June 2009, [accessed 2009-10-16].

Available at: <<http://www.usaid.gov/press/speeches/2009/sp090616.html>>

*Remarks at Georgetown School of Foreign Service by Condoleezza Rice* [online]. Gifts of Speech: 18 January 2008, [accessed 2009-12-07].

Available at: <<http://gos.sbc.edu/r/rice3.html>>

*Hillary Clinton's Concession Speech* [online]. Gifts of Speech: 7 June 2008, [accessed 2009-12-07].

Available at: <<http://gos.sbc.edu/c/clinton2.html>>

*Full text: Kofi Annan's final speech* [online]. BBC News: 11 December 2006, [accessed 2009-12-12].

Available at: <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/6170089.stm>>

*"Call to Renewal" Keynote Address by Barack Obama* [online]. Obama Speeches: 28 June 2006, [accessed 2009-12-12].

Available at: <<http://obamaspeeches.com/081-Call-to-Renewal-Keynote-Address-Obama-Speech.htm>>

*Address to World Summit on Food Security* [online]. Anc.org: Kgalema Motlanthe: 16 November 2009, [accessed 2009-12-07].

Available at: <<http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/speeches/2009/sp1116.html>>

*Address by ANC President Jacob Zuma at the launch of the confederation of black business organisations (CBBO)* [online]. Anc.org: 10 March 2009, [accessed 2009-12-06].

Available at: <<http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/speeches/2009/sp0310a.html>>

*Bush's speech: G8 summit* [online]. China Daily: 8 June 2008, [accessed 2009-12-06].

Available at: <[http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/anguage\\_tips/auvidelo/2007-06/15/content\\_895546.htm](http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/anguage_tips/auvidelo/2007-06/15/content_895546.htm)>

*Urging end to impunity, Annan sets forth ideas to bolster UN efforts to protect human rights* [online]. Statements: 8 December 2006, [accessed 2009-11-14].

Available at: <<http://www.un.org/News/press/docs/2006/statements/stat061108.asp?statID=39>>

*Address to Congress on Health Care* [online]. Miller Center Public Affairs: Barack Obama: 9 September 2009, [accessed 2009-11-09].

Available at: <<http://millercenter.org/scripps/archive/speeches/detail/5548>>

*Remarks on the War on Terror* [online]. Miller Center Public Affairs: George Bush: 19 March 2008, [accessed 2009-10-09].

Available at: < <http://millercenter.org/scripps/archive/speeches/detail/4452>>

*American Bar Association House of Delegates Meeting* [online]. American Bar Association: Karen J. Mathis: 13 August 2007, [accessed 2009-11-08]. Available at: < [http://www.abanet.org/op/mathis/speeches/HOD\\_AnMtg\\_07\\_final.pdf](http://www.abanet.org/op/mathis/speeches/HOD_AnMtg_07_final.pdf)>

*Canada and China: a good and frank relationship to build on* [online]. Stephen Harper: 4 December 2009, [accessed 2009-12-12]. Available at: < <http://pm.gc.ca/eng/media.asp?category=2&id=3010>>

*Gordon Brown's speech in full* [online]. Guardian.co.uk: 23 September 2008, [accessed 2009-11-08]. Available at: < <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2008/sep/23/gordonbrown.labour1>>

## **B Special occasion speeches**

*Remarks at the Funeral Service for Coretta Scott King* [online]. American Rhetoric Online Speech Bank: Attallah Shabazz: 7 February 2006, [accessed 2009-10-01]. Available at: < <http://americanrhetoric.com/speeches/attallahshabazzcorettakingeulogy.html>>

*Address to the Nation on the Five-Year Anniversary of 9/11 King* [online]. American Rhetoric Online Speech Bank: George W. Bush: 11 September 2006, [accessed 2009-10-16]. Available at: < <http://americanrhetoric.com/speeches/wariniraq/gwbush911after5years.htm>>

*Eulogy for Ted Kennedy* [online]. American Rhetoric Online Speech Bank: Barack Obama: 29 August 2009, [accessed 2009-10-16]. Available at: < <http://americanrhetoric.com/speeches/barackobama/barackobamaeulogytedkenedy.htm>>

*Commencement Address at Stanford University* [online]. American Rhetoric Online Speech Bank: Oprah Winfrey: 15 June 2008, [accessed 2009-10-16]. Available at: < <http://americanrhetoric.com/speeches/oprahwinfreystanfordcommencement.htm>>

*Commencement Address at Harvard University* [online]. American Rhetoric Online Speech Bank: J. K. Rowling: 5 June 2008, [accessed 2009-10-16]. Available at: <<http://americanrhetoric.com/speeches/jkrowlingharvard.htm>>

*Commencement Address at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign* [online]. American Rhetoric Online Speech Bank: Carl Schramm: 17 March 2009, [accessed 2009-10-16]. Available at: <<http://americanrhetoric.com/speeches/carlschrammcommencementuil.htm>>

*Keynote Address at the 54th National Prayer Breakfast* [online]. American Rhetoric Online Speech Bank: Bono Vox: 2 February 2006, [accessed 2009-10-16]. Available at: <<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/bononationalprayerbreakfast.htm>>

*Healing or Stealing? - "You are brilliant, and the earth is hiring..."* [online]. Culture Change: Paul Hawken: 17 May 2009, [accessed 2009-10-17]. Available at: <[http://culturechange.org/cms/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=426&Itemid=1](http://culturechange.org/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=426&Itemid=1)>

*"Great Expectations"* [online]. Humanity: Bill Gates: 7 June 2007, [accessed 2009-10-17]. Available at: <[http://humanity.org/voices/commencements/speeches/index.php?page=gates\\_at\\_harvard](http://humanity.org/voices/commencements/speeches/index.php?page=gates_at_harvard)>

*"Why Does Memory Matter?"* [online]. Humanity: Alice Greenwald: 18 May 2007, [accessed 2009-10-17]. Available at: <[http://humanity.org/voices/commencements/speeches/index.php?page=greenwald\\_at\\_sarah\\_lawrence](http://humanity.org/voices/commencements/speeches/index.php?page=greenwald_at_sarah_lawrence)>

*"A Vanguard Against this New Separatism"* [online]. Humanity: Ken Burns: 20 May 2006, [accessed 2009-10-17]. Available at: <[http://humanity.org/voices/commencements/speeches/index.php?page=burns\\_at\\_georgetown](http://humanity.org/voices/commencements/speeches/index.php?page=burns_at_georgetown)>

*Address By ANC President Jacob Zuma At ANC Manifesto 2009 Gala Dinner* [online]. Anc.org: 9 January 2009, [accessed 2009-10-17]. Available at: <<http://www.anc.org.za/show.php?doc=./ancdocs/history/zuma/2009/jz0109.html>>

*Address by President Jacob Zuma on the occasion of World Aids Day* [online]. Ang.org: 1 December 2009, [accessed 2009-12-17]. Available at: <<http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/speeches/2009/sp1201.html>>

*Transcript of Nagin's speech* [online]. Nola.com: Ray Nagin: 17 January 2006, [accessed 2009-12-13]. Available at: <[http://www.nola.com/news/t-p/frontpage/index.ssf?/news/t-p/stories/011706\\_nagin\\_transcript.html](http://www.nola.com/news/t-p/frontpage/index.ssf?/news/t-p/stories/011706_nagin_transcript.html)>

*Text of Romney's Speech: The Care of Freedom* [online]. The Foundry: Mitt Romney: 1 June 2009, [accessed 2009-12-15]. Available at: <<http://blog.heritage.org/2009/06/01/text-of-romneys-speech-the-care-of-freedom/>>

*Obama's Notre Dame commencement speech* [online]. The Huffington Post: 1 June 2009, [accessed 2009-12-15]. Available at: <<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2009/05/17/obama-notre-dame-speech-f>>

\_n\_204387.html>

*Obama's Speech at Lincoln Memorial* [online]. The Huffington Post: 18 January 2009, [accessed 2009-12-18].

Available at: <[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2009/01/18/obamas-speech-at-lincoln\\_n\\_158928.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2009/01/18/obamas-speech-at-lincoln_n_158928.html)>

*President Bush's Remarks in Eulogy to Former President Gerald R. Ford* [online]. The White House: 3 January 2007, [accessed 2009-12-18].

Available at: <<http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/ford/>>

*Vice President's Remarks at the State Funeral of Former President Gerald R. Ford* [online]. Free Republic: 30 December 2006, [accessed 2009-12-19].

Available at: <<http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1760504/posts>>

*Seven for '07: Simple Lessons for a Complicated Time* [online]. Williams: 3 June 2007, [accessed 2009-12-23].

Available at: <<http://www.williams.edu/home/commencement/2007/couric.php>>

*Graduate & Continuing Studies ceremony* [online]. Stephens College: 10 November 2008, [accessed 2009-12-23].

Available at: <<http://www.stephens.edu/news/commencement/2008/may/speeches.php>>